THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENSES OF RUNNING AWAY: WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES GENDER MAKE?

By

Amy Stinton

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the

Graduate School of Vanderbilt University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOSPHY

in

Sociology

May, 2007

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Professor Gary F. Jensen

Professor Holly J. McCammon

Professor Karen E. Campbell

Professor Katherine B. Crawford

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my dad.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My lengthy graduate career has benefited from enjoyable and productive relationships with several of my professors and fellow students, including Jim Preston, Graves Enck, Simon Tidd, Cynthia Ganote, Gab Chapman, Pam Hull, and Lori Westphal. Special thanks to Koji Ueno, for his statistical expertise and inspiring academic commitment.

I was very lucky to have had three fantastic and inspirational women on my dissertation committee: I am very grateful to Holly McCammon, Karen Campell, and Katie Crawford for their contributions to my graduate career. This dissertation, as well as the completion of most of the other prerequisites of my Ph.D., was possible only because of the generosity, patience, time and enthusiasm of my dissertation chair, Gary Jensen. I know any success I find in academics will be because of his exceptional teaching and training. Gary was a constant source of support and guidance from the very beginning of my graduate work at Vanderbilt; and so agreeable to work with me long distance at the end! Thank you Gary, for everything! I feel very, very fortunate to be your student.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Gender is the most dramatic and consistent correlate of juvenile delinquency, with boys having much higher delinquency rates than girls (Hagan, Gillis & Simpson, 1985; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Jensen, 2003; Jensen & Rojek, 1998; Mack & Lieber, 2005; Piquero, Gover, MacDonald & Piquero, 2005). The gender gap in juvenile offending is especially wide for violent and more serious crimes, and less dramatic for minor property and status offenses (Lainer & Henry, 2004; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). Status offenses are behaviors classified as criminal only for juveniles under a certain age. Status offenses in general, and running away in particular, are committed in more equal numbers by boys and girls, than are violent and victimizing offenses. Because of girls' proportionally higher rates of status offenses, and because of girls' much lower rates of offending in other crimes, status offenses comprise a larger percentage of female than male offending, and so the juvenile delinquency pattern for females is very different than for males (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004).

The large gender gap in most forms of delinquency causes status offenses, such as running away, to stand out when discussing girls' deviance. This larger representation of status offenses in girls' delinquency requires special inquiry. In addition, the pervasive gender gap in most forms of delinquency indicates that even in offenses where the delinquency rates are similar, such as in status offending, the underlying process of delinquent motivation for girls and boys may be very different (Jensen & Rojek, 1998). In other words, while a status offense such as running away occurs in equal numbers among male and female juveniles, the factors that lead to running away may vary by gender.

However, although the gender gap in juvenile delinquency and the gendered pattern of offending are pervasive and well documented, little research has examined the underlying mechanisms that lead to different proportional rates by gender, and the unique pattern of female offending (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Jensen, 2003). Girls' delinquent offending has been largely ignored in academic criminology and the juvenile delinquency literature, and what research does exist is seriously flawed (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Cernkovich & Giordano,

1987; Sharp, 2006). Little is known about the unique causes and consequences of deviant offending among females in general, and even less is known about the causes and consequences of female status offending in particular. The rate of girls' juvenile justice system contact has been increasing over the last few years (Chesney-Lind, 2006; OJJDP, 2001). And because gender is such a dramatic correlate in offending, criminological theory must be able understand and explain these gender differences; and delinquency research must specifically study those offenses which are proportionately female dominated.

Furthermore, additional research on girls, status offenses and delinquency, using a feminist criminological perspective, is necessary to fill this gap in knowledge. And, because status offenses play such and important role in girls' deviance, a better understanding of status offending will provide useful resources for the justice system to meet the unique needs of the girl offender (Chesney-Lind, 2006). This dissertation will contribute to the academic literature on girls' juvenile delinquency in two ways: First, an examination of the future delinquent and criminal consequences of status offenses, such as running away, will provide better knowledge of the negative long-term effects of this prevalent girls' behavior. Second, testing a feminist theory of delinquency to examine the correlates of status offending will not only provide information on the significant causes of status offending, but also highlight the differences among the predictive correlates of status and delinquent offenses.

In order to adequately understand female offending, criminology must also study the offenses that females most often commit. Historically, the study of delinquency has mostly ignored status offenses, although this type of offense is a major aspect of girls' offending (Chesney-Lind, 1989). Status offenses are crimes only juveniles can commit: The offense itself is based on the status (in this case age) of the person, rather than the person's actions or behaviors (Steinheart, 1996). For example, violating a curfew or underage alcohol use are status offences. Truancy, smoking cigarettes, and running away from home are also status offenses, as these actions are not crimes for adults. Although status offenses have been overlooked in juvenile delinquency research, this type of deviance comprises a large portion of juvenile offenses for both genders, and is especially critical in the deviance of girls. For example, running away and curfew violations comprise a major portion of female juvenile delinquency, but make up a much smaller segment of total male delinquency (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon,

2004). Therefore, studying status offenses is essential for understanding female delinquency as it comprises the majority of girls' crimes.

Unfortunately there is little criminological research on status offenses for either gender. Violent and dramatic crimes have received a disproportionate share of criminological study. And while the deviance literature focuses on these infrequent, violent offenses, both self-report and official arrest data indicate these crimes make up a small percentage of total offenses (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). The following statistics of official police data highlight the large role status and minor offenses play in juvenile offending and arrests, and how girls are proportionately overrepresented among these offenses: For example, in 1997, violent and victimizing crimes made up less than 5% of the total arrests for juveniles, although this small percentage is not reflected in the literature (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). That same year, girls accounted for only 6-9% of the total arrests for violent crimes such as manslaughter or robbery, but girls were 58% of the total arrests for running away, and 30% of the total arrests for liquor and curfew violations (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). In addition, in 1996, while girls were charged with only 23% of the total offenses formally processed in the juvenile justice system, girls were 41% of the status offenses processed (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). Most noticeably, almost half of girls' arrests are for only two offenses; shoplifting and running away: In 1998, larceny theft (shoplifting) was the charge in 22% of all female arrests in the juvenile justice system, with another 22% of arrests for running away (Chesney-Lind & Okamato, 2001).

As mentioned above, status offences, especially running away, stand out when studying girls' delinquency because males greatly outnumber females in other types of offending (Jensen & Rojeck, 1998). Furthermore, status offenses are important in the deviance of girls because the police and juvenile justice system has long been more concerned with morality and behavioral conduct of girls than boys, and therefore status offenses are very likely to bring girls in contact with the justice system (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Tanner, Davies & O'Grady, 1999). The absence of status offenses in juvenile delinquency literature is another example of the lack of attention girls have received in academic delinquency. Yet, because of the large and important role of status offences in girls' delinquency, examining the etiology and effects of status offending is necessary for understanding girls' deviance in general (Chesney-Lind & Okamato, 2001).

Running away from home is a status offense that has played a significant and controversial role in girls' delinquency, as running away has the highest proportion of female offenders of any form of delinquency (Chesney-Lind & Okamato, 2001; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). Yet, like most status offenses, running away is remarkably absent in the delinquency literature (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Studying running away can uncover differences in delinquent motivation by gender that may be applicable to other forms of status offenses, as well as adding necessary information about female offending in general to the existing delinquency literature. One useful area of study for understanding the causes of running away is the family life of adolescents. The family has been a central focus of criminological research in explaining juvenile delinquency in general (Jensen & Rojeck, 1998; Sampson & Laub, 1993), and may be a useful in explaining status offending behavior as well.

Past research has suggested different levels and forms of parental control and gender socialization in the family may explain gender differences in various types of juvenile offending (Gove & Crutchfield, 1982; Bartuch & Matsueda, 1996). Therefore, one factor that may help uncover boys' and girls' motivations to run away from home would be levels of parental control and supervision. In traditional deviance theories, parental control and supervision are regarded as beneficial and would decrease delinquency among adolescents. These theories also assume parents provide stricter control and tighter rules for girls than boys, making girls' behavior more monitored by the family, and leaving girls less autonomy. This tighter parental control and supervision would lead to lower rates of delinquency among girls, and is often viewed as a major factor in explaining girls' lower rates of delinquency (Jensen & Eve, 1976; Heimer & DeCoster, 1999; Hirschi, 1969). But, the "protective" effect of parental control and monitoring may not true for all forms of delinquency or status offending, or equally for both genders. While the delinquency decreasing effects of parental control and supervision has been studied in general, this prior research has not included a study of the effects of parental controls on status offenses or running away specifically.

Another factor that has been studied as a possible explanation for differences in the offending rates of boys and girls is gender socialization and risk taking attitudes. Differences in gender-based socialization in the family teach boys to have more favorable attitudes towards risk-taking, while girls are socialized to be more risk-adverse (Akers, 1997). Because more favorable attitudes toward risk-taking would translate into higher rates of offending, this

difference in risk-taking attitudes would lead to higher rates of offending for males than for females.

Discovering what effect different levels of parental restrictions and gender socialization for risk taking have on the status offenses behavior of both males and females will provide a better understanding of the causes of running away, and how family experiences translates into gender rate and gender pattern differences. The dramatically higher proportion of status offenses in girls' total delinquency may signal a gender-specific reaction to problems girls face in their families. The relationship between girls' home-life and delinquency is crucial to understanding gender difference in motivation behind running away, since gender-specific norms are more likely to keep girls home, control their sexuality, and in other ways make them more vulnerable to victimization by family members (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Also, running away is often an attempt to escape and rebel against an intolerable and possibly abusive home environment (Chesney-Lind, 1997; Chesney-Lind & Okamato, 2001). Because of their gender, girls will face their adolescence as females in a patriarchal society. Girls' delinquency, like everything else in their lives, will be shaped by this status. For this reason, a complete understanding of girls' delinquency and status offending requires an evaluation of the unique factors girls face in their family lives.

Furthermore, in addition to the lack of understanding about the causes of status offending, little research has studied the long-term effects of status offenses such as running away. To date, the literature does not provide a clear understanding of the relationship between running away or status offending in general, and other forms of deviance as juveniles, or later as adults. However, although there is no deviance research to provide a conclusive answer, two opposing perspectives exist on the relationship between status and deviant offending: Some criminologists believe status offenders do not escalate into further, more serious offending, and do not continue on to delinquent or criminal acts (Chesney-Lind, 1989). This perspective assumes runaways, and particularly runaway girls, are status-offense limited offenders, and do not commit other forms of deviance (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). On the other hand, some researchers hypothesize that status offenses are a critical step in the lives of adolescents, and the first precursor to further juvenile delinquency and escalation to adult criminality (Kaufman & Widom, 1999). In fact, one of the justifications for prosecution of status offenses is the prevention of escalation into further delinquent careers (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Jensen

& Rojeck, 1998; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). But, because the literature on runaways and other status offenders is limited, the role of running away and status offenses in delinquent and deviant careers is unclear. And therefore, the current justice system intervention and prosecution of runaways may not be necessary or helpful, and in fact could be detrimental.

Research on the type of offenses girls most often commit is only one necessity of a complete study of female offending. The study of female offending must also incorporate deviance theory sensitive to the unique experience of being female. A review of the history of criminology reveals that most theories of delinquency were formulated to explain male deviance and male dominated crimes (Bartuch & Matsueda, 1996; Belknap & Holsinger, 2006). Traditionally, the study of delinquency has been the study of males, using male-based theories to study male-dominated offenses, ignoring girls' offending, status offenses, and gender gap differences. Some feminist critics have described criminology and the study of delinquency as suffering from a "stag effect", where macho-male academics study violent male crimes, ignoring females and the offenses girls most often commit (Chesney-Lind, 1989). The lack of attention gender has received in criminological theory construction is surprising considering the gender gap in offending is much more well-documented than the offending gap in race or class, two factors which have received considerable attention in theoretical development.

With the rise of feminism in academia, attention to the considerations of female deviance and recognition of the need to understand girls' delinquency is increasing. The ability of general delinquency theories to explain girls' deviance and gender differences in offending has been debated in criminology, but not sufficiently studied (Akers, 1997; Liu & Kaplan, 1999). Some delinquency theorists believe traditional theories of delinquency can explain offending differences both between and within the genders, since the causes of offending are the same for males and females (Akers, 1997, 1998; Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Simpson & Ellis, 1995; Smith & Paternoster, 1987). These "generalist" researchers support the *general theory* of deviance position assuming males and females commit crimes for the same reasons and with the same motivations, and therefore the same theories are adequate to explain delinquency for both genders (Simpson & Ellis, 1995). General theories rely on traditional concepts of deviance theory to explain criminal behavior. But can theories formed on the study of males be generalized to adequately understand the delinquency of females?

In contrast to general theorists, other criminologists believe general theories are not adequate to explain the heterogeneity of different offending populations, such as males and females. The *developmentalists*, or those who follow the developmental view of criminological theory, believe various factors in life circumstances affect different population groups in different ways, and a single, causal theory is inadequate (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Piquero, Brame, Mazerolle & Haapanen, 2002). The dramatically different gender patterns and proportions in juvenile offending are an example of how different deviance is between the gender groups. Therefore, traditional theoretical models developed to explain delinquency for males do not adequately explain female delinquency. Criminological phenomena are too heterogeneous to be explained by a common cause, and one subset of criminals could have very different etiologies than another subset of individuals (Moffit, 1993; Paternoster & Brame, 1997).

These typological theorists criticize the application of general theories of delinquency to females as "add women and stir", a process that overlooks the unique facets of women's lives, women's unique offending patterns, and ignores the position of women in society (Baskin & Sommers, 1998; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind, 2006; Daly, 1994). In addition, applying male-based theories to understanding female delinquency results not only in a weak understanding of girls' offending, but also leads to ineffective justice system intervention and treatment for at-risk girls (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006). Therefore, a specific understanding of the unique causes of girls' delinquency will identify and promote the protective factors that prevent female offending, and also help to create the most effective programs for treating girls in trouble (Siegel & Williams, 2003; OJJDP, 2001).

Feminist criminologists have been very critical of the lack of attention girls have received in the academic study of deviance, both in the formation of deviance theory and the absence of studies on the offenses, such as status offenses, girls most frequently commit. Unfortunately, the majority of current criminological research either ignores females or treats gender simply as a control variable (Sharp, 2006). Feminist criminology is a set of diverse perspectives, but is united by a critical view of traditional criminology's understanding of female crime and the paucity of empirical research on female criminality (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). Furthermore, feminist criminologists are suspect of the ability of traditional deviance theories to explain female offending, and believe gender-sensitive theories are required to adequately study female

deviance. Gender inclusive theories would acknowledge the important and unique factors of girls' lives general theories may overlook.

Feminist criminology places girls and their unique situations and offenses at the center of analysis (Sharp, 2006). Useful feminist theories of delinquency are sensitive to the patriarchal context of girls' socialization in society, acknowledge the victimization girls often experience, and consider the gendered realities of girls' lives (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998). This feminist position believes broad general theories, which really are male based theories, are inadequate for a thorough study of female offending. And this fact is especially true in studying a status offense such as running away, where girls show unique patterns and proportions. Therefore, a thorough understanding of girls' offending requires gender-sensitive theories. These deviance theories must be aware of the unique experiences of girls, as well as oriented toward explaining those crimes girls most often commit, in order to provide a complete understanding of girls and delinquency.

Statement of the Problem

This dissertation will add to the existing literature on girls and delinquency by studying two underdeveloped topics; status offenses and feminist delinquency theory. Specifically, the first aim of this study is to add to the limited research on status offenses and running away, and the relationship between these offenses and other forms of deviance both concurrently and through the life-course. For this objective, I will examine the concurrent and long-term relationship of running away to other forms of deviance both as juveniles and adults. The second aim of this study is to evaluate a feminist delinquency theory as an explanation for status offending. This goal will be achieved by testing the applicability of Power-Control Theory in the explanation of status offending behavior. For all analyses, I will use data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, collected by the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. This data set was designed to study adolescents and their families, schools and peers, and followed adolescents from high school through early adulthood in three panels, or "Waves".

The Consequences of Running Away:

The first issue this study addresses is the consequence of running away and status offending as a juvenile. While running away from home is not uncommon deviant behavior

among adolescents of both genders, it is among their least examined and understood behaviors in both cause and consequence. Like most status offenses, running away has not received any considerable academic attention, despite having the highest proportion of female offenders of any type of delinquency (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). Furthermore, existing studies on runaway behavior do not place running away in the context of other concurrent delinquent activities, or subsequent juvenile delinquency or adult criminality. And so, it is unclear if runaways have higher rates of deviance than juveniles who do not runaway. Once on the streets, runaways may become involved in other types of delinquency as survival strategies (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Tyler, Whitbeck, Hoyt & Cauce, 2004), or because of exposure to deviant peers and behaviors (Simons & Whitbeck, 1999; Whitbeck & Simons, 1993). Therefore, runaway behavior may be a pathway into further offending.

To date, the existing knowledge about runaways comes from limited cross-sectional interviews of adolescents in shelters, focusing only on the lifestyles and daily habits of runaways and not the long-term, possibly criminogenic effects of running away. In addition, previous studies on status offending have exclusively relied on official arrest records, instead of the more representative and accurate self-report data. For these reasons, the relationship between runaways, status offending juvenile delinquency and adult crime has not been sufficiently studied (Herrera & McCloskey, 2001; Widom, 1989; Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999). If status offenses such as running away are related to other forms of delinquency, and status offenders do escalate into adult criminals, this important information would allow for preventative intervention for those juveniles most at risk for further deviant careers (Kaufman & Widom, 1999).

After a thorough review of the delinquency literature the question remains: Are status offenders such as runaways more likely than non-status offenders to participate in subsequent delinquency or adult offending? This is an important issue for juvenile justice personnel, since if status offending does not escalate into more serious offending, unnecessarily prosecuting status offenders in the juvenile justice system could lead to further problems, and there is less support for the prosecution of status offenders (Chesney-Lind, 1989). On the other hand, if the escalation hypothesis is true, understanding the causes of status offending, and how this develops into delinquent offending, will allow for intervention in the lives of adolescents in the most helpful way, so the deviant behavior does not persist, or even increase (Kaufman & Widom, 1999). Running away is an important issue in the understanding of female offending and

delinquency, since girls are proportionally overrepresented in status offending, and status offenses are more likely to bring girls than boys in contact with the juvenile justice system (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004).

The longitudinal aspect of my data set will allow for an examination of the relationship of running away not only to concomitant and subsequent delinquency and drug use, but to adult criminal behavior and later justice system contact as well. And, since previous research indicates abuse plays a crucial role in the status offending of juveniles (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006), abuse will be included in this analysis. Thus, the first research question to be addressed is; "What is the relationship of running away to concomitant and subsequent juvenile delinquency and adult criminal behavior, and is this relationship different for males and females, or for abused children?" In answering this question, I will examine runaways' other offending behaviors, such as other status offenses, substance use, and property crimes. Furthermore, runaways will be evaluated for deviant activity as adults. These factors will be studied independently by gender. Finally, the relationship of experiencing abuse as a juvenile will be tested for both juvenile delinquency and adult criminality among runaways.

Understanding the Causes of Running Away:

As mentioned earlier, although girls account for one-fourth of all delinquency cases (OJJDP, 2001), most delinquency theories being used today were created for the study of males, usually white males, and serious, male-dominated offenses (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1996). Feminist critics argue these theories are not explanations for female delinquency, but explanations of male crime (Leonard, 1982). And, while there have been some developments in feminist delinquency theory over the last few years, very few studies have tested the validity of these theories (Jensen, 2003). Furthermore, these theories have not been tested using status offending as the type of deviance to be explained, but instead used other forms, often violent forms of delinquency as the dependent variable. This is unfortunate, since status offending is much more prevalent among adolescents, especially females, than delinquent and violent crimes.

Status offending may be a different type of offending with different motivations than other forms of crime and delinquency. Because of the lack of study, and especially theoretical study, on status offenses, it is unclear if theories applicable to delinquent crimes are applicable to status offending as well. Proven correlates of delinquency, such as parental control and

supervision, may or may not have the same effect on the status offending behavior of juveniles. Furthermore, because of the large role status offenses play in girls' offending, any theory of status offending must acknowledge the lives of girls, and likewise, any useful theory of female offending must also be able to explain status offenses.

Many feminist researchers believe the patriarchal structure of society and the family affects the relationship between gender and delinquency (Chesney-Lind, 2006; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Jensen & Rojeck, 1998; Akers, 1997). One theory that incorporates patriarchy into the study of gender and delinquency is Power-Control Theory. This delinquency theory was developed by Hagan, Simpson and Gillis (1985) with the intention of including gender and exploring gender differences in the study of adolescent common (minor) delinquency. According to Hagan et al., Power-Control Theory is specifically designed for explaining common delinquency, and not useful in the examination of serious, violent delinquency or adult crime (Hagan, Gillis & Simpson, 1990). Power-Control Theory is most appropriate for this study, first because of its appreciation for gender differences in adolescent socialization in the home, and second because of the theory's focus on explaining common delinquency among adolescents. The inclusion of gender makes this theory unique, and useful for testing the effects of patriarchal family structure and parental control on gender differences in status offending. If Power-Control's hypothesis about the causes of offending is accurate, it will uncover some of the dynamics leading to status offending.

The basic assumption of Power-Control Theory is the employment patterns of parents are reflected in power and control in family life, and this influences how sons and daughters are raised. Many delinquency theories assume parents provide stricter control and supervision for their daughters than sons. This supervision leads to lower delinquency rates among daughters (Jensen & Eve, 1976). To this basic assumption about parental control, Power-Control Theory adds the concept of different levels of supervision and socialization by gender and employment family structure. Different variations of mothers' and fathers' employment status will lead to either patriarchal or balanced family structures. These family structures affect the level of parental control and supervision and the socialization of daughters and son differently, leading to gender differences in delinquency.

According to the theory, patriarchal family structures, an ideal type defined as those where the mother is not employed and the father is employed in the workforce, impose tighter

controls over daughters than sons. On the other hand, if mothers participate in the paid labor force, especially in a professional position, the family will be more gender balanced or 'egalitarian', and therefore impose a similar level of parental control and socialization over their sons and daughters. In addition, girls and boys in different household types will be socialized into different attitudes of risk-taking, presumably in preparation to enter the capitalist world, and this increased taste for risk will lead to increased delinquency among juveniles. And, while there will be different levels of supervision between male and female teens in all household structures, the gender gap will be larger in certain household types. Patriarchal families will have a larger gender gap in offending among sons and daughters than balanced families, since in balanced families sons and daughters are controlled and socialized into risk taking more similarly. Furthermore, Power-Control Theory assumes increased parental supervision is beneficial for juveniles, and will reduce delinquency for both genders.

Indeed, Power-Control Theory is unique in the study of delinquency for its focus on gender, and for providing attention to the different forms of socialization experienced by girls. However, many feminist criminologists, while commending Hagan et al. for their attention to girls' lives, find the theory sexist and unsatisfactory (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). These critics argue Power-Control Theory is still a general theory, based on criminological concepts developed on exclusively male delinquency studies. Power-Control is therefore inadequate to explain girls' delinquency, because the unique aspects of female life are not included. For instance, sexual abuse, a real issue in the lives of both delinquent and non-delinquent girls, is absent.

In addition, like other control theories, Power-Control assumes parental control will always be beneficial for adolescents. Critics point out parental control and supervision is not always beneficial in the lives of girls, since often the family is the source of violence and abuse in girls' lives (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Critics of Power-Control theory would not necessarily expect higher levels of supervision for girls to decrease running away. For example, feminist criminologist Chesney-Lind (1989) would agree patriarchal family structure exerts more control on girls than boys, but this does not always lead to less delinquency. In fact, the tighter control and supervision of girls may lead to greater levels of conflict within the family, increasing runaway episodes, an outcome opposite the predictions of Power-Control Theory.

The question of how levels of parental control and supervision specifically influence the status offense behavior of boys and girls has not been conclusively studied. And, while Power-Control Theory is controversial, like most feminist theories, it has not been sufficiently tested (Blackwell, 2000; Hagan, Boehnke & Merkens, 2004; Jensen, 2002). My dissertation will not only test the validity of Power-Control, but also increase knowledge of the risk factors for status offending, as well as the factors that decrease juvenile status offending. Also, a comparison of the ability of these same factors to explain delinquent offending among juveniles will highlight any differences between delinquent and status offending. The second research question to be addressed in the dissertation is: "Does Power-Control Theory adequately explain status offending behavior for male and female adolescents?" This question will be addressed by testing Power-Control Theory on a sample of juvenile offenders. By testing Power-Control, the gendered effect of parental control on status offending will be uncovered, as will the effects of risk-taking attitudes. Power-Control theory will also be tested as an explanation of delinquent behavior in order to reveal any differences between the correlates of status offending and delinquent offending. Furthermore, I will discover if the unique aspects of girls' lives, such as abuse, influence the application of the underlying assumptions of Power-Control Theory.

Overview

This dissertation has the following format: Chapter I provides the introduction and statement of the problem. Chapter II reviews the relevant literature on runaways, including the changing perspectives on the issue, and how runaway adolescents, once romantically viewed as boys in search of adventure, became a social problem in America. The past and existing explanations of why adolescents run away from home, including how psychological factors, family relationships and abuse relate to running away are discussed. In Chapter III, the research on delinquency and status offenses is presented. In addition, how the unique aspects of being female, such as abuse, may affect these issues is also discussed. The reviews of the literature highlight the limitations of the existing literature on the causes of status offending, and the lack of information about the long-term and short-term effects of status offending on other types of deviant behaviors.

In Chapters IV and V, I present the theoretical basis for this study. Chapter IV focuses on criminological theories in the study of gender and delinquency. This includes a review of

early theoretical explanations of female delinquency, a discussion of feminist criminology, and evidence of the need for gender-inclusive theories. Like most studies on the delinquency of girls, this chapter begins with a discussion of the lack of theoretical work on female delinquency in comparison to the amount of work on the male offender, and the absence of attention to women's issues in traditional deviance studies. A feminist explanation of why male-based theories are inadequate to explain female offending is also included.

In Chapter V, the historical roots, development and assumptions of Power-Control Theory as developed by Hagan, Simpson and Gillis (1987) are presented. Following this discussion is a review of the existing studies that have used the theory, and an evaluation of the usefulness and criticisms of the theory. The final focus of Chapter V is an evaluation of Power-Control Theory as an adequate feminist perspective. This is followed by a discussion of what aspects of girls' lives need to be included in delinquency theories to best explain the nature of female offending.

Chapter VI describes the data set, study design and methods for this research. The purpose, collection procedures, content, as well as the advantages and limitations of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health are explained. This is followed by a description and justification of how the variables are measured, and the procedures used in analysis are presented. In addition, Chapter VI also summarizes the hypotheses to be tested with this data.

In Chapter VII and Chapter VIII, I present the results of the analyses. Specifically, in Chapter VII the data set will be used to explore the relationship between running away and other forms of delinquency and drug use as juveniles, and on subsequent adult criminal behavior. These results will uncover whether status offending such as running away is related to other forms of juvenile delinquency, or later adult offending. In addition, the relationship between abuse and offending is also explored. Next, Chapter VIII tests Power-Control Theory as a useful framework for explaining the etiology of status offending behavior, and evaluates the ability of Power-Control Theory to explain gender differences in common delinquency. The final chapter, Chapter IX, concludes this research with a discussion of this dissertation's findings and academic contributions. The limitations of this study, policy implications and suggestions for future research are also presented in the final chapter.

CHAPTER II

RUNAWAY LITERATURE

The academic literature on runaways crosses many disciplines; including social work, psychology, sociology, criminology, public health, and nursing. Yet, the body of literature on running away is limited in scope and diversity. Due to the transient nature of the population, there are no clear estimates of how many runaway youth there are in America (Kingree, Braithwaite & Woodring, 2001). In addition, existing counts of runaway episodes are often conflicting. The most recent effort to identify the scope of the national population of runaways was a 1995 study by the Research Triangle Institute (RTI). This study used self-report household surveys, and found 2.8 million children, about 15% of the youth population, had experienced some type of runaway event (Steinhart, 1996). Another study found approximately one in nine secondary school students will have a history of a running away episode (Rohr & James, 1994). Studies using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth find approximately 17% of adolescents had run away from home by age 16 (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). A 1988 national incidence study found approximately 450,000 juveniles ran away from home, and stayed away from home for at least one night, that year (Finkelhor, Hotaling & Sedlack, 1990; Whitbeck, Hoyt & Yoder, 1999).

History of Runaways

The body of academic literature on runaways begins in the early 1970's, although runaways have always been a part of American folklore and culture (Melson, 1995). A review of the history of how runaway youth have been perceived in American culture reveals a changing social perspective on the issue. Runaways have been part of American history since the colonial period, as daring young boys left home in search of their fortune (Shane, 1989). But while runaways are not a recent phenomenon, runaway youth was not always viewed as a social problem by society (Staller, 1999). Prior to the nineteenth century, children routinely left their homes at ages 10 to 14, to work as an apprentice or laborer in starting their careers. This attitude of exploration was socially accepted and expected; even Benjamin Franklin began his adult life

by running away from home (Schaffner, 1999). But, appreciating the issues of runaways requires an understanding of the creation of adolescence. It was not until the nineteenth century, with the introduction of child-labor laws and the emergence of child-saving legislation, that adolescent youth in this age group came to be seen as children instead of adults (Aaisma, 2000).

The recognition of a youth precociously on his or her own as a runaway, however, does not mean runaway youth were seen as problematic. On the contrary, as mentioned above, prior to the 1970's, running away was not defined as a social problem (Libertoff, 1980; Lipschutz, 1977; Melson, 1995). A historical perspective on the meaning attached to runaways reveals an evolution in how this issue has been evaluated over time. In the past, runaway teens were romanticized as adventures with the images of Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer. In the early 1960's, the image of runaways was one of hippie youth, whose runaway adventure was a short-lived period of maturation and exploration (Justice & Duncan, 1978; Staller, 1999). The definition of runaways as a social problem began to emerge in the early 1970's when 27 boys, mostly runaways, were tortured, sexually abused and murdered in Houston, Texas (Cull & Hardy, 1976; Staller, 1999). This was a major story in the media (Staller, 1999). Much of the redefinition of runaways as a social problem occurred when this highly publicized victimization of runaway boys changed the social perception of runaways.

Around this same time, the socially constructed image of teenage girl prostitutes, many of whom were runaways, attracted public attention (Staller, 2003). This public discussion replaced the romantic versions and innocent character of runaways. With this perspective, youths under the age of 17 living on their own was not regarded as normal and age appropriate behavior, but as premature liberation from their protective families (Wells & Sandhu, 1986). The socially constructed image of runaway youth was no longer seen as a hippie adventurer, but as a vulnerable child unprotected on hostile streets, and the issues of runaway moved from the private to the public sphere (Staller, 1999).

Runaways as a Social Problem

Along with public awareness, runaway youth began attracting political funding and academic attention in the 1970's. In 1974, public concern about runaways led Congress to pass the Runaway Youth Act of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (Bradley, 1997). This law funded studies of runaway youth and provided shelters and other services around the

United States (Bradley, 1997). In the first year after the Runaway Youth Act, 120 runaway aid programs and shelters were established (Janus, McCormack, Burgess & Hartman, 1987). As the number of social services for runaways grew, the population of runaways became more visible, and so did the opportunity to gain knowledge about the nature of their problems. There was now an identifiable and accessible population of runaways to study.

This exposure allowed professionals working in these shelters to realize the majority of runaways were not romantic adventurers, running to something, but were troubled adolescents displaying serious emotional problems and running away from intolerable conditions at home (Pagelow, 1984). In these examinations, runaways reported neglect, abuse, and conflict at home as reason for leaving their families (Janus et al., 1987). The information about the family life of runaways led to the realization that runaways are not only at great risk of victimization on the streets, but also in the homes they run from. The previous conception of adolescent explorers running to adventure had been replaced. Runaways are now viewed as vulnerable children with personal problems, who are running from or drifting out of troubled and broken families (Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999).

Why They Run

A review of the academic literature on the explanations of why adolescents run away from home finds previous studies cross a variety of disciplines, although the body of knowledge is small. One reason for this lack of comprehensive knowledge is the majority of studies to date are small-scale clinical studies, conducted in shelters or other institutions. The information provided by these studies is limited since it is unclear how many runaways present to shelters, and if those who do are different from those runaways that remain anonymous (Stiffman, 1989). Therefore, an institutional population is an inadequate research base for understanding runaway behavior, and limits the generalizability of many existing runaway studies (Bradley, 1997). In addition, these studies do not examine running away as a status offense behavior with relationships to other forms of deviance. However, these clinical studies do yield some interesting insights on possible explanations of why adolescents run away from home. The answers previous literature has provided on why youth run can be classified along two major assumptions about sources of the runaway problem; the individual or psychological perspective,

believing the cause is in the youth; and the dysfunctional family perspective, finding the cause of runaway behavior is in the family (Brennan, Huzinga, & Elliot, 1978; Schaffner, 1999).

Individual Explanations:

Early research on the causes of runaway behavior began in the 1970's and primarily came from the psychological and psychiatric perspective (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997). This assumption finds the cause of running away in the individual and views the runaway as a troubled or problem teenager, a bad or sick child with an anti-social personality. Psychiatric or psychological explanations such as depression or other personality disorders are viewed as the cause of running away (Denoff, 1987; English, 1973; Kammer & Schmidt, 1987; Reilly, 1978). Depending on the study, rates for depression and other forms of mental disturbances among the clinical runaway population have been reported from 38 to 84% (Kurtz, Jarvis, & Kurtz 1991; Yates, Mackenzie, Pennbridge & Cohen, 1988). Although the authors conclude these problems were present before the runaway episode, the cross-sectional nature of these studies raises the question of whether these attributes were precipitant to running away, or a consequence of the behavior (Bradley, 1997). For example, attempted suicide rates are much higher for runaways than other adolescents, but it is unclear if this precipitates running away, or is a response to the situation (Rotheram-Borus, 1993a; 1993b). In addition, the psychiatric profile of teenage runaways has included the concept of a "runaway reaction", a medical model explanation of disturbed emotional behavior, included as a diagnostic category in the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders*, Second Edition (Jenkins, 1971).

Other studies that assume the individual perspective focus on personality characteristics of runaways, as teens who are emotionally unstable and socially disorderly. In these studies, the runaway is seen as more aggressive, possessing weaker superego strength, and having lower general intelligence than non-runaway youth (Melson, 1995). Runaways are believed to have low self-esteem, especially females (Maxwell, 1992; Englander, 1984; Kurtz et al, 1991). Runaway girls are viewed as angry, incorrigible, impulsive, and sexually promiscuous (Greene & Esselstyn, 1972; Dunford & Brennan, 1976; Reilly, 1978). Again, this perspective is flawed in that most were small scale interviews with teens in shelters or the justice system, lacking 'normal' controls. However, despite methodological flaws, the psychological perspective

remained dominant thought through the late 1970's (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997). By the end of the decade however, several researchers noted the individual perspective ignored the stressful environments runaways were leaving (Brennan, Huizinga & Elliot, 1978; Nye, 1980).

Family Explanations:

While psychological studies explain the cause of runaway behavior as located in the adolescent, many studies indicate there are serious problems within the families they leave. Studies using dysfunctional family explanations are more numerous and recent than studies using the psychiatric or psychological profile explanations. Obviously, looking for causes of runaway behavior would lead to an examination of the family, as this is what adolescents run from. And because the family is such an important and influential institution in an adolescent's life, many studies have tried to correlate family factors with runaway behavior. This perspective believes it is a misconception to understand running away as indicative of a psychopathic problem youth (Adams & Munro, 1979; Janus et al, 1987; Rohr, 1996). Instead, this perspective believes the cause of running away is family stress, family deterioration, parental conflict and possibly dangerous living conditions. Literature with this perspective may even view the adolescent as healthy and normal, and running away as a sensible and appropriate coping mechanism from a pathological situation (Brennan, Huizinga & Elliott, 1978; Melson, 1995).

Research using this perspective appears in the literature starting in the late 1970's. These studies have shown runaways leave families characterized by high levels of conflict and fragile family ties. Runaways consistently report parental marital problems (Rotheram-Borus, Mahler, Koopman, & Langabeer, 1991; Carlson, 1990) and parental-child conflict (Adams, Gullotta & Clancy, 1985; Daddis, Braddock, Cuers, Elliott & Kelly, 1993, Schaffner, 1999; Shane, 1991) as their motivation for leaving. Runaways often describe their families as having low parental warmth and supportiveness (Spillan-Grieco, 1984; Whitbeck, Hoyt & Ackley, 1997). Several studies find runaways complain of overly restrictive parental control and unreasonable rules and regulations making home life intolerable (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998, Crespi & Sabatelli, 1993; Schaffner, 1999; USGAO, 1989; Van Houten & Golebiewski, 1985; Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999). Studies including parents' assessment of family situation have found remarkably similar descriptions corroborating a family life of unstable ties, dysfunction and conflict (Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999; Whitbeck et al., 1997). In other words, parents of runaways report very similar

levels of parental conflict, adolescent mistreatment and substance abuse in the home, indicating these conditions are not simply a misperception on the part of the adolescent.

Running away from home often follows a lengthy period of intense family conflict, overly restrictive discipline, abuse, or several of these factors (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). From the dysfunctional family perspective, running away becomes the result of a disturbed family life. A recurring theme in this literature is the runaway's inadequate parental relationships and a very unhappy or stressful home life (Melson, 1995). Some studies indicate runaways flee homes where there is an unusual amount of strict and unreasonable parental control and supervision (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). In one of the few large-scale studies of runaways, Whitbeck and Hoyt (1999) interviewed 600 runaway "street kids" about their parental relationships. The authors found the majority of runaways reported living with a parent who had a problem with alcohol, over half reported a parent used illegal drugs, and almost half reported a parent with a serious problem with the law. In the same study, the authors found two-thirds of female runaways and one-half of male runaways said they felt neglected by their parents. The authors conclude "the majority of adolescents are leaving families that have little to hold them" (Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999, p.53). However, this study also lacks 'normal' controls.

Abuse:

One of the most disturbing reports from runaways about their families is the prevalence of abuse. Abuse is a recurring theme in interviews with runaways, and the subject has been the explicit focus of much of the recent literature (Bucy & Nichols, 1991; Carlson, 1991; Janus et al., 1987; Kingree et al., 2001; Kennedy, 1991; Kufeldt & Nimmo, 1987; Lewis, Mallouh & Webb, 1990; McCormack, Janus & Burgess, 1986; Schaffner & DeBlassie, 1984; Simons & Whitbeck, 1991; Springer, 1998). There are no clear estimates of how many juveniles have or will experience abuse in the runaway population (Tyler, 2002). Rates of runaways' experiences of neglect, physical and sexual abuse vary depending on the study and methodology used (Bradley, 1997). Although some studies have found runaways have abuse rates as low as 3 percent (Kaufman & Widom, 1999), many studies find physical and sexual abuse rates of runaways in shelters exceed 70% (Kennedy, 1991; Schaffner, 1999; Siegel & Williams, 2003). One estimate believes that among runaways, one in four girls and one in ten boys will suffer from such victimization (Finklehor, 1993).

In addition, several studies have found girls are more likely than boys to report abuse as their main motivation for running away when asked about their motivations for leaving home (Janus, Archumbault, Brown & Welsh, 1995; Ward, 1982). One study reported over one-third of girls in a runaway shelter report sexual abuse as the main reason for running away, a rate over three times the reports of boys (Whitbeck & Simons, 1990). Runaway girls who were sexually abused also had higher rates of drug use than non-abuse runaways (Chen, Tyler, Whitbeck & Hoyt, 2004). However, the above studies relied on data from a shelter sample of runaways, and therefore the generalizability to the greater population of adolescent runaways is unclear. In sum, while the exact rate of sexual abuse among runaways is unknown as rates vary widely across reports; several studies indicate runaways are experiencing a variety of abuse in the family (Dean & Thomson, 1998; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Imm, 1998; Smart, 1991). Therefore, acknowledging abuse is necessary for a comprehensive study of runaway behavior, or the status offending or girls in general.

Limitations of the Literature

A review of the literature finds some descriptive studies of runaway behavior, but also highlights the issues that are not explained. Three shortcomings of the runaway literature are most noticeable: First, the over-reliance on the clinical case study methods limits the generalizability of the findings, especially to disciplines outside social work. These studies are often limited with small, non-representative samples and anecdotal cases that fail to acknowledge the diversity among runaways (Bradley, 1997). Many studies have less than ten runaways as subjects. In addition, these studies are conducted on runaways in the clinical settings of shelters or institutions, a subject base that may have unique qualities not found in more anonymous runaway groups (Stiffman, 1989). Studies indicate female and non-white runaways tend to be overrepresented in shelter samples (Robertson, 1991).

Furthermore, because almost all runaways return home with in a week and do not present to shelters (Brennan et al., 1978), studies of runaways in an institutional setting are really studies of running away to a shelter, not running away as a status offense behavior. For this reason, running away has not been examined as a delinquent behavior with a possible relationship to other forms of delinquent behaviors. In addition, since the runaway literature is mostly cross-sectional and focuses on the familial causes of running away, or on the life-styles and habits of

runaways, the long-term consequences of running away are unknown. Because of these gaps in the runaway literature, this study will examine the causes and consequences of running away as a status offense behavior. This dissertation will also examine the relationship between running away and current and future deviance, as well as contact with the justice system in the life course.

A second shortcoming of the runaway literature is the failure to suggest and test a theoretical explanation of why juveniles run. While the clinical case study method provides insight for creating theories, the majority of studies have not tested a theoretical understanding of the family dynamics that leads to runaway behavior, as the majority of these studies have been only descriptive (Jones, 1988). In addition, individual perspective studies provide insight of runaways' emotional problems and problems in family life as correlates, but not in a framework for understanding the cause and applying those findings to prevention (Janus et al., 1987; Shane, 1989). The lack of guiding theoretical basis and theory testing in these studies has reduced their ability to explain the connection between adolescents' families and status offenses. Therefore, this dissertation will include a test of theoretical variables useful as a possibly relevant explanation for runaway and status offense behavior.

A third shortcoming in the existing literature concerns the limited examination of abuse in the juvenile offender population. As mentioned, studies conclude a large proportion of runaways report being abused and neglected as children (Lewis et al., 1990). But, these studies fail to examine how the issue of abuse and neglect relates to running away and other forms of delinquency. And, although a link between abuse and delinquency has been reported, remarkably few studies have examined this question over time and into adulthood. Furthermore, what additional factors influence whether childhood abuse will lead to further offending in adolescence and as adults among abused juveniles is unclear.

Some studies show less than 20% of abused children will become delinquent, and how these abused adolescents differ from the non-delinquents is unknown (Lewis et al., 1990). Even less clear is the relationship between running away and concurrent delinquency, and the later adult criminality of abused and non-abused adolescents. As these three shortcomings of the literature show, there is much more research needed on the causes and consequences of running away before there is a thorough understanding of this adolescent behavior. The goal of this

dissertation is to add to the existing literature on runaways and provide necessary information on this understudied but important topic in female deviance and status offending.

CHAPTER III

STATUS OFFENSES AND DELINQUENCY

As the previous literature review indicates, the majority of studies on runaways are from the clinical social work or psychological perspective. Little research has come from the juvenile delinquency or deviance literature. This is unfortunate, since running away is a status offense: A status offense is a behavior classified as a law violation only if committed by a juvenile. In addition to running away, truancy, liquor laws, tobacco and curfew violations are status offenses (Steinhart, 1996). Often, status offenses are not a violation of a criminal law, but an affront to authorities such as parents, schools or communities. This can lead to the arrest of juveniles for behaviors that are violations of parental authority, and not just legal authority (Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). This includes being "beyond control" or "incorrigible" (Chensey-Lind & Pasko, 2004). In this manner, status offenses are an indication of how the troubled parent-child relationship can become a legal, delinquent offense.

The prosecution of status offenders has had a controversial history in the juvenile justice system and generated much criticism from justice system reformers. One concern is the inherent vagueness in the implementation of status offenses, meaning there is considerable room for interpretation by police authorities and juvenile justice officials, and provides these officials considerable discretion in application (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Another concern is that the enforcement of status offenses violates the equal protection laws, since prosecution and punishment ensues from the status (in this case age) of the offender rather than their behavior (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2006).

In criminology, status offenses are an area of juvenile delinquency that has been ignored in both delinquency studies and theoretical explanations, lacking the attention researchers have given more violent and serious male-dominated crimes. Since status offending has not received considerable academic attention, little is known about the causes and effects of status offenses in the lives of juveniles, as this type of offending has not been included in theoretical explanations or analyses. In addition, there is no clear understanding if the theoretical explanations of delinquency are also applicable to status offending. Also unclear is if the traditional assumptions

about delinquents, their careers and desistance for example, are also applicable to status offending. Some factors in general delinquency studies, such as family and abuse, have been applied in studying status offenses in an attempt to understand this distinct type of offending. This research is limited however, and has produced conflicting and confusing results.

Family and Delinquency

One area of delinquency research that has been the focus of much attention is the family. Generally, criminological theory believes a poor or nonexistent relationship between parent and child is highly influential in causing delinquency (Hirschi, 1969; Gove & Crutchfield, 1982). In addition to problems in interpersonal family dynamics, the structural make-up of the family has been used as an explanation for delinquency. 'Broken homes', or homes that have lost one or more parents through divorce, death or desertion, have attracted the most persistent attention in the study of juvenile delinquency and family life (Jensen & Rojek, 1998; Brennan et al, 1978; Hil & McMahon, 2001; McCormack et al., 1986; Rebellion, 2002; Reilly, 1978; Wells & Rankin, 1986; Wells & Rankin, 1991). The loss of a parent, often the father, is assumed to disrupt the effective socialization and supervision of the juvenile (Jensen & Rojek, 1998). Homes that deviate from the ideal nuclear family (both biological parents present), are viewed as facilitating delinquency, and especially status offenses such as running away (Rankin, 1983).

In one of the largest studies on the broken home/delinquency connection, Wells and Rankin (1991) concluded broken homes may have a small, positive effect on delinquency, increasing delinquency by approximately 10%. However, while studies have found a small relationship between delinquency and broken homes, equally important is the functionality of the family. In fact, further research has found the broken home factor to be largely spurious, as broken homes may not be as detrimental to the child as the dysfunction that precedes and follows the formal family disruption (Rebellon, 2002). Harmonious broken homes may be far less detrimental than dysfunctional intact homes (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987; Haas, Farrington, Killias & Sattar, 2004). Therefore, broken homes are more of an indirect cause of delinquency, as the family structure is not as influential to delinquency as the dysfunctional family dynamics preceding the dissolution (Hil & McMahon, 2001).

Another aspect of family life that has attracted much attention in the causes of delinquency and crime is maternal employment (Vander Ven & Cullen, 2004). Traditionally,

criminological theory has viewed maternal employment as increasing adolescent delinquency because of lack of supervision or reduced parental bonds and attachment. However, academic research on the subject is scarce and has produced mixed results (Vander Ven & Cullen, 2004). Early research on maternal employment did find a positive relationship between maternal employment and delinquency (Hirschi, 1969; Nye, 1963). Other, more recent studies have found reduced delinquency associated with maternal employment (Farnworth, 1984; West, 1982), while other, even more recent research has found no relationship (Broidy, 1995; Vander Ven, Cullen, Carrozza & Wright, 2001; Vander Ven & Cullen, 2004). Perhaps these mixed results indicate an actual change in the relationship of maternal employment and delinquency overtime.

Although overall the literature finds the relationship between broken homes or household structure and maternal employment weak or spurious when studying serious forms of juvenile delinquent offending, the same is not necessarily true for juvenile status offending (Wells & Rankin, 1991). There is evidence that in homes with reduced parental supervision due to employment or a variety of reasons, juveniles have higher rates of status offending (Rebellon, 2002). In addition, some literature has found a positive relationship between status offenses and "broken homes", even when a relationship between broken homes and serious forms of delinquency does not exist (Free, 1991; Maar, 1984; Rosenbaum, 1989; Van Vorris, Cullen, Mathers & Garner, 1988; Wells & Rankin, 1991). Because of this, household structure may be causal for only some forms of deviant behavior, such as running away and other status offenses, while unrelated to other more serious forms, such as robbery or violence (Wells & Rankin, 1986). These findings indicate parental supervision and control are key factors in preventing status offending among adolescents, and perhaps even more important than in the prevention of delinquent offending.

For example, adolescents from single-parent homes have higher rates of alcohol use and sexual risk-taking, presumably because of lowered parental monitoring and control (Thomas, Reifman, Barnes & Farrell, 2000). Canter (1982) found both male and female juveniles from broken homes had slightly higher rates of status offenses than juveniles from intact homes. In addition, children from a family with a large number of children have higher rates of status offenses than smaller families, possibly due to lower parental control and supervision per child. Runaway behavior is included in this examination of family structure and increased status offending. Rankin (1983), found adolescents from broken homes had runaway rates four times

higher than those from intact, traditional families. Janus, Burgess and McCormack (1987) reported almost 60% of runaways came from non-intact homes. The findings of the last two studies are limited, however, since neither of these studies reported on control groups of non-delinquent adolescents.

Family Abuse and Juvenile Offending:

In juvenile delinquency studies, the family is typically viewed as a beneficial agency of control, inhibiting delinquency by providing juveniles with safety and security (Jensen & Rojek, 1998). However, often the family can also be a source of maltreatment and abuse. The definition of child maltreatment includes sexual, physical and emotional abuse, as well as emotional, educational or physical neglect (National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, 1996). The extent of the problem of child maltreatment cannot be determined with certainty because much of the problem is never brought to the attention of either researchers or officials (OJJDP, 1997). Some family factors do seem to correlate with an increased risk of abuse and neglect for the children raised in these households. For example, children living in single parent household are at twice the risk for neglect as children living with both parents (Rosenbaum, 1989; National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, 1996). Children from larger families are at twice the risk for maltreatment as are those in one-child families (National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, 1996). Also, 78% of maltreated children were victimized by birth parents, with another 14% being victimized by other types of parental figures (National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, 1996).

While most abused and maltreated children do not become delinquent juveniles (Siegel & Willams, 2003), academic studies on abuse and delinquency do conclude there is a positive link, although overall the effect on future criminality may be rather small (Baskin & Sommers, 1998; Robert, Fournier & Pauze, 2004; Widom, 1995; Wright & Wright, 1994). Longitudinal research has largely confirmed the conclusion that abuse increases deviant behavior (Ireland, Smith & Thornberry, 2002). Many studies indicate maltreated children have generally higher rates of offending as both juveniles and adults (OJJDP, 2001; Widom, 1989a). Studies have uncovered a connection between abused and neglected juveniles and higher rates of arrests for various types of delinquency and adult crime (Brown, 1984; Smart, 1991; Smith & Thornberry, 1995) although the process that links these determinants is not well understood (Maxfiled & Widom, 1999).

Researchers studying juvenile delinquency have identified a "cycle of violence", where maltreated children have a higher potential of violent behavior, and have higher rates of arrests for these behaviors (Widom, 1995). Marital or domestic violence witnessed by the child also places children at increased risk of delinquency, especially when concurrent with parental substance abuse and criminality (Herrera & McCloskey, 2001).

Abuse has been suggested to be a unique risk factor for girls' delinquency (Herrera & McCloskey, 2001). Many scholars believe any useful explanation of female offending must take into account victimization (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Katz, 2000; Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989; Siegel & Williams, 2003). Recently, several academic criminologists have recognized girls follow a unique route to offending: Girls' negative experience in the home has been shown to increase their delinquency, especially when their experience includes sexual or physical abuse (Widom, 1994; Chesney-Lind, 1998; Owen & Bloom, 1995). Often status offenses are indicators of abused and victimized girls, who run away to escape dangerous environments (Chesney-Lind, 1997). Because of the prosecution of status offenders, many girls end up in the juvenile justice system because of family maltreatment (Belknap & Holsinger, 1998; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998), and this is especially true of runaways (Janus et al, 1995).

Sexual abuse has been of special interest when studying girls and delinquency, and female criminality in general. Sexual abuse of girls has been linked to various status offenses such as truancy, conduct disorders, and running away among female juveniles (Widom, 1995). In addition, sexual abuse has been indicated in a number of other high-risk behaviors such as unprotected sex (Rotheram-Borus, Mahler, Koopman, & Langabeer; 1996), gang participation (Thompson, & Braaten-Antrim, 1998), and alcohol and drug use (Tyler, 2002). Furthermore, being sexually abused as a juvenile may have long-term effects on criminality throughout the life-course. Incarcerated women indicate significantly higher rates of sexual and physical abuse than the general population, with adult women prisoners have abuse rates two to three times the national female rate (Harlow, 1999). Furthermore, women under correctional supervision are more likely than men under correctional supervision to have abuse histories (Harlow, 1999; Katz, 2000). Despite these finding, however, other studies have found the relationship between sexual abuse and violent crime to be weak (Siegel & Williams, 2003). Therefore, the sexual

abuse/delinquency relationship is not conclusively determined, and should be the focus of further inquiry.

Status Offenses and Gender

As mentioned previously, status offending plays an important and unique role in the lives of adolescent girls (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001; Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Feld, 1999), although the issue has been largely ignored by mainstream deviance studies (Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989). In fact, the most distinguishing characteristic of female offending is the prominent role played by status offenses (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). For example, in 1997 females were charged with less than 20% of the total delinquency cases, but were involved in half of the status offense cases (JJB, 2000). In fact, much of the lack of interest in girls' delinquency may be because the crimes girls commit have a higher proportion of status offenses and a smaller proportion of violence, making their delinquency less interesting to researchers and less threatening to society (Chesney-Lind, 1989).

Therefore, an examination status offending is crucial for a thorough understanding of female delinquency (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1996). While indifference to the issues of girls in the study of delinquency is not unique to status offending, status offenses are often the first or only contact girls may have with the juvenile justice system, and therefore this type of offending is central to girls' deviance experience. This is because the offenses most likely to bring girls into contact with the justice system are those that are not only criminal, but also involve and affront to moral conduct and obedience to parental authority (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001). The prosecution of status offenses reflects the traditional focus of the juvenile justice system; a concern with the morality of girls (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Not surprisingly then, girls proportionally dominate this type of prosecution in the juvenile justice system.

Unfortunately, status offending results in girls being disproportionately incarcerated in public detention centers. While 11% of the girls in public detention centers nationwide are incarcerated for status offenses, only 3% of incarcerated males are detained for status offenses (Schwartz, Steketee & Schneider, 1990). In some states, over 24% of the girls in public detention centers were status offenders (Schwartz et al., 1990). As can be seen, status offenses are a major part of girls' contact with the juvenile justice system. The perception that

criminologists do not need to study or understand girls' delinquency because girls offending is rare, non-serious or sexual in nature continues to perpetuate the lack of information about the etiology and consequences of status offenses (Chesney-Lind, 1989). However, if authorities could identify the traits of status offenders that serve as precursors to further criminality, justice system officials could respond to these female offenders in the most beneficial way, as this group of girls is often the most in need of assistance because of previous maltreatment and lack of other resources (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind, 2006).

Running away is a status offense that stands out for girls. In 1997, 22% of girls arrested for a status offense were runaways, while only 10% of boys arrested for a status offense were arrested for running away (OJJDP, 2002). In 2000, juveniles were arrested for runaway offenses approximately 142,000 times, with 59% of runaway arrests involving females (OJJDP, 2002). In contrast, just 9% of robbery, 10% of weapons, 12% of vandalism and 12% of burglary juvenile arrests involved females (OJJDP, 2002). Even among "career" juvenile offender, those with several contacts with the justice system, only 16% of girls' records include a serious offense, while 42% of boys have at least one serious offense (OJJDP, 2002).

Running away is a status offense particularly vulnerable to the effects of contact with the juvenile justice authorities. Of all status offenses, running away is the offense most likely to result in being detained (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Krisberg & DeComo, 1993). In addition, runaways account for the largest group of status offenders detained by juvenile authorities, with almost 50% of status offenders detained in juvenile court being runaways (Krisberg & DeComo, 1993). Also, there is a unique relationship between girls and running away that has been overlooked in the literature. For example, female runaways are more likely to be incarcerated than male runaways when there is police contact (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). This in unfortunate, because although status offenses such as running away are not criminal acts, girls arrested for these offenses may be confined in facilities intended for criminal youth, or even criminal adult women (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989).

Once in the juvenile justice system, gender continues to be a factor in the processing of status offenders, although the exact effects are unclear. Some studies suggest girls are treated more leniently than boys in the justice system (Horowitz & Pottieger, 1991; Poe-Yamagata & Butts, 1996), and this treatment is especially favorable at the early stages of processing (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001). Other studies conclude girls charged with status offenses

are treated more harshly than boys (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1997; Sheldon & Horvath, 1986). Research has concluded that girls are more likely to received formal processing for status offenses (Sheldon & Horvath, 1986), and once charged with status offenses girls are more likely to be processed in court than boys (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998). Furthermore, predominately female status offenses have the highest rates of detention, even though male offenders may be more likely to have committed other types of crime (Stahl, 1998). Finally, juveniles from ethnic groups are also more likely to received unfavorable treatment in the justice system, and girls from ethnic groups appear to be dually disadvantaged in the justice system (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001).

Status Offending and the Life-Course Perspective

One area of research in criminological studies that has recently received a lot of attention is life-course deviance, or the persistence or desistance of criminal careers throughout a person's life (Cernkovich & Giordano, 2001; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Hoffman & Cerbone, 1999; Paternoster, Brame & Farrington, 2001; Piquero, Brame & Lynam, 2004; Sampson & Laub, 2003). Not only is past juvenile delinquency the best predictor of current and future delinquency (Agnew, 1991), but juvenile delinquency is one of the most significant predictors of adult criminality, as most adult offenders have histories of offending as juveniles (Paternoster et al., 2001). Furthermore, juvenile delinquency has not only been significantly linked to adult crime, but also other forms of adult deviance as well, including alcohol use (Jessor, Donovan & Costa, 1991; Sampson & Laub, 1993), job stability (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Tanner et al., 1999) and divorce (Sampson & Laub, 1993). Also, the probability of juvenile re-offending increases with each offense (Johnson, Simons & Conger, 2004). Apparently once an individual has engaged in a deviant behavior, further and increasing engagement in a variety of deviant offenses becomes more likely throughout his or her life (Sampson & Laub, 2003).

While the strong juvenile to adult offending connection is one of the most accepted facts in criminology, this connection is not well understood or researched (Brame, Bushway & Paternoster, 1999; Paternoster et al., 2001; Tanner et al., 1999). And although there is agreement among criminologists that previous delinquent behaviors increase further offending, equally accepted is the reality that most juvenile offenders do not develop adult criminal lifestyles, but mature out of, or 'age-desist', from criminal activity (Cernkovich & Giordano, 2001; Paternoster

et al., 2001). Said differently, while the majority of adolescents will engage in some form of delinquency, very few adolescents will continue criminal activity into their adult years, and only a few juvenile offenders will become chronic, long-term offenders (Ayers et al., 1999; Lay, Ihle, Esser & Schmidt, 2005).

Therefore, looking at the past of an adult criminal, the continuities of offending are very strong, but looking forward from adolescence, the predictive ability is less effective (Maughan, Pickles, Rowe, Costello & Angold, 2000). This dual emphasis on both the continuity and desistance of deviance throughout life comprises the life-course perspective of offending. Unfortunately, since status offenses are an understudied area, and little is known about the relationship between status offending and other forms of deviance throughout the life-course, the escalation or desistance of deviant behavior among status offenders is unclear. Whether or not runaways have higher rates of delinquent offending as a juvenile, and later as an adult has not been studied, and therefore the role of running away in life-course of offending is not understood. If status offending is related to other forms of delinquent activities, the continuities described in delinquent to adult offending may be related to status offending as well. If there is a relationship between status offending and subsequent delinquency, status offending may be an important area of study for preventing the onset of juveniles' delinquent careers.

Life-Course Perspectives:

Three theories are most prevalent in life-course offending study, static theories, dynamic theories and typological theories (Blockland & Nieuwbeerta, 2005). Some criminologists claim individual propensities or latent traits in self-control are responsible for offending throughout the life-course. These are referred to as static life-course theorists (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Cernkovich & Giordano, 2001). Of course, the actual number of offenses each offender commits may decrease with age, but the most crime-prone adolescents will continue to be crime-prone adults (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Cernkovich & Giordano, 2001). The second perspective, the dynamic theoretical model, believes adolescents reduce the amount of offending with age because some juveniles gain crime-reducing social bonds and life experiences that make offending more costly for adult roles and responsibilities, and therefore desist from offending (Sampson & Laub, 2003). Adolescents who do not mature-out of criminality fail to establish or maintain those bonds (Sampson & Laub, 2003).

The third perspective, the typological theory, combines the life-course theories and an offense heterogeneity perspective (Blockland & Nieuwbeerta, 2005). Moffit's (1997) dual taxonomy of juvenile offender sub-groups holds there are two distinct groups of offenders that follow different paths; and these two paths explain both the continuity of crime and age-desistance among juvenile offenders. The first group type of juvenile offender commits a variety of forms of offending, and fails to mature-out of offending with age. Moffit refers to these versatile, chronic and serious offenders as life-course-persistent offenders. Due to a combination of neurological difficulties, early defective upbringing and anti-social peers, these persistent offenders miss out on the opportunities to acquire crime-reducing social bonds.

The life-persistent offender group has population differences from those juveniles who commit less serious forms of adolescent offending, have less diversity in offense categories, and do mature-out of offending with adulthood. Moffit refers to this second group as the adolescent-limited offenders. Adolescent-limited offenders do have the resources to develop social bonds and mature into conventional pathways. These adolescent-limited juvenile offenders differ from the previous typological group on offending seriousness and versatility, and well as career length, and commit more of typical adolescent offending such as acts that rebel against adult authority and minor acts of theft (Cernkovich & Giordano, 2001). Moffit's typology is influential because it advances the idea that there may be distinct offender groups that are the result of different etiologies, and challenges the idea that all adolescent offenders escalate without intervention (Blokland, Nagin & Nieuwbeerta, 2005). Although Moffit does not address status offenders specifically, as relevant to this dissertation, status offenders who do not commit other forms of delinquency would be classified as adolescent-limited offenders.

As are the traditional theories of crime causation, life-course perspectives of juveniles' pathways to crime are based on male models of crime using male subjects (Gaarder & Belknap, 2002; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998; Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004; Gilfus, 1992; Moffit, 1993; Sampson & Laub, 2003; Simons, Stewart, Gordon, Conger & Elder, 2002; Uggen & Kruttschnitt, 1998). Likewise, most longitudinal or life-course analyses use exclusively male subjects, and make little effort to understand how the longitudinal process would pertain to females (Gaarder & Belknap, 2002; Giordano, Cernkovich & Rudolph, 2002; Katz, 2000; Tanner et al., 1999; Sampson & Laub, 1990; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Sampson & Laub, 2003), or if the continuity of deviant behavior found in many male-based studies would apply to women

(Giordano, Millhollin, Cernkovich, Pugh & Rudolph, 1999; Simons et al., 2002). Those longitudinal studies that have focused on delinquent girls study non-criminal adult outcomes such as spousal abuse rather than adult criminality (Giordano et al., 1999). Little attention has focused on whether there is a female "criminal career" life-course pattern, how girls' status offending could be involved, or if this continuity is similar to or different than males (Gaarder & Belknap, 2002; Gilfus, 1992; Uggen & Kruttschnitt, 1998).

In sum, while most juveniles age-desist from offending by early adulthood, a few offenders persist into adult criminality. There is no data examining if female juvenile status offenders are equally or disproportionately represented among adult offenders. And, whether or not the risk factors for continuing deviance into adulthood differ by gender has not been studied (Mears, Ploeger & Warr, 1998; Tanner et al., 1999). Furthermore, whether or not the pathway to or away from continuous offending is the same for males and females also has not been examined (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992; White, 1992). The lack of study on the relationship between gender, status offending, further delinquency and adult criminality makes this topic an important area of study, especially considering the prevalence of status offending among both male and female juveniles.

A major contribution to the life pathways perspective is the recognition girls' lives are shaped by the social conditions and expectations of females in a patriarchal society (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Gaarder & Belknap, 2002). Life-course or continuity perspectives that emphasize criminal desistance through social bonds may be more applicable to females than males, since gender socialization and nurturing role identities result in making social bonds and personal relationships more valuable for women than men (Gilligan, 1982). The increased value women place on social bonds would make continuing deviant life-course patterns, which jeopardize these social relationships, more costly for females than males. In addition, females experience stronger socialization pressure toward conformity than males, making females more likely to "grow-out" of deviance than males (Schur, 1984; Uggen & Kruttschnitt, 1998). Moffit (1993) contends females would be most often in the adolescent-limited group, and rarely exhibit the traits of the life-course-persistent typology. However, there is little evidence to support the belief females would be more likely to desist from delinquent offending than males (Cernkovich & Giordano, 2001), even though females do seem to desist from violent offenses sooner and more frequently than males (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996).

Relationship between Status Offenses and Delinquent Offending:

One possible explanation for the lack of attention given to status offenses is these 'minor' forms of misbehavior are considered victimless crimes (Janus et al., 1987). Status offenders are seen as violating a code of society, not trespassing on an individual's rights or property. Furthermore, the behavior of status offenders is viewed by many criminologists as unrelated to other types of criminal activity. In fact, for some delinquency researchers, status offenders are assumed to be a special, homogeneous class of juveniles that do not typically have either a past record of serious criminal behavior or a likely future career of involvement in crime (LeBlanc & Biron, 1980; Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989; Thomas, 1976). Status offenders and criminal delinquents are seen as different groups, with status offenders unlikely to become serious delinquents. In this perspective, status offenders are really more like a typical, rebellious adolescent than criminal offender, and their behavior is only an extreme clash of parental and adolescent views and values (Murray, 1983). Therefore, delinquency researchers have not explored this area since running away is seen as transient or unrelated to other types of offending.

On the other hand, some juvenile justice researchers see status offenders as rejecting the traditional authority sources of home, school and social codes in general, and this rejection of authority is the precursor to more serious forms of misbehavior (Murray, 1983; Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989). There is evidence to support the conclusion there is great versatility in delinquent offending, with juvenile offenders committing a wide variety of offenses, both status and criminal (Deane, Armstrong & Felson, 2005). In this view, the causes of status offending and criminal offending are the same, and status offenders are future delinquent offenders. Status offenders will escalate and become criminals, and therefore severe deterrence of status offenders is necessary to prevent further offending (LeBlanc & Biron, 1980). In large part, juvenile courts have followed this "nip it in the bud" philosophy by prosecuting and therefore theoretically deterring status offenders from further crime, despite the fact there is very little evidence this deterrence is necessary or effective (Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989).

Understanding the relationship of status offenses and delinquency is important for adequate treatment of status offenders. Since status offenders are often viewed by juvenile justice officials as occupying a pre-delinquent and pre-criminal position in their lives, they are

very vulnerable to the effects of juvenile justice processing (Rausch, 1983; Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989). Therefore, the justice system reaction to status offenders is particularly influential (Rausch, 1983). Yet, since status offenders' behavior is not, by definition, criminal, should these juveniles be arrested and prosecuted? Two criminological theoretical perspectives provide opposing views on the usefulness of the prosecution of status offenders. The first perspective to be discussed is deterrence perspective, and the second perspective is the labeling perspective.

Deterrence theory assumes juveniles are rational actors and will not continue deviant activity if they have experienced punishment, or perceive the threat of punishment, for deviant acts (Jensen & Rojeck, 1998). The deterrence perspective assumes juveniles will make a rational decision based on whether the risks of the punishment outweigh the rewards of the offense. Court intervention and prosecution is necessary to prevent further, and increasingly serious, delinquent activity (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Status offenders should be prosecuted to prevent further deviant activity. In fact, juveniles would be emboldened knowing they could not be arrested for status offenses and would be more likely to stay on the dangerous streets, where they would be at risk for victimization themselves (Steinheart, 1996). Furthermore, removing or reducing juvenile justice system involvement may also eliminate what little assistance is available to these troubled adolescents (Mann, 1980).

This belief is challenged, however, with the argument that formal intervention by juvenile justice authorities may actually promote, rather than prevent, further crime (LeBlanc & Biron, 1980; Thomas, 1976). This second perspective, the labeling perspective (see Schur, 1973), believes contact with the juvenile justice authorities would increase, rather that decrease, deviant behavior for juvenile status offenders. While deterrence theory would predict juvenile court contact would decrease recidivism among status offenders, labeling theory believes the opposite. Because of hidden, negative consequences, juvenile court contact would stigmatize the status offender, and this label of delinquency would lead to a self-concept that would perpetuate deviant behavior and also an adult career in crime.

In addition, official processing of these juveniles results in the application of delinquent labels to the status offender. This will cause others to react to the juvenile in a manner that will result in a career of crime by sustaining a trajectory of criminal behavior (Jensen & Rojeck, 1998; Johnson et al., 2004; Sampson & Laub, 2003). In a longitudinal study, Johnson, Simons and Conger (2004) found juvenile justice system contact did increase further offending among

status offenders, supporting labeling theory. This finding is limited, however, since as in many juvenile delinquency studies, all of the participants were male.

The question of whether or not juvenile justice system involvement is beneficial or harmful in status offending is unanswered, since there is no convincing research confirming status offenders escalate. And although the assumption underlying the juvenile justice perspective on status offending does assume deterrence is necessary, unfortunately, the research needed to conclude whether or not status offending is related to other forms of delinquency, or find whether or not status offending is related to adult criminality, is not available. As mentioned earlier, very few studies have looked at the relationship between status offenses and other forms of delinquency, and those that have are more than twenty years old. These past studies, however, do not entirely support the conclusion that status offenders do not commit other types of offending or are isolated from committing other forms of delinquent behavior (LeBlanc & Kaspy, 1998; Rankin & Wells, 1985; Rojek & Erickson, 1982; Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989). For example, Thomas (1976) found 40% of status offenders brought to the juvenile justice system for a first-time status offense had prior non-status offenses.

However, although previous studies indicate status offenders may commit other forms of delinquency, there is not enough evidence to conclude juveniles necessarily "escalate" from running away to more serious delinquent acts (Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989; Weis, 1980). Status offenders commit a variety of offenses, a pattern termed "offense heterogeneity," without the clear pattern of beginning with a certain status offense and progressing to more serious crimes (Rankin & Wells, 1985; Sheldon, Horvath & Tracy, 1989). Le Blanc and Biron (1980) found that while status offenders are more likely to engage in other forms of non-violent delinquency than non-status offenders, status offenders are not more likely to commit serious delinquency or violent offenses than non-status offenders. In addition, Thomas (1976) found over 60% of first time status offenders processed in juvenile court never returned to court again, while only 20% "escalated" into more serious forms of delinquency.

The research on the effects of the formal prosecution of status offenders on the future criminality of those juveniles is limited and not conclusive. Two studies of status offenders in formal juvenile court processing versus status offenders in a less punitive program did not show a difference in recidivism rates (Rausch, 1983; Spergel, Reamer & Lynch, 1981). These studies were flawed, however, because they lacked a control group of status offenders not experiencing

contact with the juvenile justice system, as well as a control group of delinquent offenders. Furthermore, all of the above studies on the offense patterns of status offenders failed to distinguish between different types of status offenders, and between male and female status offenders.

The findings of one study that did study male and female status offenders independently indicate gender is important in predicting the delinquency of status offenders. Datesman and Aickin (1984) found among those juveniles whose first referral to court was a status offense, less than 40% ever returned to court for any offense. And, when there was a subsequent court appearance, the offense was almost always another status offense. In their study, status offending girls were particularly likely to never return to court again, and were especially likely to desist after one court referral. The two authors conclude, that for girls especially, there may be a specialized status offender group that does not commit other forms of delinquency. Like females in other areas of deviant behavior, it appears female status offenders' careers are shorter and are less likely to progress to other forms of delinquency. However, the findings of this study, like the above studies on this subject, should be interpreted with caution because the authors relied on official court records for data analysis, and their subjects were limited to only those juveniles who were formally processed in court.

Running Away, Delinquency and Adult Criminality:

Since studies of runaways have largely focused on finding out why they run away, and not the long-term, criminal consequences of running away (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997), research examining whether or not status runaways commit other forms of deviance, or will "escalate" into more serious types of adult crime, is limited and has produced mixed results. As mentioned earlier, some evidence indicates status offenses such as running away may lead to other forms of delinquency, since running away places adolescents in a situation where delinquency is used for survival (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997), or because of exposure to deviant peers (Whitbeck & Simons, 1993; Yoder, Whitbeck & Hoyt, 2003). These conditions that runaways experience may increase the risk of further offending, especially among those runaway who have been on the streets for a long period of time (Hagan & McCarthy, 1994; McCarthy & Hagan, 1992). Furthermore, once on the streets, these runaways are at increased risk of victimization, exploitation, personal injury, drug abuse and sexually transmitted and other diseases (Ayres,

1988; Flowers, 1995; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Herman, 1988; Hoyt, Ryan & Cauce, 1999; Jones, 1988; Kipke, Montgomery, Simon & Iverson, 1997; Rotherham-Borus et al., 1991; Smart & Adlaf, 1991; Windle, 1989), and the availability of access to social services is very low (Smart & Adlaf, 1991). These aspects about the life of runaways are all risk factors that may lead to subsequent delinquency and later adult offending.

Therefore, running away may be the first offense in a delinquent pathway. For example, Robertson (1991) found many runaways participate in drug deals, and approximately one-fourth of female runaways and half of male runaways have been arrested for other drug crimes. However, the relationship between runaways and other forms of delinquency may not necessarily be causal, but instead a spurious relationship with other factors in adolescent's lives: If running away is a response to intolerable home conditions, then the offender's delinquency also may be related to those family conditions. This association between runaway and delinquent is important, however, because runaways who become involved in other forms of delinquency may lose their status as victims as their behavior becomes overshadowed by criminal activity (OJJDP, 1997; Smith & Thornberry, 1995).

To date, little is known about the effects of running away on later adulthood criminality (Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999). As mentioned, many studies have confirmed a relationship between general types of juvenile offending and adult criminal and destructive behavior (Gottfriedson & Hirschi, 1990; Hagan, 1991; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Sampson & Laub, 2003). Windle (1989) found youths who ran away from home had increased rates of alcohol and illicit drug abuse as adults, and this substance abuse could lead to criminal activity. However, while status offending in general may lead to increased incidence of problem behavior as an adult, the specific relationship has not been conclusively studied.

Whether runaways as a unique, specific group have higher rates of other types of crimes as adults is not known. And although status offending may be related to adult criminality, the relationship may not necessarily be causal. If runaways do report higher rates of adult offending than non-runaways, the patterns of interaction in the family that leads to running away, and not specifically the social experiences of running away, can be the spurious factor causing both the runaway episode and the adult offending. However, it is possible experiences as a runaway make desisting from juvenile offending more difficult. For example, there is evidence running

away decreases adolescents' ability to develop future social bonds (Simons & Whitbeck, 1991), and this makes adjusting to conventional roles as adults more difficult.

Furthermore, the issue of abuse, a factor sited frequently in runaway literature, may interact with status offenses such as running away and affect future deviance patterns. Some studies indicate abused runaways may be more likely to commit other forms of delinquency than non-abused runaways. Among juvenile females, one retrospective study found abused runaways have higher rates of other types of delinquent activity than non-abused runaways, although this relationship did not hold for males (McCormack et al., 1986). Unfortunately, few studies have examined longitudinally the relationship between sexual abuse and running away (Tyler, 2002).

In one of the few studies to examine the female status offending and adult criminality relationship, Widom (1989b) found girls who were abused and neglected were more likely to have a formal juvenile delinquency record. Similarly, Maxfield and Widom (1999) found half of the abused and neglected females who had juvenile justice system contact had arrest records as adults, while only one-third of non-abused female status offenders had arrest records as adults. By using arrest records of juveniles, Maxfield and Widom hypothesized that status offenses can possibly further derail abused girls' lives from conventional social controls and lead to increased risks of adult criminality.

However, while Widom's (1989b) and Maxfield and Widom's (1999) studies find an interesting relationship between abuse, gender and criminality, the authors' study is limited by small sample size and exclusive reliance on official court and arrest records of female subjects, instead of the more representative and accurate self-report data. Like much of the data on runaways, research linking abuse and maltreatment to the victim's careers of delinquency and adult crime suffers from methodological problems, including exclusive cross-sectional designs, lack of control groups, and reliance on official arrest records (Herrera & McCloskey, 2001; Siegel & Williams, 2003; Widom, 1989). In fact, a further examination of these studies indicates that using arrest data may actually largely underestimate the magnitude of the abuse/neglect and criminality relationship (Maxfield, Weiler & Widom, 2000). Self-report data is desirable in the study of causes of delinquency because self-report data provides a more varied and larger picture of delinquent behavior not involved with the juvenile courts (JJP, 2000).

Although girls appear in delinquency statistics less often than boys, the fact is that girls do appear and have a unique pattern of offending requires examination. Exploring the

differential effects family life, parental control and family abuse has on girls and boys are useful for this inquiry. Considering the previously documented link between a history of being abused and further delinquency for girls (Herrera & McCloskey, 2001; Siegel & Williams, 2003; Smith & Thornberry, 1995; Whitbeck et al., 1997), status offenders may be an important intervention group in the prevention of further delinquent activity, and subsequent adult criminality. However, it is also possible that the same factors that contribute to running away, for example abuse, also increase the probability of other types of offending (Tyler, 2002).

In sum, the frequency of running away makes the issue an important one to study in adolescent well-being, especially for girls. The relationship between status offenses and other forms of deviance, both concurrently and as later as an adult, may be important in preventing further life-course offending. But the role of running away, or status offending in general, in subsequent deviant activities is not conclusive. As mentioned, some studies show females as more likely to specialize in either status offenses or runaway offenses (Datesman & Aickin, 1984; Farrington, Snyder & Finnegan, 1988), and do not commit other forms of delinquency or escalate into more serious or violent offenses (Tracy & Kempf-Lenord, 1996). Other studies, however, find status offenders do commit other forms of delinquency (Thomas, 1976). All of these studies, however, are flawed as the conclusions were based on limited arrest data and small sample size (Mazerolle, Brame, Paternoster, Piquero & Dean, 2000).

Conclusions derived from some previous life-course delinquency studies, however, would indicate status offending may not be isolated offending, but may be the first step of a deviant career (Deane, Armstrong & Felson, 2005). As mentioned, studying status offending is especially crucial in girls' delinquency, as these offenses may be an important mediating step triggering a life-course of offending for females, and a point where intervention programs would be the most useful. While running away may be a predictor of future delinquency, a "gateway" to delinquent behavior, identifying runaways at risk for escalation also provides an opportunity to positively intervene in their lives. However, contact with the juvenile justice system often compounds the injuries abused runaways have suffered in the home, and may not be beneficial for at-risk girls (Acoca, 1998). For this reason, adequate knowledge about the relationship of running away to other forms of delinquency, and how this relationship varies by gender, is needed to identify juveniles likely to engage subsequent deviance and construct adequate prevention programs to encourage desistance.

CHAPTER IV

THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS OF GENDER AND CRIME

Although gender is the most significant and reliable predictor of crime, little criminological research has focused on examining the effects of gender on delinquency (Jensen, 2003; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998). When gender is included in deviance studies, gender is usually included as one of several control variables, not as a focus of interest in empirical research (Burton, Cullen, Evans, Alarid & Dunaway, 1998; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Sharp, 2006). One explanation for the lack of attention is there are fewer female criminals than male criminals, and that female crimes are not considered as serious or interesting as male crimes (Cowie, Cowie & Slater, 1968). In fact, some criminologists refer to delinquent behavior as a "male phenomenon" (Bartusch & Matsueda, 1996). Therefore, female crime has not received as much attention as male crime simply because there is less of it, and the type of crime committed is less threatening to public safety (Steffensmeier & Broidy, 2001). And, despite a small increase in the arrest rate of juvenile offending for girls, the female proportion of offenders in the juvenile justice system remains very small (OJJDP, 2001).

Perhaps for these reasons, the majority of theoretical study of delinquency has largely ignored girls, and focused instead on explaining male deviance. While the absence of gender concerns is not unique to the discipline of criminology, criminology is one of the most male-dominated academic disciplines (Moyer, 2001). Yet, a historical review of the criminological theory reveals that although females were not included in the creation of the major theories of delinquency in use today, women were not completely absent from the study of deviance. However, theories used to explain the deviant conduct of females were qualitatively different from those of males, and girls were studied with different explanatory variables (Smith & Paternoster, 1987). As the following review of the literature on delinquency theory reveals, female and male offending have been seen as separate issues in criminology, with explanatory theories developing along gender-specific tracks. Male-based criminology has mostly explored the social and cultural factors of the environment as causation for crime, while theories studying women have mostly emphasized the personal and individualistic nature of females, with female

deviance often attributed to biological or psychological disturbances (Bottcher, 2001; Naffine, 1981; Smith & Paternoster, 1987).

Early Theories of Women and Crime

A history of female theoretical criminology uncovers the origins of problematic aspects in the study of female delinquency. Historically, girls have been ignored and marginalized in the study of delinquency. Even though gender has received little attention in criminology, the gender gap has been recognized from the beginning of criminological study, and explained with a variety of theories (Hagan, 1988). In 1900, Ceasar Lombroso wrote *The Female Offender,* a study considered to be first scientific study of female crime (Leonard, 1982). Lombroso explained female offending with the biological and psychological inferiority of women, and concluded the female criminal was not really a woman, but a hermaphrodite, almost male in physical appearance and actions (Campbell, 1981; Messerschmidt, 1993; Jensen & Rojek, 1998). A few years later, Wilhelm Bonger (1916) explained the gender ratio (why women have lower rates of crime), by concluding women were biologically programmed to be weaker and less courageous than men, and this passivity led to low rates of offending.

While Lomborso and Bonger believed women actually committed fewer crimes due to biological inferiority, Otto Pollak (1950) argued women's offending rate was not actually lower, but underreported, because the crimes women committed were largely "masked". According to Pollak, women, who are biologically more deceitful than men, are addicted to those crimes easily concealed, such as shoplifting. Pollack postulated the crime rates among women were probably equal to those of men, if it were not for the "hidden" female criminality.

Like other early criminologists (see Cowie, Cowie & Slater, 1968), the above theorists explained female crime as something inherently wrong in the nature of women, ignoring the social world of women and girls. This pattern of individualized or biological explanations and theoretical development for female crime continued despite the separate concurrent development of culturally based explanations such as social disorganization and strain theories for male deviance. These cultural explanations of deviance looked to social circumstances for explanations of male behavior. Similar to other social sciences originating in the 19th century, criminology has suffered from an andocentric bias in theoretical assumptions and subject matter (Faith, 1993). In the last century, the study of female delinquency was marginalized with

theoretical explanations of women's biology or sexuality, while the theories of and studies on exclusively male subjects became mainstream criminology. Therefore, the theories of crime that have shaped the contemporary study of delinquency were created to explain only male offending.

Although the above theories are now considered outmoded and sexist, the underlying assumptions are still reflected in more modern theories of delinquency. A review of the central theories of deviance finds differential association (Sutherland, 1947), strain (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960) sub-cultural (Cohen, 1955), and control (Hirschi, 1969) theories were consciously created for male delinquents exclusively. In fact, Hirschi (1960) deleted all the females from the data set of his initial application of control theory, a theory of delinquency as concerned with explaining conformity as deviance (Naffine, 1988). The deletion of girls is confusing, for as Naffine (1988) points out, girls have lower offending rates and would be a more reasonable population for studying conformity. But this example highlights the historical focus of attention in delinquency: The masculine nature of criminology has resulted in the omission or misrepresentation of female crime (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998). In sum, the major delinquency theories were developed to explain male behavior, with little consideration of girls.

As is evident from the above history, deviance theory developed along two unequal paths; the central focus of the major criminological theories for males, and a separate sub-category for the study of females as an addendum. When females were studied, delinquency theories explaining female delinquency were qualitatively different from those theories offered to explain male offending (Smith & Paternoster, 1987). While male criminality was explained in terms of social class or learned in intimate groups (see Cloward & Ohlin, 1960; Cohen, 1955; Sutherland, 1947), female criminality was assumed to be the result of peculiar individual physiological or psychological characteristics, or underdeveloped sexuality (Klein, 1973). Women's crime was explained with sexual or biological factors, or by the characteristics of men's lives that women lack, such as testosterone.

Furthermore, the social structures that limits female opportunity in a patriarchal society was neglected (Belknap, 1996; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998; Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1996). This is curious considering male delinquency was commonly being explained with social structure and economic variables. In addition, traditional theories see male criminals as 'normal' offenders, and are the yardstick against which the offending of females is measured (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998). These explanations of female offending created a tradition in

criminology of explaining the high gender ratio in crime with the examination of women, not men. For example, when the gender ratio of crime was addressed, criminology asked why female crime rates were so abnormally low in comparison to the 'normal' offending rate of males (Cain, 1990; Messerschmidt, 1993). Also, women criminals were seen as twice deviant, once deviant for committing a crime, and again deviant for not conforming to the expected female role (Schur, 1984; Heidensohn, 1987).

Until the mid-1960's, academic discussions of juvenile delinquency largely ignored the realities of female offenders (OJJDP, 2002). Few theorists gave consideration to the socialization of females, or the unique experience of being female in a patriarchal society (Akers, 1997). Theoretical attention directly intended to explain the gender variation in offending by considering the social structure's effects on women and girls began in the 1970's. At that time, two books, Adler's *Sisters in Crime* (1975) and Simon's *Women and Crime* (1975), proposed a liberation or egalitarian theory explanation of female crime. This theory suggested that as restrictions on female participation in education and occupational opportunities are removed, female participation in crime would increase, as a negative effect, or 'shady side' of women's emancipation and liberation. According to the theory, as employment patterns become more similar, so will offending rates, as women become more liberated and consequently assume traditional male social roles (Adler, 1975). Simon (1975) believed increased participation in education and the labor force presented opportunities to commit crimes unavailable to housewives, such as larceny, embezzlement and fraud.

The works of Simon and Adler introduced important factors to the theoretical discussion of women and crime, and started the theoretical tradition of liberation or emancipation based criminological theories in explaining female offending. Because liberation theory looked to the social structure to explain female crime, it departed from earlier, individualistic explanations. The introduction of liberation theory started concerted efforts to study the gender patterns as a central issue in criminology (Jensen, 2003). Following Adler's and Simon's pioneering work, the focus of the study of women and criminology shifted from emancipation to a focus on patriarchy and social oppression (Lilly, Cullen & Ball, 1995). By focusing on the relationship between women's changing social and economic roles and crime, liberation theory did raise an important question for the study of female offending that would draw attention to a neglected

area of female criminology: What effect does being female in a patriarchal society have on girls' delinquency (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1996)?

However, liberation theory was still controversial in the explanation of gender and deviance. Because this theory assumes women will behave similarly to men given equal opportunities, liberation explanations still look to women to explain the gender gap in offending. Like the theorists before them, liberation theorists look for something women lack in relation to men, rather than explaining the gender difference in offending with consideration to women's experiences and the relationship between women's lives and offending. Furthermore, considering the popular strain and social disorganization theories' emphasis on lower-class position and blocked opportunities in as conducive to crime, concluding women's increasing equality and economic and educational opportunities would actually increase crime among women highlights the peculiar and separate explanation given to women's deviance (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998). For example, considering strain theories emphasis on blocked access to educational and economic opportunities as motivation for crime, and given the economic and employment discrimination women face, women should have much lower rates of delinquency when restrictions are absent. Furthermore, liberation theory has been discredited because of the fact that gender patterns of criminal offending have not changed significantly, or adopted a more male pattern of offending in recent years (Smart, 1979; Steffensmeir, 1978, 1980a, 1980b, 1993; Miller, 1983). For these reasons, many criminologists conclude liberation theory is not an adequate theory for studying the relationship between gender and crime.

Current Research on Female Offending

In the mid-1970's the claims of liberation theory started a focus on female criminality and what factors are necessary to adequately and completely understand female offending. Many years later, there is still no consensus or clear idea of how to best study girls' deviance. The current discourse on the necessary factors in feminist delinquency theory involves four main issues: The first area of focus is the gender-ratio, gender gap, or gender pattern issue. That is, an adequate delinquency theory should explain the differences in offending rates, patterns and proportions between the genders. Specifically, this question tries to examine why girls' rates of offending are lower than boys' rates of offending overall, but also why girls' offending follows a different pattern than boys' offending.

Second, while attention to the impressive gender gap in offending is indeed necessary for an understanding of female offending, research in this area should not obscure an important fact in juvenile delinquency: The majority of juvenile self-report deviant behaviors show little gender difference overall (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). The majority of juvenile deviance is minor, and in this area of offending, the gender gap is very small. Because there is as much gender similarity in juvenile deviance as gender difference, equally important to a comprehensive theory of juvenile offending is the realization that while many offenses show a large gender gap, much of the deviant behavior of boys and girls is actually very similar. And, studying and explaining the behaviors in which girls and boys are equally involved, such as status offending, is also necessary for a comprehensive understanding gender and offending.

The third issue that developed in the study of females and deviance relates to the existing theoretical explanations of deviant behavior that were developed for male offending, and the ability of these theories to adequately explain both male and female offending. Can theories developed to explain male behavior apply equally well to females? This third focus of concern is referred to as the generalizability issue. Finally, much of the current discussion on female offending involves girls' victimization experiences as a central causal factor. Research consistently highlights the importance of abuse in the lives of female offenders, especially abuse from intimate relationships, and how this abuse experience evolves into deviant actions. Thus, explanations of female offending should also acknowledge the victimization females experience. Further discussion of these four issues follows.

The Gender Gap:

Currently in delinquency theory, the explanation of females' lower rates of offending involves the application of traditional delinquency theories. These theories explain girls' lower offending rates as the result of decreased exposure to criminogenic factors, or increased exposure to protective factors. The most common theoretical explanation for why girls have much lower rates of delinquency than boys is differences in parental control in the family. Girls are more supervised and controlled by their parents than boys (Hagan, Simpson & Gillis, 1987; Jensen & Eve, 1976; Richards & Tittle, 1981). This closer supervision of girls is both quantitatively and qualitatively different, and leads to lower offending rates (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998).

Another explanation of why females have lower rates of offending is because this gender groups is more strongly invested in social networks and social bonds than males (Brody & Agnew, 1997). Because these social bonds are so important, females will avoid serious criminal behavior that would jeopardize these relationships. In addition, social learning theories explain delinquent behavior as the result of norm violating definitions learned through deviant contacts (Akers, 1997). Therefore, girls' lower delinquency rates are the result of fewer associations with deviant peers. In the above theories as well as others, explaining the gender gap in offending involves differential exposure to the same factors for males and females, and the different offending rates are the result of different levels of exposure.

Related to the gender gap, or differences in the amount of offending issue, is the gender pattern question: Why are there different offending patterns between the genders? Self-report statistics indicate while the gender gap in offending is large in violent delinquency, status offenses are committed in equal numbers, and a few offenses, running away among them, are committed slightly more often by females (Farnsworth, 1984). Why females are much less likely than males to offend in certain crimes, such as violent crimes, but have equal or even higher rates of other offenses, such as shoplifting and running away, is unclear.

The question of why some offenses are committed proportionately more often by females, while other offenses are mostly committed by males, is an area of gender and delinquency that has been overlooked (Hagan, 1990). This is because the search for explaining the causes of offending in delinquency has resulted in a lack of attention to why male and female adolescents commit one type of crime instead of another (Cullen, 1983). In the study of gender and delinquency, this focus resulted in explaining the cause of the gender gap, or the motivational variables that explain why boys are more likely to offend than girls, while neglecting an explanation of the different gender patterns of offending.

One explanation of why, when the motivation to deviate is present, delinquency takes one form more often for females and another form for males, involves an examination of structural variables in the lives of adolescents (Cullen, 1983). Structural variables channel the expression of deviance, and explain why girls are more likely to offend in some forms, such as running away, than in other forms, such as violence. Cullen (1983) believes structural variables need to be considered when studying gender and crime since theories should account for the specific forms of criminal responses, as well as the causes of deviance. A structuring perspective

accounts for the macro-level, status opportunity, or social-psychological variables that affect the channeling of deviance into one particular type of criminal response. In the study of delinquency, while there may be a common cause of deviance for both genders, the criminal response to this common cause would take gender-specific forms.

Social structural variables in the lives of adolescents would explain why girls or boys choose one type of criminal response more often than another, or as a group why girls have a higher rate of running away than boys. Past theories of delinquency have implicitly considered structuring variables in the study of crime and gender. For example, Bonger (1916) studied how the status of sex directs women, who have less physical strength than men, away from crimes requiring personal physical strength, such as assault. Similarly, the liberation or egalitarian theorists, such as Adler (1975) and Simon (1975), report how the change in the structural variables of occupational opportunities allowed women to participate in forms of crime previously available to only men, such as financial or work-related crimes. These theories show how specific criminal expressions of the motivation for deviance are available only one gender because of the structure of society.

Other theories of delinquency explain the gender differences in crime by gender-specific reactions to the same criminogenic factors. This gendered response is shaped by social-psychological variables. For example, Broidy & Agnew (1997) revised traditional strain theory to better account for the gender differences in crime. In their general strain theory, the gender difference is hypothesized to be the result of not differing amounts of strain, but instead different types of strain. Males are more likely to experience the type of strain conducive to serious crime, while females are more likely to experience the types of strain conducive to self-destructive behavior. The gendered response to this strain for males is to react with violence, and for females, self-destructive behavior. Furthermore, females are more likely than males to experience depression, guilt and anxiety in response to strain, and these emotions dampen criminal actions and reduce the likelihood of an other-directed criminal response. In sum, general strain theory explains the gender differences in offending by the gender specific type of strain experienced as well as the gender specific type of emotional responses to strain.

De Coster (2003) further developed the structural aspect of deviance theory. De Coster finds the cause of deviance for both males and females in disadvantaged positions and weak social bonds, but the specific deviant response is shaped by the adolescent's gender role. Social

learning results in the formation of male and female self-identities, and gender difference in self-identities result in delinquency being channeled into gender-appropriate forms. Macro-level structures, such as a patriarchal society, determine the kinds of deviant activities that prevail for each gender. Taking the gender role of male or female explains why boys are more likely to use law violations to express deviance, and girls are more likely to deviate with depression. Through gender-identity and role-taking, girls learn the appropriate type of deviance for females is depression, and express deviance in that form. Boys, on the other hand, are more likely to learn the appropriate definition of deviance for males is law violation. The motivation to deviate for girls and boys is the same, but the expression of deviance is not, due to the structuring of gender-identity.

Gender Similarities:

As mentioned above and in the opening sentence of this dissertation, gender is the most dramatic correlate in crime and delinquency. Furthermore, the gender gap in offending is persistent throughout historical and cross-cultural perspectives, and among different methods of study and different measurements of criminal activities (Britton, 2000; Jensen & Rojek, 1998; Mears, Ploger & Warr, 1998). However, although males dominate criminal statistics, equally true is the fact the much of deviant behavior of males and females is very similar in offense type, prevalence and frequency (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). The bulk of offending for all ages in both self-report and arrest statistics is for less serous offenses such as drug use and petty theft, and males' and females' offense histories are actually quite similar on these crimes (Britton, 2000). This gender similarity is especially true of juvenile delinquency: In adolescent offending, the majority of delinquency is minor, boys' and girls' offending behavior patterns are incredibly similar (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004).

Canter's (1982) analysis of National Youth Survey juvenile self-report data highlights this finding. In Canter's analysis of several delinquency offenses over time, boys reported higher offense rates in every category and in every panel wave. While this finding can be interpreted as further evidence of male's dominance is delinquency, also true is the fact that in over 40% of the deviant behaviors, there was no statistically significant difference between the genders. Furthermore, the author concludes in many of the offenses where there was a statistically significant difference, the practical significance of the gender gap was negligible. In fact, the

offense patterns between boys and girls were overwhelmingly similar in both proportions and frequency, and, only at the extremes of offending did a gender difference emerge. What Canter's analysis indicates is that gender similarity in delinquent behavior is as much an essential factor in the study of gender and juvenile offending as the gender gap in delinquent behavior. This gender similarity, however, has not received equal attention.

In past studies of gender and deviance, researchers have over-emphasized gender differences in the offenses which show a large gender gap, and ignored those offenses where there is gender parity. This oversight has resulted in an absence of study on those offenses, such as status offenses, where there is overwhelming gender similarity in offending. This is unfortunate, since research on offenses where there is both gender similarity and gender difference in offending is necessary for an adequate understanding of juvenile delinquency (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). To thoroughly understand the relationship between gender and offending, gender and delinquency research must focus on the areas of juvenile offending where girls' and boys' offending is similar, as well as different. Therefore, instead of consistently asking why males are consistently more likely to offend, researchers need to ask an additional question in studying gender and delinquency: Why are males and females remarkably similar in the majority of their offending?

The Generalizability Issue:

The third issue that developed in the study of female criminality is generalizability, or the ability of dominant existing criminological theories to be effectively applied to females. As the above history of female criminology shows, the study of female offending was marginalized, while the study of male offending, and the theories developed to explain it, became main-stream. The major delinquency theories were developed on studies of males to explain male delinquency, and the deviant activities of females have received only a fraction of the theoretical development and attention devoted to male offending. But, do these "mainstream" theories, or general theories of delinquency based on traditional theories, apply to female deviance?

The evidence available to completely answer this question is limited and inconclusive (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1996; Smith & Paternoster, 1987). For years, several researchers have discussed the shortcomings of applying traditional deviance theories to explain the delinquency of girls (Belknap, 1996; Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon,

1992; Katz, 2000; Klein, 1973; Leonard, 1982; Naffine, 1987; Sharp, 2006; Simpson & Elis, 1995; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). If the major theories of delinquency are indeed general theories with the ability to explain several different types of crimes among different actors, these theories should be able to explain delinquency among all classes and both genders, and explain why males offending rates are higher than female offending rates in certain crimes, and equal to female offending rates in other crimes (Paternoster & Brame, 1997).

Some theorists argue traditional delinquency theories can be used as comprehensive general theories to explain the deviant behavior of both males and females, because the process that causes delinquency in females is the same as in males (Burton et al., 1998; Simons, Miller & Aigner, 1980). These 'generalist' theorists believe there is a general theory of delinquency that can explain offending difference both between and within gender (Heimer, 1999; Jensen & Eve, 1976). Several studies have concluded the factors that influence male offending are similar for females, and the operation of these causal factors is the same for males and females (Liu & Kaplan, 1999; Morris, 1987; Simons et al., 1980; Smith, 1979). Therefore, females are less deviant than males because they report lower levels of the attributes traditional theories conclude promote deviance, or possess more of the attributes than prevent deviance. Some of these general theories have been successfully used to examine girls' offending (Jensen & Eve, 1976; Smith & Paternoster, 1987).

One example of a deviance theory reported to be able to explain both male and female delinquency is general strain theory (Broidy & Agnew, 1997). The authors of general strain theory believe the underlying process of strain, negative emotions and subsequent coping behaviors in triggering delinquency is the same for both genders. Yet, this strain takes gender-dependent forms and produces gender-dependent deviance. In another example, Smith and Paternoster (1987) found the same factors that increase drug use among males also increase drug use among females, but the exposure to these predictors was different between the genders, and this resulted in lower rates of drug use for females. In addition, Svensson (2003) found exposure to deviant peers was a significant explanatory factor in juvenile drug use, and this exposure was lower for females, explaining lower rates of drug use among girls.

Again, the process for developing a proclivity to offend is the same for males and females, but differential exposure to the factors that cause delinquency are responsible for gender ratio difference in offending. These authors conclude that for minor forms of offending, gender-

neutral theories of delinquency are adequate for studying both male and female offending, as long as differential exposure to delinquency correlates is considered and explains any gender gap in offense rates. For this reason, generalists believe female criminality can be explained by traditional theories and it is not necessary to abandon male-based, traditional theories, or create separate studies for females, as long as gender issues are acknowledged. An example of a traditional-based theory considered sensitive to gender issues is Power-Control theory.

However, other theorists are critical of this "add women and stir" approach, concluding traditional delinquency theories are not applicable in an unmodified form to girls (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998; Gaarder & Belknap, 2002; Klein, 1973). And, while some studies have found factors related to male delinquency are also relevant to female delinquency, other studies have found male correlates of deviance are unrelated to female offending (Giordano et al., 2002; Katz, 2000; Kruttschnitt, 1996). Furthermore, girls may react differently than boys to some adolescent experiences, but react in the same way to other adolescent experiences (Kruttschnitt, 1996). In addition, while some parts of traditional theories may be enlightening, as a whole these theories are not as adequate an explanation of female crime as male crime (Katz, 2000). Applying traditional theories to females assumes that if females were raised the same way as males and had the same experiences as males; girls would report delinquency rates as high as boys' rates (Chesney-Lind, 2001b). In reality, girls and boys have gendered experiences in a gendered society. Therefore, female offending is qualitatively different from male offending, and requires unique theories and separate studies.

For feminist criminologists, traditional theories were formulated using the experiences of males, and patterns of male deviance, which became the 'normal' deviance. For these authors, general theories are really theories of male deviance. Different explanations and theories for male and female behavior are needed, since traditional theories do not consider the social experiences of women. For example, the inattention to patriarchal family arrangements in the lives of adolescent girls make traditional theories inadequate for explaining any type of female behavior, not simply delinquency (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998). Applying traditional theories has resulted in the finding that simply acknowledges males commit more crime than females, and ignored unique forms of female delinquency (Sharp, Brewester & Love, 2005)

Some feminist criminologists argue when traditional theories of deviance are applied to females, the unique social and economic aspects of girls' lives are overlooked (Bloom, Owen,

Deschenes & Rosenbaum, 2002; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998). For Chesney-Lind and others, the fact that the different gender patterns in offending are the result of differential exposure to delinquency risk factors just leads to the question: "What unique gender-specific factors are responsible for that different exposure?" Furthermore, feminist criminologist believe the only way to understand female delinquency is to construct theories of criminality and offending grounded in the conceptual framework of gender, and especially gender in a patriarchal society. For example, traditional theories have ignored the role of patriarchal power in contributing to participation in crime (Burton et al., 1998).

In addition, feminist criminologists believe the study of female delinquency needs to consider the patterns of offending that are different for men and women, and women have unique characteristics about their crimes. For example, serious property crimes as well as violent crimes are much less prevalent in female offending than among males (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). Furthermore, females are more likely to be solo perpetrators than males (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). In addition, the processes and motivations in male and female delinquency are too different to be explained by a common set of causes. Assuming the development of delinquency in males is similar to the process in females is a serious misconception, as the few studies on delinquent girls suggest different risk factors for delinquency between the genders (Wangby, Bergman, & Magnusson, 1999). Also, many authors conclude the limited empirical evidence available on this subject does indicate traditional theories are better at explaining male than female delinquency (Katz, 2000). Although some applications of traditional theories of delinquency to girls may exist, girls' experiences are much different than boys' experiences in adolescence, especially in family life (Akers, 1997).

Gender and Victimization:

One of the most essential and consistent perspectives of feminist criminology is that girls follow a unique route to offending, a pathway that often involves victimization (Acoca, 1998; Belknap & Holsiner, 1998; Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Gaarder & Belknap, 2002; Holtfreter, Reisig & Morash, 2004; Katz, 2000). As mentioned earlier, people who experience any form of abuse or neglect during childhood are more likely to be arrested later as adults (Britton, 2000; Gaarder & Belknap, 2002; Widom & Ames, 1994). Furthermore, there appears to be a positive

connection between the number of different forms of abuse and the number of different types of deviant behaviors (Acoca, 1998).

And although abuse is seen as a risk factor for delinquency for both genders, childhood maltreatment may be especially salient for girls (Herrera & McCloskey, 2001; Smith & Thornberry, 1995). The relationship between victimization and offending has given rise to the concept of "blurred boundaries" in feminist criminology, where the cause of offending, and the offender herself, cannot be separated from her victimization experience (Lanier & Henry, 2004). Furthermore, some researchers conclude females require a higher level of provocation before turning to crime than males, and victimization is a large part of that provocation (Daly, 1994; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). Past victimization experience is especially important in studying running away, girls and delinquency because often running away is a means to escape abusive homes (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998; Siegel & Williams, 2003). Furthermore, a high proportion of delinquent girls first come into contact with the juvenile justice system as abused runaways (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). And, these abused runaways may turn to stealing and other forms of delinquency (Gilfus, 1992) or prostitution (Widom & Kuhns, 1996) to survive on the streets.

Research in this area concludes experiencing abuse, physical, sexual or emotional, can be the first step in girls' delinquent careers and influence the patterns of offenses girls commit (Belknap, Holsinger & Dunn, 1997; Chesney-Lind, 1997). There is some evidence females' victimization experience may be more predictive of subsequent, life-long offending than males' victimization experience, although this may be due to the lack of study on male offending and abuse (Katz, 2000). For example, Acoca and Austin (1996) found a history of violent victimization was one of the most frequent attributes of adult female state prisoners. Similarly, Acoca and Dedel (1998) studied a repeat juvenile girl population and found over 90% of these offenders reported some form of emotional, physical or sexual abuse. Maltreated girls were found to have significantly higher rates of alcohol and drug arrests as adults than non-abused females, a relationship that did not hold for males (Ireland & Widom, 1994).

Feminist Theory and Delinquency

In sum, while the feminist perspective in criminology is varied (Burgess-Proctor, 2006), there is a core of shared ideas that distinguishes this perspective from traditional forms of

criminological inquiry (Lanier & Henry, 2004). Recognizing gender stratification exists, and has implications for the experience of being female, is crucial for an adequate explanation of female offending. The social placement of females in the patriarchal social structure is more important in an explanation of girls' delinquency than traditional theories of criminology allow. Girls' position in society is not only important for understanding a motivation for delinquency, but also shapes the form of delinquency girls commit. Therefore, a comprehensive theory of delinquency needs to acknowledge the differences in social context experienced by males and females, and how this leads to the differential socialization of girls and boys (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1996; Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988). The theory will also have to acknowledge gender differences and similarities in offending, and be applicable to those offenses girls most often commit.

Furthermore, the sexist view in traditional delinquency theories can have a profound impact on the treatment of girls in the juvenile justice system (Holsinger, 2000), as viewing people unequally usually results in damaging consequences for those less powerful (Odem, 1995). For example, early theorists' preoccupation with girls' sexuality as a cause of delinquency focused the attention of the juvenile justice system on charges of immorality for girls for the same actions that were usually ignored among boys (Hoyt & Scherer, 1998; Odem, 1995). This is also evident in the harsher treatment given to girl status offenders in the juvenile justice system (Berger & Hoffman, 1998; Bishop & Fraiser, 1992; Chensey-Lind, 1973; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Rosenbaum & Chensey-Lind, 1994).

Feminist perspectives on the uniqueness of women's and girls' offending have existed since the 1980's, and many academics consider feminist criminology a mature field (Burgess-Proctor, 2006; Chesney-Lind, 2006; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Sharp, 2006). However, while this history of criminological interest in the gender variations of offending has resulted in discussion about the applicability of delinquency theories to girls, only a few studies have tested a gender comprehensive theory, and those studies have been limited by small samples and limited measures of delinquency (Blackwell, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 2006; Deschenes & Esbensen, 1999; Jensen, 2003; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996; Svensson, 2003). Therefore, more study is necessary on this issue, as there is no accepted feminist theory of delinquency. Explanations of delinquency that include the recognition of gendered pathways to delinquency, the consequences of victimization, and unique cultural experiences of girls are not found in traditional theories, and therefore these theories have limited explanatory power for girls' offending.

However, this does not necessarily suggest elements of traditional theories have no place in studying female crime. In fact, the assumptions of traditional theories could be revitalized to include appropriate gender variables, therefore satisfying both the issues of generalizability and gender sensitivity. As mentioned above, a gender sensitive perspective would not suggest that only females will be studied, but include males in the analysis as well (Holsinger, 2000), since any adequate general theory of crime should be able to explain the causes of offending for both genders (Lanier & Henry, 2002). In addition, a useful gendered theory of delinquency should be able to explain both gendered delinquency patterns as well as the gender difference in crime.

Therefore, the underlying components and assumptions of traditional theories that have been tested effectively on male samples could be a useful starting point for developing a gender comprehensive theory of delinquency. In doing so, a general, comprehensive theory of delinquency would effectively explain female delinquency as well as male delinquency. The question for feminist criminologists studying girls' delinquency becomes how do you resolve the different perspectives in the study of female delinquency into a useful theory? This would require finding a comprehensive theory of delinquency that can explain offending for both genders, while taking into account the important factors traditionally overlooked by male-based theories. Power-Control Theory, developed by Hagan and associates, attempts to satisfy the requirements of a comprehensive theory sensitive to the unique conditions of growing up female.

Power-Control Theory is rooted in the traditional theories of delinquency, and therefore is a product of male-based theories. However, Power-Control was specifically developed to explain gender differences and be sensitive to gender issues unique to girls, such as acknowledging the reality of the patriarchal society. Furthermore, Power-Control Theory is intended to explain common adolescent delinquency, an area of offending where the gender gap often minimal. Power-Control Theory considered by the authors to be a general, feminist delinquency theory. Yet, this delinquency theory is not without critics, and like most theories in the study of female delinquency, Power-Control Theory has not been thoroughly tested. Power-Control Theory is presented and further examined in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

POWER-CONTROL THEORY

As mentioned in the previous chapters, gender explains more variance in delinquency than any other variable (Jensen & Eve, 1976; Jensen & Rojek, 1998), but has not been a major focus in the delinquency literature. And, while gender issues were absent in early criminological theory construction, in the last twenty years several theories have evolved with the manifest purpose of evaluating and explaining female delinquency and gender differences in offending. Some of these theories have incorporated parts of past theories of delinquency, but are reformulated to include important and unique aspects of gender to the explanation.

One theory that purports to satisfy the requirements for a general, comprehensive and feminist theory of delinquency is Power-Control Theory. Power-Control Theory, developed by Hagan (1988) and Hagan, Gillis and Simpson (1985, 1987, 1990), is a theory of common delinquency formulated specifically to study the gender difference in common delinquency. The basis of Power-Control is social control theory, purposefully reformulated to better explain the gender difference in delinquency. Power-Control is unique in delinquency theories because of this primary intention of explaining gender difference in delinquency (Blackwell, 2000).

Power-Control Theory revives two traditional theoretical approaches in delinquency research, class and control, and adds gender to the control tradition by relating the workplace roles of parents to differences in the socialization and supervision of sons and daughters. Hagan and associates also incorporated feminist scholarship into the explanation of offending. The works of Carol Gilligan, regarding 'different voices' of the genders, and Nancy Chodorow's 'double identification' are incorporated to explain the reproduction of gender roles in the household (see Hagan et al., 1988). Following the works of Gilligan and Chodorow, Hagan et al. conclude mothers identify more with their daughters than sons, and mothers also socialize their daughters to be more like themselves. The differing process of gender socialization in the family translates into stronger connections of mothers to daughters than mothers to sons, and tighter control of daughters' behavior in the household.

Power-Control Theory attempts to acknowledge the unique social position of girls by integrating the effects of patriarchy, class and differences in gender socialization into an explanation of the developmental patterns of delinquency. The authors believe Power-Control Theory explains how differences in the family structure leads to different forms of parental supervision, control and adolescent socialization, and this then leads to different rates of juvenile delinquency. Prior tests of Power-Control theory are limited by faulty variable definition and have yielded mixed results, often only supporting some elements of the theory (Blackwell & Reed, 2003; Hill & Atkinson, 1988; Jensen & Thompson, 1990; Singer & Levine, 1988). Furthermore, previous tests of Power-Control Theory have focused on exclusively on juvenile delinquency, ignoring status offenses, or only including some status offenses into the delinquent scale variable. Therefore, any utility or difference in Power-Control's ability to explain status offenses as compared to delinquent offenses is unknown.

Historical Roots of Power-Control Theory

Power-Control Theory is a recent and continually changing variant of the control and liberation theory traditions. The theory combines elements of social control, conflict (neo-Marxist) and liberal feminism criminological theories into an explanation for juvenile common delinquency. Social control theories focus on conformity as much as deviance, and on what stops individuals from committing crimes (Hirschi, 1969). The central idea of control theories has a long history based on the classical tradition of social thought. For example, Bentham (1948) believed individuals work to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. Crime provides immediate gratification, so in the absence of perceived consequences, people will be deviant. Therefore, individuals need to be deterred from engaging in delinquency by social controls. When social controls are strong, rates of delinquent behaviors are low, but when controls are weak, offending increases. Durkeim (1865/1966) also believed individuals needed to be saved from their own destructive and insatiable desires by social controls provided by society.

The most well-known application of control theory to delinquency is Hirschi's (1969) social control theory. Hirschi applied traditional ideas of control theory on a micro level, and believed close bonds between children and their parents would prevent delinquency thorough attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. High levels of these four bonds will prevent children from engaging in delinquency. Juveniles who engage in delinquency have failed to

form strong affective attachments to parents, failed to become committed to conventional norms, failed to become involved in conventional activities, and/or failed to share a belief and respect for conventional norms. As were most theories of delinquency, Hirschi's control theory of delinquency was developed to explain delinquent behavior among males.

Hirschi gave little attention to how gender or the class level of parents will affect the bonds, and ignored the gender gap in offending. This is unfortunate, since later research has indicated parental control may be more effective in decreasing male than female delinquency, indicating gender differences in both the application and results of parental control that should be acknowledged (Seyditz, 1991). Explaining the gendered nature of offending with control theory requires confirming females have higher levels of social bonds than males, and why this difference in social bonds exists (Jensen & Eve, 1976). Because Power-Control theory predicts tighter supervision by parents will control common delinquent tendencies of teenagers, it advances the control theory tradition in delinquency by including gender and class to explain this divergence.

Furthermore, Power-Control theory relies on another traditional theory of delinquency with its use of class-based categories. Marxist or conflict theories of crime link criminal behavior to class position in the capitalist system. Conflict theories see crime as the result of the unequal distribution of power in society. Bonger (1916) was among the first to use a Marxist theory to explain crime as based on the capitalist economy, and also believed the criminality of women would be affected by the economic condition of capitalism. However, Marxist or conflict theories believe lower class membership is positively associated with criminality. In contrast, Power-Control Theory predicts the opposite relationship with common delinquency; girls from upper classes will have higher delinquency. Marxist feminists assert gender inequality (or the gender gap in delinquency) is a product of the hierarchical relations promoted by capitalism that lead to unequal power between men and women in society. Male power in the household is derived from male power in the capitalist system. Power-Control Theory is consistent with Marxist feminism because it views class and economic factors and conditioning the delinquency rate differently by gender.

Although traditional Marxist theories are concerned with the overall macro influence of the economic structure on crime, Power-Control Theory is concerned with how class affects the relative occupations of the father and mother, and how this translates into the home. Because

family conflict is a reoccurring theme in lives of runaways, and has been indicated as possible causal factor for running away, Power-Control Theory may be useful in developing a theoretical explanation of runaways. In Power-Control Theory, girls are seen as more acquiescent to the demands and conditions of their parents, and, therefore less likely to disobey them and runaway from home, especially in homes where traditional patriarchal norms are enforced. From this perspective, having parents that impose tight controls over girls' behavior would result in lower delinquency and status offending among girls.

Gender Explanations and Power-Control Theory

Recent work in criminology has directed theoretical attention to the effects of family and parental control in explaining the gender gap in delinquency (Liu & Kaplan, 1999). Power-Control explains the gender gap in delinquency as a product of difference in the social control and risk-taking socialization of sons and daughters in the family based on the employment status of their parents. This theory examines how the patriarchal structure of social life, and how this structure is replicated within the family, exerts a major effect on the delinquency rates of girls by imposing stricter standards of behavior and tighter parental control on girls than boys in the family.

Briefly, Hagan's theory relies on an economic system which divides the occupational worker into two groups: command and obey classes. Command class employees are those who have authority over others in the work place, while obey class employees do not. At home, parents are the instruments of the control imposed on their children, and the level of control varies by parents' class and gender. Those parents who have power over others at work will also have control over their children at home, but because these parents hold power at work, command class parents are more likely to excuse the deviant behavior of their children at home. Therefore, children in command class households will have higher delinquency rates than those children in obey class households.

In Power-Control Theory, families are divided into patriarchal and egalitarian structures. An ideal type patriarchal family is where the husband is employed in a position of power while the wife stays home. Because in the patriarchal families husbands work outside the home, husbands have more power and control in the family since they control the economic resources. In these patriarchal families, girls will experience more parental supervision and be socialized

very differently than boys. On the other end of the family structure, the ideal type command balanced family is where the husband and wife both have power in the workplace. As women increasingly participate in paid labor, particularly when their jobs have authority, they gain power in the family as well. Also, egalitarian mothers are more likely to socialize their daughters to be more like themselves. In egalitarian command class families, where both mothers and fathers are in authority positions in the workplace, sons and daughters are supervised, controlled and socialized in a more similar manner.

A central point of Power-Control Theory is juvenile risk-taking attitudes. The more gender-neutral upbringing experienced in egalitarian or balanced command families includes socializing both male and female adolescents in attitudes favorable toward risk-taking, in anticipation that such attitudes will be useful when they assume power in authoritarian positions in the workplace as adults. Of course, being socialized to take risks may be expressed in forms other than deviance, for example competitive sports. Yet according to Power-Control, positive attitudes towards risk taking will be often expressed in delinquent activities (Singer & Levine, 1988). Because their mothers' and fathers' employment life is more similar, the way sons and daughters are raised will be more similar. In these command balanced families, daughters are socialized and supervised more similarly to sons, because in these families both boys and girls will be socialized to enter the work force.

In all family types, mothers are assumed to be more likely than fathers to be the major sources of control, and daughters will be the objects of that control more than sons. And, in all families, girls will be less delinquent than boys, because girls are more. But girls in patriarchal families with tighter parental control over their behavior and little socialization into risk-taking would be the least likely to commit offenses. Furthermore, in patriarchal households, the gender gap in offending between brothers and sisters will be larger than in egalitarian balanced households because girls will be supervised more in patriarchal households, and girls will be taught to avoid risky endeavors to a greater degree in patriarchal families than in balanced command families.

By focusing on the role patriarchy plays in the gender socialization of adolescents, Power-Control Theory may provide an explanation of the gender and delinquency relationship. Hagan and associates describe the above household categories as ideal types, and acknowledge that other types of families exist. Yet, the theory assumes most adolescents live in two-parent

families (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Families are considered to be on a continuum between the ideal types, and should be classified according to which household type is more relevant in terms of parents' relational power in the workplace. For example, a household when the father is employed in a command class job while the mother worked in an obey class job, would be considered unbalanced, and considered patriarchal.

Criticisms of Power-Control Theory

Power-Control has added to the theoretical explanation of gender and delinquency in several areas. For example, while ignored by many theories, Power-Control acknowledges the differences in female delinquency by including the concept of patriarchy into the explanation of delinquency, and how gender construction and socialization varies in different settings such as social class (Messerschmidt, 1993). Power-Control Theory is unique in that it combines the aspects of class and gender status with power into an examination of delinquency as an attempt to explain the gender gap in offending, issues traditionally ignored in delinquency theories. The theory also makes a macro-micro link regarding how the larger social structures influence parental and child relationships at home.

But while Hagan et al. should be applauded for considering the issue of gender in criminology and appreciating how boys and girls experience family life and family dynamics differently (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004), the theory has several flaws, and has attracted much criticism (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998; Jensen, 1993; Jensen & Thompson, 1990; Morash & Chesney-Lind, 1991; Simpson, 1989; Singer & Levine, 1988). First, critics argue the theory has not been supported by current research, although existing tests of Power-Control are limited and not conclusive (Liu & Kaplan, 1999). To date, empirical tests of the theory have produced mixed and confusing results. Hagan et al.'s own work has consistently supported this theory, as have other authors (see Uggen, 2000). But other tests of Power-Control Theory have produced contradictory or only partially supportive results, indicating it may not be sufficient explanation of the gender gap in delinquency (Hill & Atkinson, 1988; Jensen & Thompson, 1990; Singer & Levine, 1988). Therefore, the accuracy and predictive value of the theory has not been adequately studied to conclude this is a general or feminist theory of delinquency.

Second, Power-Control Theory has been criticized for a narrow definition of 'power' in the family, and a narrow, unrealistic definition of family structure in general (Blackwell & Reed,

2003; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Jensen & Thompson, 1990). First, power in the family household is not simply a product of economics or employment class (Jensen & Thompson, 1990; Messerschmidt, 1993). Furthermore, although economic or employment advancement is a step toward gender equality, this does not necessarily equal advancement for power and authority in the home, or define household decision making (Messerschmidt, 1993). This is especially true in single-parent or non-traditional structure family units (Lieber & Wacker, 1997). Therefore, the current definition of the central variable in Power-Control Theory is not adequate.

Furthermore, Hagan's typology of families employs a very narrow view of family structure. For example, single-mother families are assumed to be inherently 'balanced' since there is no power imbalance between parents, regardless of the occupational level of the mother (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Mack & Lieber, 2005). Hagan and associates have been criticized for failing to recognize variation among these and other types of households. In some of his studies, Hagan himself limits participating juveniles to those from two-parent family units (Hagan et al., 2004), ignoring the reality of many family units, including father-headed households. This myopic view of family structure is not reflected in the reality of family life in society, and therefore limits the theory's general applicability.

A third category of criticism for Power-Control asserts the theoretical foundations of Power-Control are not supported by the literature, and the theory ignores important aspects of juvenile offending that have found support in the literature. The theory is not only based on prior theories, such as the liberation hypothesis, which have not received support, but also omits variables from other theories that have been proven useful in explaining delinquency, such as the effects of delinquent peers (Blackwell & Reed, 2003; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Leiber & Wacker, 1997). Like other liberation theories, Power-Control blames the liberated attitudes among girls and mother's work force participation for an increase in juvenile delinquency through more egalitarian attitudes and households. Critics complain Power-Control is simply a recent liberation hypothesis, blaming mothers' employment for their daughters' deviance (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Morash & Chesney-Lind, 1991).

As mentioned earlier, both Adler (1975) and Simon (1975) wrote the women's movement had opened up criminal and delinquent opportunities for women previously unavailable. The movement allowed for not only gains in the area of employment, but also opened up opportunities for female crime. Power-Control Theory relies on this assumption, predicting as

women become more equal at work, their daughters are less parental controlled and more socialized into risk taking, and therefore have more opportunity to commit crimes. This idea effectively holds mothers, especially employed mothers, responsible for girls' delinquency (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Jensen & Thompson, 1990; Morash & Chesney-Lind, 1991). However, there is little evidence women's increasing labor force participation has increased delinquency among juveniles (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004).

Power-Control Theory sees the gains in equality of the women's movement as leading to an increase in female crime, the 'shady side of liberation' (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Yet, as mentioned earlier, liberation theories have received little support (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Messerschmidt, 1993). Furthermore, the high rates of abuse among girl delinquents and women offenders leaves little support for any emancipation or liberation theories of female offending, as this maltreated group has little power or opportunity (Chesney-Lind & Okamoto, 2001). This leads many feminist criminologists (see Chesney-Lind, 1989) to reject any theory assuming improved economic conditions would increase crime for females when most literature stresses the role abuse, economic marginalization and poverty has in increasing female crime. The recent increase in property crime rates among females, for example, is more likely the product of economic disadvantages among women than economic gains or increasing gender employment equality (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996).

Furthermore, studies that have looked at the role of maternal employment on delinquency in general are limited and produced mixed conclusions overall (see Vander Ven & Cullen, 2004). Another foundation of Power-Control Theory, the SES or class and delinquency relationship, has also received little empirical support in the literature (Jensen & Thompson, 1990; Morash & Chesney-Lind, 1991; Singer & Levine, 1988; Uggen, 2000). Since two of the foundations of Power-Control Theory have received little support in previous literature, this leads to doubt about those aspects of the theory considered effective predictors.

In addition, studies show Power-Control Theory fails to explain much more of the gender difference in delinquency than social control theory, which has received support (Jensen, 2003). If the support for the theory is due to the control foundation of the theory, and not the class part of the theory, little is gained by including those variables in the model. Hagan et al. do not show sufficient evidence that household categorization on its own makes a significant contribution. And although the fact that Power-Control relies on a theoretical basis that has received little

support in the literature is concerning, even more disturbing is the reality that aspects of juvenile delinquency that have received consistent empirical support in the literature are absent. For example, the influence of peers and normative aspirations, two factors that have been found to have a significant relationship to delinquency, are not included (Akers, 1997).

Many feminist criminologists criticize Power-Control Theory and similar theories which focus on opportunity (see Tittle, 1996) as a sexist continuation of the traditional view of viewing girls' low rates of deviance as simply the result of limited opportunity and constraint (Jensen, 2003). While the authors of Power-Control Theory consider their theory adequate in its focus on the importance of patriarchy in shaping both male and female delinquency, other feminist criminologists have found the feminist label inappropriate. For the critics, Hagan et al. have not advanced feminist criminology but simply produced another flawed, sexist theory in the tradition of male-based criminology, with all the problems of the previous theories. In addition, the theory treats males as the yardstick in measuring delinquent behavior. When males do not engage in delinquency, it is considered a normal level of conforming behavior, but girls' low rates of delinquency is seen as having 'high' rates of control or 'low' rates of risk taking attitudes, since boys' rates are seen as normal. When girls conform, on the other hand, they are seen as passive and over-controlled (Messerschmidt, 1993). Girls are devalued for the same behavior boys are celebrated for (Naffine, 1988).

In addition, the gender ratio is still explained by focusing on females, making Power-Control simply a more contemporary version of the "why women do not offend" explanation of delinquency. Like the early studies of female criminality, the focus on the explanation of gender ratio is concentrated on the characteristics of females. Males in the family, such as the fathers and sons, are generally irrelevant as the cause of crime is found in the deficiencies of mothers' parenting and daughters' lack of conformity (Messerschmidt, 1993). Instead of advancing feminist criminological theory, Power-Control simply perpetuates the sexist traditions in criminology; devaluing women and celebrating male behavior (Messerschmidt, 1993).

Many of the criticisms of Power-Control Theory come from criminologists who hold a different concept of what a feminist delinquency theory should consider. Like Power-Control Theory, the radical feminist perspective also assumes patriarchal control over females in society and the family, but sees this control as leading to a very different outcome. According to Power-Control Theory, having parents that impose tight controls over girls' behavior limits delinquency

and running away. Yet, critics of Power-Control Theory would expect a very different outcome from this tighter control and supervision. Furthermore, while these theorists agree risk-taking behavior is encouraged more among boys, and girls are more closely monitored than boys, these indirect and direct sources of parental control have different effects on delinquency than hypothesized by the Power-Control perspective allows. Chesney-Lind and Sheldon (1998, 2004) employ a radical feminist criminology perspective and see the closer parental control and monitoring of girls as increasing delinquent activity, since this closer supervision results in clashes between parents and girls, and therefore leads to greater offending.

Furthermore, Power-Control Theory ignores the frequent reality of abuse in the home (Chensey-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Girls are often the victims of violence and sexual abuse by parents and in the home, as elsewhere in society. Oppressive control, exploitation, or sexual abuse of females by males acts as the cause of girls' delinquent activity, by forcing them to escape victimization and unfair restrictions. While boys are also abused, girls are more likely to be victimized by someone in their home (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). The lives of these girls do not necessarily follow the traditional gender patterns of gender and social control within the home. And, parents who are abusive and dysfunctional may not socialize their girls into traditional gender norm patterns. Therefore, the lives of abused adolescents do not necessarily reflect traditional patriarchal patterns or structure, so assuming traditional socialization is inappropriate in the discussion of abused girls. To date, tests of Power-Control Theory have ignored the role of abuse in the delinquency of both male and female juveniles.

Finding a delinquency theory sensitive to girls' experience in the family and society, while acknowledging how their experience differs from that of boys, is necessary for feminist criminology. Understanding how familial control, socialization and traditional sex-roles relate to delinquency is useful in explaining girls' offending (Gelsthorp & Morris, 1990). The recognition of physical, sexual and emotional victimization as the first step in females' pathways to offending, and how this abuse shapes the types of offenses committed, has been the most significant and useful advance in deviance theory in recent years (Belknap & Holsinger, 1998; Belknap & Holsinger, 2006). The acknowledgement that dysfunctional family relationships are part of girls' realities has significant implication for delinquency theories that base their explanations in the control theory tradition. Unfortunately, parental control and supervision is

not always benevolent or beneficial in reducing deviance. And this is a real issue for girls, who may spend more time in the home than boys.

For the radical feminists, when the parental relationship is dysfunctional, stronger parental controls would increase delinquency among girls, not decrease offending. Therefore, the sexual double standard of parental behavior that provides more restrictions and parental controls on girls than boys would not lead to less delinquency for girls, but to more. In the view of many feminist criminologists, Power-Control Theory ignores crucial aspects of girls' lives, fails to appreciate the reality of many parental relationships, and is an inappropriate theory for understanding girls' delinquency. For example, for Chesney-Lind and others, running away is not something that can be prevented with more parental supervision or controlling socialization, but a survival response to an unfair and oppressive environment in the home. In contrast, Power-Control Theory would predict more parental control would decrease the incidence of running away, and this is especially true in the patriarchal type households. This dissertation will test the applicability of Power-Control theory to explain status offending, and in doing so, evaluate the theory as an adequate feminist theory of deviant juvenile behavior.

CHAPTER VI

RESEARCH DESIGN

Data for this study will come from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health ("Add Health"), a prospective, longitudinal data set collected by the Carolina Population Center at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Udry, 1998). The Add Health data set was designed to investigate the social environments of adolescents, examining their families, schools and peers. The principal investigators write: "The Add Health study collects data to use in exploring the influences of both the individual attributes of adolescents, and the attributes of their various environments on health and health-related behavior in areas such as diet, physical activity, health service use, morbidity, injury, violence, sexual behavior, sexual transmitted infection, pregnancy, suicidal intentions/thoughts, substance use, and runaway behavior" (Carolina Population Center, 1998). This study follows cases from adolescence to young adulthood, and consists of three panels, or 'Waves'.

Wave I is a nationally representative sample, comprised of students in 7^{th} to 12^{th} grade. The students came from 80 high schools and also 52 middle schools that send students to those high schools, in 80 communities. All US high schools, public and private, had an unequal probability of selection, based on consideration to region, urbanization, racial composition, and student body size. Over 70% of the contacted schools agreed to participate. When one school refused to participate, another school of similar characteristics was added to the sample. Wave I was conducted in 1994-1995 school year. More than 90,000 adolescents completed the In-School self-administered questionnaire during one class period. Only students present on that day were included. Students' parents were notified of the study in advance and could prohibit their children from participating. The questionnaire collected information on topics including demographic characteristics, parental characteristics, household structure, and extra-curricular activities.

From the students who completed the In-School questionnaire, plus those who were listed on school rosters but did not complete the In-School portion, a nationally representative sample of adolescents in grades 7 to 12 was randomly selected for the more extensive In-Home

interview. Approximately 200 adolescents from each high-school were selected to complete the In-Home questionnaire in an interview that lasted approximately one to two hours. The interview was usually conducted in the students' homes. The overall response rate was 79%. The In-Home questionnaire is more in-depth than the In-School questionnaire, covering a broader range of personal and family topics. Because most of the necessary variables for my study are from the In-Home questionnaire, this study's analysis will be restricted to those adolescents who completed the In-Home survey.

Questions were administered either verbally by an interviewer or by a pre-recorded audio-tape listened to with earphones when the questions became more sensitive or personal. The respondent entered the answers directly into a lap-top computer, and no paper questionnaires were used. This method minimized the influence of a present parent or the investigator on the responses of the adolescent, and increased accuracy of response. One parent (usually the mother or mother-figure) of each student was also interviewed using the Parent questionnaire. There are approximately 20,500 students in the Wave I In-Home sample. The operational sample of Wave I is composed of those respondents who had valid values for all variables used in the analysis. Approximately 10,400 males and 10,200 females were included in the Wave I operational sample. The age range for my operational sample was age 12 to 18, with a mean age of 15. These students reported attending grades seven through twelve.

Respondents in Wave I who were in 7^{th} through 11^{th} grades were re-interviewed one year later with a similar questionnaire and interview format. Those students who graduated from high school were not re-interviewed. One parent for each respondent, mostly mothers, was also re-interviewed. Interviews from the 1995-1996 academic year form Wave II of the data set. The response rate for Wave II was 88%. As in Wave I, the operational sample for Wave II was composed of those respondents with valid responses for all variables used in analysis. The ages of Wave II respondents range from 13 to 19 years old, with a mean age of 16.2 years old. Not re-interviewing high school seniors also resulted in the loss of roughly 6000 respondents, or 20% of the original sample. Approximately 7100 males and 7500 females are included in Wave II analysis.

The Wave III sample consists of Wave I respondents re-interviewed between August 2001 and April 2002. Most of the respondents are between the ages of twenty and twenty-four in this sample. Approximately 15,000 original respondents were located and completed

questionnaires. Interviews were conducted in all US states including Alaska and Hawaii, however Wave I respondents living outside the country or on military deployment during the period of data collection were excluded. An IRB approved prisoner protocol was developed and implemented to gain access to respondents who were incarcerated in correctional facilities at the time of data collection. Respondents located in correctional facilities were re-interviewed in the correctional facility if at all possible.

As before, data was recorded on laptop computers, and the respondent entered more sensitive answers in private. The average interview lasted 90 minutes. The mean age for Wave III is 22 years old. Approximately 7200 males and 8000 females comprise my operational sample for Wave III. To uncover the effects of running away as a juvenile on adult deviance, the sample was split into runaway and non-runaway groups, using the respondents' self-reported runaway behavior as juveniles (Wave I and Wave II). If the respondent reported a runaway episode in either Wave I or Wave II, the respondent was placed in the runaway sample. For Wave III, approximately 600 males and 750 females comprise the runaway sample.

Data Analyses

This data set is well-suited to the needs of this study for several reasons. First, the questionnaire contains relevant information for a study of adolescent status offending, delinquency and family relationships. Second, self-report measures of delinquency present a preferable and more accurate report of adolescent offending, since it is often argued official records measure police behavior more than the adolescents' behavior (Deschenes, 1990). In addition, Maxfield, Weiler and Widom (2000) found using official records to study the relationship of juveniles and delinquency to adult criminality can significantly underestimate the magnitude of the relationship.

Furthermore, using official arrest statistics to study girls' offending is especially problematic because of gender biases in the justice system (Campbell, 1981). Third, the large size of the data set allows for a sufficient number of adolescent runaways to be studied, and allows for analysis of subsets of family structures, as well as separate analyses by gender and abuse histories. In this data set, less than 10% of adolescents identified themselves as having run away, so smaller data sets would not provide sufficient numbers for analysis. Fourth, this

contemporary data set add temporal variety to several recent works on gender and crime which use data gathered in the 1970's (see Liu & Kaplan, 1999).

In addition, the longitudinal design of this data set allows for both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses are not mutually exclusive and are best used to complement each other (Deschenes, 1990). Cross-sectional analyses will examine the variables related to running away, since this method is most useful for exploring and establishing the effects of stable variables such as gender and family structure on behavior (Blumstein, Cohen, & Farrington, 1988a). Causal effects, and the long-term influences of running away on the life-course, are best tested by a longitudinal research design. For example, the relationship between running away and family conflict has been identified in the literature. But the causal order of the two variables is often in question. Longitudinal data sets allow for the temporal ordering of events. In addition, longitudinal analyses of the effects of running away allows for determining those factors that may predict additional crime and delinquency, since this type of analysis resolves the problem of causal order and correlation.

Longitudinal data is necessary for identifying causal pathways among various groups of individuals. Past studies of longitudinal research in criminology have identified some of the key factors that lead to adult criminality, yet more longitudinal research is crucial for the study of juvenile offending, and identifying the role of status offending in life-course criminal careers (Deschenes, 1990; Dugan, 2002). Government agencies concerned with delinquency, such as the National Institute of Justice and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, have emphasized the usefulness of longitudinal analysis in delinquency explanations, and the need for additional studies (Deschenes, 1990). Longitudinal research is also necessary to justify and evaluate intervention programs in the treatment of juvenile delinquency (Deschenes, 1990).

Some criminologists believe longitudinal research is unnecessary, concluding cross-sectional research is more cost-effective and provides the same information, for existing longitudinal research has only confirmed the findings of cross-sectional studies (Deschenes, 1990; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1988). Many others, however, have concluded the benefits of longitudinal data are overwhelming in testing causal hypotheses, and believe more longitudinal analysis is crucial for understanding delinquency, and the role of juvenile offending in the life-course (Blumstein et al., 1988a; Blumstein Cohen & Farrington, 1988b; Greenberg, 1985).

Longitudinal research also prevents the need to rely on retrospective information, which can be flawed due to poor memory (Blumstein et al., 1988a, 1988b; Greenberg, 1985).

Using this data set also has disadvantages. First, like most longitudinal studies, the data may be biased by the problem of subject attrition. Although the researchers made every effort to contact respondents in correctional facilities, adolescent runaways with severe problems as adults may not be included in latter waves, making the findings more conservative than if the entire population was studied. Second, because the sampling was school-based, and also gathered data from the adolescent's home, only adolescents enrolled in school and living with a 'parental' figure at the time of the data collection were eligible for study. This sampling method excludes adolescents not in school or living in a home, and therefore runaways who have dropped out of school, or living in shelters or on the streets long-term, will not be studied. This is unfortunate because this group may have experienced the most intense predictive family relationships and be at the greatest risk for further delinquency and criminal involvement. However, the effect of this sampling bias should be small, as studies show the group of runaways living in shelters appears to be a tiny percentage of the total runaway population. Previous studies have found the majority of runaways return home within three days, and less than 6% are away from home over one month (Brennan et al., 1978).

Operationalization of the Variables

Runaway—Definitions of what constitutes runaway behavior have not been clear or consistent in the literature. One limitation of the existing runaway literature is the failure to adequately define the runaway episode, and to use the same definition between studies (Brennan et al, 1978). Running away can be defined as any child who leaves home without the permission of capable guardians. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention defines a runaway as a "child/youth who has left (or not returned to) a parent's or caretaker's supervision without permission" (U.S. Department of Justice, 1993).

Previous studies have defined runaways using different age limits, conditions of parental consent for leaving, time away from home, intentions to leave, and contact with or arrests by justice authorities (Brennan et al, 1978; Melson, 1995). These inconsistencies question whether researchers are studying the same behavior, as no operational criteria or consistency in terminology is found in the literature (Melson, 1995). For this study, the variable *runaway* will

be constructed from the question "How many times in the last 12 months have you run away from home?" This question was asked in the middle of 12 other questions regarding delinquent and deviant activities, under the questionnaire section heading "Delinquency Scale".

The operationalization of *runaway* with this question is appropriate, since asking the question with the phrase "run away" captures the intention of the adolescent to "run away from home", and eliminates those adolescents who have left by mutual consent or were evicted. This measure also allows youth to self-identify themselves as runaways, another advantage of this study. Much of the previous runaway literature uses adolescents in shelters to identify the runaway population. This may be problematic because these adolescents are possibly homeless youth, "throwaways" (parents do not care if the adolescent leaves) or "pushouts" (parents actively evict) instead of runaways (Steinhart, 1996). "Throwaways" and "pushouts" appear to have different etiologies and behaviors than runaways, and studying these groups as runaways may confuse findings (Adams, Gullotta & Clancy, 1985; Hier, Korboot & Schweitzer, 1990). I am interested in a runaway and non-runaway comparison, and so the dimensions of why "push-out" and "throw-away" adolescents leave home are beyond the scope of my study. Furthermore, self-report statistics of runaway behavior avoid sample bias present in official arrest data.

If the adolescent reported any runaway episodes in Wave I or Wave II, the respondent was coded as a runaway. Frequency analysis of the runaway variable shows girls run away from home slightly more than boys, as 55% of those who ran away at least once in the sample were girls. This ratio is consistent with the findings of many other studies of runaways. In addition, this percentage is very close to the gender ratio in national arrest data, as the 2000 Juvenile Justice Department crime statistics show 59% of juveniles arrested for running away were female (Snyder, 2002).

Status Offenses—This dissertation includes four other status offenses in addition to running away. These offenses include being loud and rowdy in a public place, skipping school without permission or an acceptable excuse (truancy), using alcohol and smoking cigarettes. The scale of status offense includes all five status offenses when runaway is not used elsewhere in the analysis, the other four status offenses when runaway is being used independently in the analysis. The alpha for the five-item status scales is .58 for Wave I, with approximately 75% of males and 73% of females reporting at least one status offense in Wave I. When runaway is used as another variable in the analysis, the status scale is a four-item index, excluding running away.

The alpha for the four-item status scale is .62. Approximately 74% of males and 72% of females reported at least one status offense in Wave I.

Delinquency—The delinquency variable was measured with a twelve-item index, using questions about how often the respondent engaged in a specific delinquent act over the last year. These questions concerned the activities of painting graffiti, damaging property, shoplifting, physical fighting, stealing a car, breaking into a house, or selling drugs. The answers originally allowed four response categories (never, 1 or 2 times, 3 or 4 times, and 5 or more times). To avoid a skewed distribution, all answers are dichotomized. Factor analysis forcing all the items to load on one factor showed the delinquency items correlate together well. The alpha was similar for both Waves at .82 for Wave I and .86 for Wave II.

Adult Crime—This variable measures the amount of criminal activity in the past year from the Wave III questionnaire. Twelve items asked questions on stealing, using weapons, damaging property, selling drugs, and writing bad checks. There are four possible answers, (never, 1 or 2 times, 3 or 4 times, and 5 or more times). All answers will be dichotomized to avoid skewed distribution. Factor analysis forcing all the items to load on one factor showed the crime variables correlate together well. The alpha was .78.

Justice System Contact—Variables measuring justice system contact were constructed from the respondents' answers to six questions. All of the questions were asked of the respondents in the Wave III questionnaire. The first four questions ask about justice system contact as a juvenile, or before the age of 18. *Juvenile contact* with the police was measured with the question of ever being stopped or questioned by the police, other than a traffic violation. *Juvenile custody* asked if the respondent had ever been taken into police custody. Approximately 20% of male and 4% of female respondents had been taken into custody before the age of 18. *Juvenile arrest* asked the respondent about any arrests as a juvenile. Almost 9% of male and less than 1% of female respondents reported an arrest before the age of 18. The final juvenile justice system variable, *juvenile conviction*, asked if the responded was ever convicted or pled guilty to a crime in juvenile court. This was true for over 4% of males, but less than 1% of females.

Two justice system variables measured justice system contact as an adult. The first was *adult arrest*, and asked respondents if they were ever arrested as an adult, or since the age of 18. The respondents reported adult arrest rates of 9% for males, and less than 2% for females. The

second was *adult conviction*, and asked if the respondent had ever been convicted or pled guilty to a crime in adult court. Approximately 4% of males reported a conviction as an adult, while for females the affirmative response rate was less than 1%. All variables were dummy coded to reflect if the respondent had any contact or no contact with the justice system.

Family Household Structure—Patriarchal or egalitarian family structure was constructed using respondents' reports of their parents' occupations. By the direction of Hagan et al., if a parent's occupation was a listed as doctor, lawyer, manager, teacher, etc., the parents was coded as having authority in the work place, and in the command class. If a parent occupation was listed as factory worker or laborer, janitor, secretary, etc., or did not work for pay, such as a homemaker, the parent was classified as being in the obey class. The relationship between the parents' occupations decided the classification of the family household. For the purposes of this study, and following the intentions of Power-Control Theory, three categories of family households are used. This classification of household type has also been used in other tests of Power-Control Theory (see Singer & Levine, 1988). If both the parents were in the command class, the household is categorized as command-balanced. If both parents fall into the obey class, the household is classified as obey-balanced.

Finally, if the father is in the command class, and the mother is in the obey class, or does not work for pay, the family is considered patriarchal. Of course, these groupings are not exhaustive of the family social class types found in the sample. However, following the tenets of the theory and the previous studies and evaluations by Hagan et al., as well as other researchers testing Power-Control Theory (see Singer and Levine, 1988), I exclude households where the mother has authority and the father does not, as well as male-headed single households. In the Wave I sample, 32% of the total sample respondents were classified as living in a patriarchal household, 16% was classified as living in a balanced obey-class household, and 11% in a balanced command-class household. The households not classified into one of these three household types were filtered from analysis.

Parental Control—Parental control was measured from a series of seven questions which asked adolescents if they are able to make their own decisions about everyday matters. These questions asked about whether or not parents let them make their own decision on what time to be home on weekend nights (curfew), the friends they spend time with, their clothes, television habits, their bedtime and what they eat. Questions were answered yes or no. The dichotomized

responses were added together to form the level of parental control. Higher scores indicate higher levels of parental control. The alpha for this scale was .64.

Risk taking—The analyses used for the evaluation of Power-Control Theory include variables measuring the respondent's propensity for risk-taking. Seven questions asked the respondent to choose which of two statements better describes what he or she likes or which statement better describes them. These statements include liking wild parties, drinking alcohol or smoking cigarettes, and exciting sexual experiences. The alpha was .68.

Abuse—The abuse variable was constructed from two questions about the amount of physical or sexual abuse experienced as a child. The questions asked how often parents or other care givers "slapped, hit or kicked you" (physical abuse), or "touched you in a sexual way, forced you to touch him or her in a sexual way, or forced you to have sexual relations" (sexual abuse). For sexual abuse, roughly 400 females (5% of the female population) reported sexual abuse, while 300 males (4% of the male population) reported sexual abuse. Physical abuse has greater prevalence with approximately 30% of males (2100 respondents) and 28% of females (2100 respondents) reporting physical abuse. Approximately 2100 (31% of the male population) males and 2200 (29% of the female population) females reported one or both types of abuse. The *Abuse* variable will be dichotomized to distinguish between those who experienced either form of abuse and those who did not experience any abuse.

Research Questions

Two main research areas will be addressed: The first area of research is the relationship between running away and concurrent delinquency, as well as the long-term effects of running away in girls' lives. As mentioned earlier, most of the research on runaways has focused on the causes of running away, and little research has studied the relationship between running away and other forms of delinquency, or the long-term consequences of running away (Windle, 1989). According to Hagan and McCarthy (1997), running away may lead to other types of crime, since running away may lead to socialization among delinquent peer and victimization, so subsequent delinquency and criminality would be expected among runaways. If this hypothesis is true, the frequency and prevalence of other forms of delinquency, as well as adult offending, should be higher among runaways than non-runaways. Therefore, Wave I runaways should have higher rates of other types of delinquency in both Wave I and Wave II.

More research is also need on the long-term effect of running away in girls' lives. One of the most consistent findings in criminology is the positive correlation between delinquency as a juvenile, and later criminal offending as an adult. This relationship has been found among serious juvenile delinquents in life-course studies following adolescents into adulthood (see Sampson & Laub, 1993). But, little is known if this longitudinal life-course relationship holds for running away or status offenses in general and increased adult offending (Kaufman & Widom, 1999), or for females (Katz, 2000). This is unfortunate, since as mentioned earlier, running away has potential implications for involvement in further criminal activity and victimization when adolescents are on the streets. If the juvenile offending to adult offending hypothesis is true for status offenders as well as delinquent offenders, Wave I and Wave II runaways should have higher rates of adult offending than non-runaways in Wave III

Of course, there are many juvenile risk factors for delinquent and adult offending, many of which may be related to running away. One possible spurious relationship between running away and further offending is abuse. This is because abused girls are not only at increased risk for running away, but also at increased risk for delinquent and adult offending. Surveys of adult women prisoners routinely find high rates of emotional, physical and sexual victimization as children (Acoca & Austin, 1996, 1998; Covington, 1998). And abuse and prior delinquency may interact to increase adult offending. If both running away and child abuse increase adult offending, the abused girl who runs away should have a higher risk of adult offending than non-abused girls who run away. In addition, the role of juvenile justice system contact has not been thoroughly examined among status offenders. Labeling theory concludes any contact, even informal contact, with the juvenile justice system can increase the likelihood of later offending for adolescents. If this hypothesis is true for status offenders, status offenders who have contact with the juvenile justice system as juveniles will have increased rates of offending as adults.

The second area of research is an exploration of how household family structure and parental control relates to running away using a test of Power-Control Theory. This analysis will use Wave I of the Add-Health data set. First, how do levels of control and supervision, and risk taking attitudes relate to status offenses? Second, how does the level of parental control and supervision, and socialization into risk taking attitudes, vary by gender between command and obey balanced and patriarchal households? The hypothesis generated by Power-Control Theory would expect girls in patriarchal households to be the most controlled and supervised, and report

the least favorable risk-taking attitudes. Furthermore, the gender-gap between levels of adolescent autonomy in patriarchal households should be the largest. Because higher levels of supervision should decrease delinquent behavior, Power-Control Theory would expect delinquency and status offense rates among patriarchal girls to be lower than girls in balanced families, and boys in all families.

Summary of Research Hypotheses and Study Contributions

This study will add to the limited literature on the relationship between delinquency and status offenses, and specifically running away. How the offense of running away is related to other forms of deviance has not been studied, and there are many questions about the correlations and effects of running away to be answered. For example, does running away have a different effect on the delinquency of boys and girls? Furthermore, are abused runaways more involved in status offenses and other forms of delinquency than non-abused runaways? In general, do status offenders such as runaways have higher rates of adult criminal behavior than non-status offenders? Or, is the positive relationship between juvenile offending and adult offending only for non-status offense behavior?

Because there are no studies that examine the relationship of running away, gender and abuse to other forms of deviance, or adult criminality, there is no information to answer these questions. Therefore, the first set of data analyses will aim to answer the question: "What is the relationship of running away and status offenses to other forms of juvenile deviance, and later adult criminal behavior, and is this relationship different for males and females, or abused children?" Based on information provided from previous research and the theories presented above, five hypotheses were formulated to address this issue:

Hypothesis I

Runaways are more likely to commit other forms of deviance than non-runaways as juveniles (Wave I and Wave II). Therefore, runaways will have higher prevalence of self-reported delinquency, status offenses and drug use than non-runaways. This is true for both males and females.

Hypothesis II

Runaways will have higher rates of self-reported deviance and criminal justice system involvement than non-runaways as adults (Wave III). This is true for both males and females.

Hypothesis III

Among non-delinquents (those juveniles who reported no delinquent activity), status offenders will have higher rates of adult criminal behavior and criminal justice system contact than non-status offenders.

Hypothesis IV

Status offenders with juvenile justice system contact will have higher rates of adult offending than status offenders who do not have juvenile justice system contact.

Hypothesis V

Abused runaways will have higher rates of deviance and criminal justice system contact than non-abused runaways, both as juveniles and adults.

The next hypothesis studies the questions of how the structure of home-life contributes to the frequency of running away. Runaways are a diverse population with many individual problems and experiences. Although the reasons adolescents run may be diverse, running away is a means of dealing with problem situations in their lives. Because of the lack of deviance literature on status offending in general, little is known about how family structure and parental control affects runaways. The most prevalent and popular delinquency theories conclude parental supervision and control decreases delinquency among adolescents. If this is correct, girls, who are traditionally more closely supervised than boys, should have lower rates of risk-taking and anti-social behavior.

But, the lives of abused girls may not necessarily reflect the socialization patterns of traditional theories of parental and social control. Girls in abusive household may lack the traditional bonds that decrease delinquency among girls. Or, parental control in the lives of abused girls may not have same effect as in the lives of non-abused girls. Furthermore, status

offenders may be a distinct type of offender, and variables useful in predicting delinquency may not be equally useful in predicting status offending. The second research question asks the question: "Does patriarchal or balanced command family structure decrease or increase status offending behavior, and does the relationship vary by gender?" This question will be examined with Hypothesis VI.

Hypothesis VI

There is significantly less of a gender gap in status offending in balance command households than in patriarchal households.

CHAPTER VII

STUDY FINDINGS: RUNNING AWAY AND DELINQUENCY

A series of analyses designed to examine the relationship between running away, status offenses and delinquency is presented below. The first set of analyses is intended to test Hypothesis I, and addresses the relationship of running away to other forms of deviance. There are two stages to this analysis: First, descriptive statistics of juvenile delinquency, status offenses and drug use are presented for Wave I and Wave II. The second analysis presented is a multivariate logistic regression equation, estimated separately for males and females, with delinquency as the dependent variable. (For all descriptive statistics presented, significant gender differences are determined by a chi-square test for the prevalence variables and a t-test for the frequency variables. Because of the large sample size, .01 and .001 levels of significance will be used.)

For these analyses, the data set is divided into subgroups on the basis of gender. Those statistics with a significant difference between males and females are indicated with an asterisk. Descriptive statistics (prevalence and frequency) for Wave I delinquency are presented in Table 1a. The gender differences in all types of offending is pervasive, and, as can be seen, this analysis shows males have significantly higher prevalence of offending in every category of delinquency. Also, in six out of the nine categories of delinquency, males reported significantly higher frequency of delinquent acts than females. As expected, the scale delinquency variable was significantly higher in prevalence and frequency for males as well. In addition, the gender difference varies among the different offenses. The more prevalent and less serious offenses, such as shoplifting, show the smallest gender difference in offending, with more serious and less prevalent delinquency, such as burglary, showing the largest gender gap. The above results were expected and consistent with previous literature using self-report data, indicating this data set is representative of the juvenile population.

For status offenses, the gender gap is less pronounced. There is either no gender difference (such as being loud and rowdy in a public place), or a small gender difference (such as truancy) in the prevalence ratio between males and females. The one exception to higher prevalence of males in offending is running away, where females show significantly higher

prevalence and frequency than males. In the category of drug use, again males have significantly higher prevalence of substance use (with the exception of inhalants, which was not significant), and males show significantly higher frequency of marijuana use. As with the above finding on delinquency, these findings were expected and are consistent with the previous literature on gender and offending.

In order to explore the relationship of running away to other forms of status offenses and delinquency, the above prevalence and frequency analyses were performed on split samples of runaways and non-runaways. Table 1b presents the results of analysis for those juveniles who did not report any runaway episodes in the previous year, the non-runaway group. The non-runaway sample consists of 9407 males and 9354 females. The results for the non-runaway sample are similar to the whole sample presented in Table 1a, although the prevalence rate of offending is generally lower than in the whole sample. As in Table 1a, there is a significantly higher prevalence of delinquent offending among males, and in four out of the nine categories, significantly higher frequency. Among status offenses, males have significantly higher rates of offending in all the same categories as in Table 1a, with the addition of males' significantly higher rates of smoking, an offense with no gender difference in the whole sample.

Table 1c presents the results of the runaway-only Wave I sample. Respondents who reported at least one runaway episode in Wave I comprise the runaway group. In Wave I, 756 males and 1052 females reported a runaway episode in the previous year. (Since the runaway sub-sample sample is smaller in size than the whole sample and non-runaway sample, there may be fewer significant relationships in the sub-sample analysis than in the other samples due to sample size. For this reason, I included the ratios as well.) In the category of delinquency, males again have significantly higher prevalence of all offenses, although the gender difference is smaller than the non-runaway sample presented in Table 1b.

However, several interesting relationships in the runaway sample not present in the earlier tables are apparent in the status offending category. For example, females have higher rates of offending in all but one of the status offense categories (truancy), although the gender difference for these offenses is not significant. Females' higher rates of offending includes the status scale variable as well, although again the difference is not significant. What is significant is the gender difference in alcohol use, with female runaways having significantly higher rates of alcohol use than males. This is the opposite finding of the whole sample and non-runaway

sample, where males had significantly higher alcohol use. In addition, while males have higher rates of offending in drug use in all categories, this difference is not significant as was the gender difference in previous tables. The one exception is the drug scale variable, where males do have a significantly higher prevalence of use.

The final presentation of Wave I data is Table 1d. The purpose of this table is to highlight the higher rates of offending among runaways than non-runaways within each gender. As shown in earlier tables, the offending rates of runaways are significantly higher than non-runaways in every category and for both genders. Also, the ratio of offending between runaways and non-runaway is larger for females than males. For example, in the category of delinquency, the difference in offending between runaways and non-runaways is larger for females in all offenses, except stealing a car, which is essentially equal.

In addition, both individual status offenses and the scale status variable show a larger offending gap between runaways and non-runaways among females than males. In the drug use category, again both individual offenses and the scale variable also show a higher ratio of offending for females than males (with the exception of the inhale variable). The results of Tables 1a through 1d support the hypothesis that runaways have higher rates of concurrent deviance than those juveniles who do not report a runaway episode in the prior year. This is especially true of other status offenses. In addition, female runaways show much higher rates of alcohol use than not only female non-runaways, but male runaways and non-runaways as well.

The above presentation of data indicates those juveniles who report a runaway episode in the previous year have higher rates of concurrent delinquency, status offenses and drug use than non-runaways. However, it is unclear if this relationship persists in later years, or is simply concurrent. For this reason, similar analyses were performed on Wave II of the data. The operational sample for Wave II consists of 7182 males and 7556 females. Table 2a presents the prevalence and frequency of offenses for the entire Wave II sample. Overall, the data are similar in findings to the Wave I analysis. As in Wave I, males have significantly higher rates of prevalence and frequency in all categories of delinquency. For status offenses, as in Wave I, the gender difference in prevalence is smaller than the gender ratio for delinquency, or there is no gender difference.

The prevalence of drug use, however, is higher than in Wave I, mostly due to the much higher prevalence of marijuana use in both genders. While this rate of marijuana use is

surprisingly high, this prevalence is not inconsistent with recent studies which indicate use of marijuana is the third most frequently used and abused substance among juveniles, only slightly behind tobacco and alcohol use (Preston, 2006). This prevalence increase may be due to the significant, positive relationship between age and marijuana use found both in this data set and recent literature, since prevalence of marijuana use peaks around age 18 (Preston, 2006). The mean age is over a year older in Wave II than in Wave I. With this exception, however, the whole sample results for Wave II are overwhelmingly similar to the whole sample results for Wave I in offending prevalence and frequency.

To compare the relationship of running away to other forms of delinquency one year later, the data was split into two groups: The first group is the runaway group composed of juveniles who reported a runaway episode in Wave I, but not in Wave II. The second group is the non-runaway group, and includes those juvenile who did not report a runaway episode in either Wave I or Wave II. For Wave II analyses, 405 males and 577 females are in the runaway group, and 6777 males and 6979 females are in the non-runaway group. (Again, the difference in sample size between the two groups may affect significance.) Table 2b and table 2c present the prevalence and frequency results of Wave I and Wave II non-runaways and Wave I runaways, respectively. When the Wave II offending data are analyzed separately by runaway status, many of the results are similar to the split sample findings in Wave I.

Table 2b presents the prevalence and frequency of Wave II offending for Wave I and Wave II non-runaways. The results of the non-runaway sample are similar to findings in the whole sample for Wave II presented in Table 2a, although the gender difference in smoking for non-runaways is now significant, with males having higher rates than females. This change in significance for smoking prevalence is a similar finding to the split sample of Wave I, where the non-runaway sample (Table 1b) also had a significant difference in smoking not seen in the whole sample (Table 1a). Another change from the whole sample in the non-runaway sample is the scale status variable is now significantly higher for males in Wave II, where in the whole sample the difference was not significant.

Table 2c presents the offending prevalence and frequency results for the runaway sample. Again, many of the differences in Wave II offending are similar to the difference between runaways and non-runaways in Wave I, as presented in Table 1d. As in Wave I, runaway girls in Wave II have significantly higher rates of alcohol use than runaway boys, while alcohol use

among non-runaways is significantly higher for males. For both Wave I and Wave II, the analyses show a significant change in the higher gender prevalence of alcohol use: Among non-runaways, males have higher rates of alcohol use, however among runaways, alcohol prevalence is significantly higher for females, and female runaways have significantly higher alcohol rates than in any other group. This finding was also significant in Wave 1 analyses. Also as in Wave I, female runaways show higher prevalence of cigarette smoking than male runaways, although again the difference is not significant. Furthermore, for the first time Table 2c presents higher prevalence of marijuana use for females, although as in the Wave I offending runaway sample (Table 1c) the gender difference in all categories of drug use is not significant.

Table 2d compares Wave I runaways with non-runaways within each gender. As in Table 1d, there is a significant difference in the offense rates for each individual offense as well as the scale variables. (The one exception is females' truancy, a variable that shows no difference between runaways and non-runaways.) Also as in Wave I, with one exception (stealing over $50), the ratio of delinquent offending between runaways and non-runaways is larger for females than males. In addition, the offending ratio of runaways and non-runaways is higher in Wave II delinquency than in Wave I delinquency for both genders, (with the exception of males' drug selling offense). Therefore, data presented in Table 2a through Table 2d shows a higher prevalence of offending in the status, delinquency and drug use categories among those juveniles who reported at least one runaway episode in the year prior to Wave II data collection than those with no runaway reports. In addition, Wave II data confirms the higher rates of offending for runaways not only continue from Wave I data, but the prevalence ratio of delinquent offending actually increases in the subsequent year. This may indicate that the gap in delinquency between the two groups actually increases over time, or at least through adolescence.

While the above analyses indicate runaways do have increased incidence of delinquent offending, whether or not this relationship remains after controlling of the effects of other status offenses is not clear. The next analysis is intended to answer this question. Because of the dichotomous dependent variable, logistic regression was used for this analysis. Logistic analysis is the appropriate analysis when the dependent variable is binary, or has only two possible values (Neter, Kutner, Nachtsheim & Wasserman, 1996). Table 3 presents a series of nested logistic regressions with the dependent variable of committing one or more delinquent acts in Wave II.

Because of the possibility of gender differences in the variables examined, each model is run separately by gender. The results of the logistic analyses are very consistent with the relationships presented in the previous tables, and are discussed below.

For the analyses in Table 3, the dichotomous dependent variable is delinquency in Wave II. There are two control variables included in the following analyses; age and race. The age variable was constructed from the respondent's self-reported age during the interview. As mentioned earlier, the prevalence and frequency of deviance is related to age during throughout the life course (Sampson & Laub, 2003). The variable race was dichotomized to reflect minority group status, and was based on the respondent's self-reported racial category as identifying with a group other than white. A juvenile respondent's race has been a frequent control variable in delinquency research (Jensen & Rojek, 1998). However, few longitudinal or life-course studies have included non-white respondents, and so the effects of race in life course offending is unclear (Giordano et al., 2002). In addition, some research suggests causal variables in the delinquency of girls differ by race, and this is especially true of abuse (Holsinger & Holsinger, 2005).

The first model included only the demographic control variables of age and race. Model 1 concludes age and race are significant variables only for females. This finding on race supports another study on adolescent deviance which found race to be a factor for only one gender for certain types of deviance (Bachman & Perlata, 2002). Also, non-white identification increases the delinquency rates for females. This finding is also supported in the literature: Some delinquent crimes are more prevalent among non-white girls; however, white female respondents report more involvement in drug, alcohol and other status offenses than non-white girls (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). The findings of this data set are also supported by previous findings on race and status offenses.

The second model includes the variable Wave I runaway in the prediction of delinquency. As the earlier descriptive analyses concluded, having at least one runaway episode in Wave I increases delinquent behavior in Wave II. Model 3 adds the four other status variables to the runaway variable in Model 2. Although the inclusion of other status offense variables decreases the significant, positive relationship between running away and delinquency, running away is still a significant predictor variable in Model 3 for both genders.

In sum, three statements can be derived from Table 3 about the relationship between running away, status offenses and gender. First, as can be seen, the results of the logistic regression echo the positive relationships between running away, status offenses and delinquency observed in the prevalence tables presented previously. Second, the gender, running away and delinquency relationships found in the prevalence tables persist after controlling for two socio-demographic background variables. Finally, in general, the gender specific models predicting delinquency present very similar results for males and females. As can be seen, the coefficients are the same direction for both girls and boys. Running away and status offending seems to increase the prevalence of later delinquent offending for both male and female juveniles.

To see if running away is differentially related to subsequent delinquency and status offending for boys and girls, the above analyses were repeated including an interaction term of gender-by-runaway. These results are presented in Tables 4 and 5. An assumption of logistic models is that an effect for one value is the same for both genders (Norusis, 2005). Including the product of two variables, the interaction term, can examine the interactive relationship between those two variables in the model (Norusis, 2005). As can be seen in Table 4, the demographic variable age is positively related to status offending, while identifying as non-white is negatively related to status offending. Both these findings are supported by the previous literature (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1979; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Also, while running away is a significant predictor of subsequent status offending, the interaction term is not significant and including the interaction term in the model does not change the significance of the other two variables. Table 5 presents a similar test with delinquency as the dependent variable. As in Table 4, the interaction term is not significant, and does not change the significance of the other two variables in the model. Therefore, Tables 4 and 5 indicate running away significantly increases subsequent status and delinquent offending, and running away appears to affect the subsequent offending of males and females in a similar manner.

In the previous chapter, I presented several hypotheses that would be tested in this dissertation. The first hypothesis, Hypothesis I, stated: Runaways are significantly more likely to commit other forms of deviance than non-runaways as juveniles (Wave I and Wave II). This is true for both males and females. The theoretical implications of the significant relationship between running away and further delinquency indicate status offenses may be a precursor to other types of deviance, perhaps because the individual motivation to deviance is the same for

status offenses and delinquent behavior, or exposure to delinquent peers through status offenses facilitates the path to delinquency. Analyses performed on Wave I and Wave II of the Add Health data set show runaways have higher prevalence of self-reported delinquency, status offenses and drug use than non-runaways in the current year of analysis, and this difference continues the year subsequent to the runaway episode. These analyses are presented in Tables 1a through 1d, Tables 2a through 2d, and Table 3 and these findings support the conclusion of Hypothesis I. Therefore, Hypothesis I is supported.

The above analyses found a relationship between running away and other forms of deviance as juveniles, and concluded the relationship was similar for males and females. What is still to be examined, however, is the relationship between running away, or juvenile status offenses in general, and deviance in adulthood. To date, existing research on juvenile runaways has focused on the causes of runaway behavior, and has ignored the long-term consequences into adulthood. This is unfortunate, since the experiences, and particularly deviant experiences of adolescents can have long-term consequence, and continue to affect their offending patterns as adults. Fortunately, the Add Health data set provides information on juvenile runaways as they transition into adulthood. The next set of analyses addresses the question of running away and deviance later in the life course, specifically deviance as young adults. The following set of analyses is intended to test Hypothesis II.

Analyses of Wave III data provide information on the lives of respondents as they reach the approximate age range of 20 to 25. Before the results of the logistic regression are discussed, descriptive statistics of adult offending are provided. Tables 6a through 6d present the prevalence and frequency of deviant behavior and criminal justice system involvement for Wave III. The operational sample for Wave III consists of 7206 males and 7969 females. As shown in Table 6a, the self-reported criminal offenses for the whole sample present a significant gender difference in all offenses (except deliberate bad checks), with males having higher prevalence. The frequency of all offending responses is also higher for males, although the difference is not always significant.

In the category of alcohol and drug use, again, males have significantly higher prevalence in all responses. Frequency is also higher for males, although again the difference is not always significant. In the final category, contacts with the justice system, all five variables show a significant gender difference, with males having higher prevalence. In addition, the mean age of

being taken into custody is significantly higher for females than males. The findings in Table 6a were expected and are consistent with previous literature.

When the sample is split into runaway and non-runaway groups, the non-runaway group presents prevalence rates and gender difference ratios similar to the whole sample. Table 6b presents the non-runaway sample. These respondents reported no runaway episodes in either Wave I or Wave II, if the respondent was included in Wave II. For the non-runaway sample of Wave III, 6635 males and 7225 females are included. One notable difference in the non-runaway sample is the mean age taken into custody is older among the non-runaways than in the whole sample (Table 6a).

The runaway sample presented in Table 6c is comprised of respondents who reported a runaway episode in either Wave I or Wave II, if the respondent was included in Wave II. There are 571 males and 744 females in the runaway sample. In the runaway-only sample shown in Table 6c, some of the significant gender difference in prevalence found in earlier tables disappears. For example, cigarette smoking and alcohol use no longer have a significant gender difference. This is also true of some drug use, which showed a significant gender difference in the two previous tables. In addition, the mean age of being taken into custody is younger than in the previous analyses, and there is no longer a significant gender difference, although this could be due to the very small sample size of this category. Also, the ratio of male to female offending is generally larger in the non-runaway sample than in the runaway sample.

Table 6d compares the different prevalence rates of runaways to non-runaways within each gender. While there is a no significant difference between runaways and non-runaways for alcohol use, for males, all forms of criminal offending continue to show a significant difference between runaways and non-runaways (except credit card use). This is mostly true for females, as well, although the lack of significance could be due to small sample size. Furthermore, often the ratio of offending between runaways and non-runaways is larger for females than for males in certain categories of criminal behavior and alcohol and drug use. The conclusions of this final table of the Wave III analyses indicate the significant difference between runaways and non-runaways in self-report criminal behavior and alcohol and drug use seen as juveniles continues into adulthood.

Also significant is the difference in criminal justice system contact between runaways and non-runaways. For example, the mean age taken into custody by the justice system is

significantly younger for runaways than non-runaways for both genders. In addition, all four responses of justice system contact are also significantly higher for runaways than non-runaways. This is true for both genders. The final result of interest for Table 6d is the ratio of offending between runaways and non-runaways is larger for females than for males in all forms of criminal justice system contact.

Further examination of the juvenile status offending and adult criminal behavior relationship is presented in Table 7. The dependent variable in this logistic regression is self-reported criminal behavior as an adult. Model 1 includes the two control variables of race and age, as well as the runaway variable and the other status offenses variables. In this model, the results of the status offense variables indicate a gender difference. While runaway and smoking are not significant for males, alcohol use and being loud and rowdy in a public place are significant. On the other hand, all the status offending variables are significant for females. However, the variance explained by Model 1 is greater for males than for females. The gender differences in the findings of Model 1 indicate certain forms of status offending may have different outcomes on the adult offending of males and females. Finally, as in Tables 4 and 5, the interaction term of gender-by-runaway was included in analysis to examine the relationship between gender and running away on adult criminality. Table 8 presents the findings of this analysis. While both gender and runaway are significant, including the interaction term in the model does not change the results of the other variables. This indicates the effects of running away are similar for both males and females.

In summary, the second hypothesis in my dissertation deals with the long-term consequences of runaway behavior among juveniles. The positive relationship between juvenile offending and adult offending is well-documented, but this has not been conclusively studied for status offenders. If the theory of a positive relationship between past and future offending holds for status offending as well as delinquent offending, juveniles who commit any form of deviance or "rule-breaking" such as status offending, will have higher rates of adult deviance behavior. This continuation of deviance may be due to an individual's propensity for deviance (low self-control), or because of an introduction into a criminal lifestyle or peers, or due to deviant labeling.

The prevalence results presented in Tables 6a through 6d indicate runaways do have higher rates of offending as adults, although these descriptive statistics also show evidence of

noticeable desistance in both the runaway and non-runaway groups. Furthermore, the subsequent logistic regression concluded that while some status offenses are not significant predictors of male adult criminality, alcohol use and being loud and rowdy are significantly related to adult offending for males. In addition, all of the status offenses are significant for females. Hypothesis II stated: Runaways will have higher rates of self-reported deviance and criminal justice system contact than non-runaways as adults (Wave III). Hypothesis II is supported by the results of this dissertation.

The previous analyses indicate there is a positive relationship between status offenses, specifically running away, and other types of offending both as a juvenile and as an adult. This finding could support a theory such as Gottfredson & Hirschi's (1990) low-self control, where personal attributes or personality characteristics that affect juveniles' decision to runaway or status offend also influence the choice to commit adult offending. However, this relationship may be spurious, as those factors which cause status offenses may also cause adult offending. The questions now becomes if the positive relationship between status offenses and adult offending remains even after controlling for the effects of another variable.

An example of a variable related to both status offending and adult crime is delinquency. Since delinquency is significantly, positively related to both status offenses and adult offending, status offenders may have higher rates of adult offending because status offenders are also delinquent offenders. And once delinquent offenders, these juveniles are more likely to continue their criminal careers as adults. For this reason, it is important to study the adult criminal behavior of status offenders who did not report any forms of delinquency in Wave I or Wave II.

Table 7, model 3 adds a delinquency (Wave I) variable to the status offense models predicting adult offending. As expected from previous literature, delinquency has a significant, positive effect on adult offending for both genders. Furthermore, while the same status offenses that were significant predictors of adult offending in model 1 are also significant in model 1 among male respondents, the female respondents indicate a different pattern. Among female respondents, while all status offenses were significant in model 1, adding the delinquency variable left only the loud and rowdy and smoking variables significant for females. Running away and alcohol offenses are no longer significant among females.

To further examine the relationship between status offenses and adult deviance among non-delinquents, Table 9 presents the results of a logistic regression analysis on a filtered sample

of only those juvenile who did not report any delinquent episodes in either Wave I or Wave II. Therefore, this analysis only examines the effects of status offenses on adult criminal behavior in the Wave I and Wave II non-delinquent juvenile population. The results of Table 9 are similar to the results of model 3 in the previously presented Table 7. As shown in Table 9 model 1, among non-delinquents, reporting a runaway episode is not significantly related to adult offending for either gender.

However, as shown in Table 9 model 2, many of the status offenses remain significantly positively related to adult offending, although this pattern differs by gender. Alcohol use is a significant predictor for males, although this relationship does not hold for females. This finding supports previous studies that have found a significant relationship between alcohol use and other forms of deviance for males but not for females (Bachman & Peralta, 2002). Likewise, truancy is only significantly related to the dependent variable for males. On the other hand, cigarette smoking was significantly positively related for females, but not for males.

In sum, there are several interesting results from the above analysis on the effects of status offenses on adult criminal offending: Overall, the above analyses indicate the effects of running away and status offending are long-term and negative, and this is similar for both genders. While not all status offenses are significantly related to adult offending, and these relationships vary by gender, some status offenses remain significant and positively related to adult offending even when controlling for socio-demographic variables and other related factors, such as delinquent histories. Hypothesis III stated: Among non-delinquents, status offenders will have higher rates of adult criminal behavior and criminal justice system contact than non-status offenders. This is true for males and females. Hypothesis III is supported.

The final two models in Table 9, model 3 and model 4, add variables intended to explore the role that juvenile justice system contact in the lives of status offenders. Several criminology theories hold contact with the formal justice system will increase subsequent offending either through labeling the juvenile, or contact with delinquent peers, while other theories such as deterrence theory predict the effect of justice system contact will decrease subsequent offending (Akers, 1997; Jensen & Rojeck, 1998; Johnson et al., 2004; Sampson & Laub, 2003). The first justice system variable added in Table 9, model 3 is juvenile contact, and indicates whether or not the respondent had been informally stopped and detained by the police for questioning about his or her activities (other than a traffic violation) before the age of 18.

The second variable, juvenile custody is added in model 4 of Table 9 and asks the respondent if they were ever taken into formal police custody, or arrested as a juvenile. Approximately 20% of boys and 4% of girls were taken into custody by the police before turning 18 years old. For males, both variables of justice system contact are significantly related to adult offending for non-delinquents. For females, only juvenile contact is significant for non-delinquents. These findings indicate that informal justice system contact has a significant relationship with adult offending for male and female non-delinquents. Formal justice processing, however, is only significant among male non-delinquents.

Returning to Table 7, model 5 also has justice system variables. The first variable added in Table 7, model 5 is juvenile contact, as defined above. The second justice system variable in Table 7, model 5 is juvenile conviction, and asks the respondent if he or she had been convicted of or pled guilt to a delinquent offense in juvenile court. For boys, 4% of the respondents were convicted, while for girls, less than 1% reported conviction prior to age 18. For both males and females, justice system contact variables are significant, and do not change the significance of the other variables in the model. The above findings indicate that for both delinquents and non-delinquents, and for both males and females, juvenile justice system contact is significantly related to adult offending. Hypothesis IV stated status offenders with juvenile justice system contact would have higher rates of adult offending than status offenders who do not have juvenile justice system contact. Hypothesis IV is supported.

One issue of significance in the study of females and status offending that has not yet been studied is abuse. As mentioned throughout this dissertation, previous literature indicates abuse is a key factor in juvenile offending, especially for females. For this reason, an abuse variable was constructed from the data. The abuse variable is a dichotomized response to whether or not the respondent had experienced either physical or sexual abuse as a juvenile. Approximately 2100 (31% of the male population) males and 2200 (29% of the female population) females reported experiencing either one or both types of abuse. This high prevalence was startling, but not inconsistent with recent literature that reports high levels of abuse in the lives of both male and female juveniles (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006). The following analyses are intended to examine the relationship of abuse to status offenses and delinquency, as well as adult offending.

Before presenting the logistic regression models, Table 10a and 10b present bivariate relationships of abuse and the juvenile and adult deviance variables. Indeed, abuse is significantly related to all forms of offending for both juveniles and adults. All status offenses are positively related to abuse in Table 10a for girls. This is consistent with the large amount of literature on running away that describes a connection between running away and abuse. For males, the relationship between abuse and offending was also generally significant and positive. Less literature has studied the relationship between male delinquency and abuse, and therefore the literature has not found a consistent relationship between abuse and deviance for males. These findings indicate abuse is a significant factor in the delinquency of males. Therefore, further research on delinquency should include the role abuse plays in increasing offending among males, as this pathway to offending may be very productive for explaining male offending as well as female delinquency. Table 10b presents the bivariate relationships between abuse and adult deviance. In general, both genders show a significant relationship between abuse and adult offending. This indicates abuse experienced as young child has significant and long-term effects, and may lead to deviance at later ages, possibly because abuse increases juvenile delinquency and status offending.

Additional descriptive statistics on the frequency of offending among abused and non-abused respondents are presented in Table 11a and Table 11b. In Tables 11a and 11b, both male and female abused respondents report significantly higher offending rates as both juveniles and adults than their non-abused peers. In sum, the relationship between abuse and subsequent offending appears to be positive and consistent. For both genders and across most offenses, abused juveniles report higher frequency of offending than non-abused juveniles, even years after the abuse has occurred. The theoretical implications of this findings support the hypothesis that, by disrupting the normal development of social skills or by encouraging the acquisition of maladaptive behaviors related to delinquency, abuse early in life has long-term, criminogenic consequences (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Ireland et al., 2002).

Returning to Table 3 and Table 7, an abuse variable was included in model 4 and model 2, respectively. As can be seen, the results of the logistic regression models with abuse in Table 3 and Table 7 are similar to the relationships presented in Tables 10a and 10b, and Tables 11a and 11b. In Table 3, model 4 adds abuse to the status offense variables. In Table 3 model 4, abuse has a significant, positive relationship to delinquency, and, the other status offense

variables remain significant when the abuse variable is included. However, the variance explained remains unchanged when abuse is included in this model.

In Table 7, model 2, abuse is included in the equation with adult offending as the dependent variable. Again, there is a significant, positive relationship between abuse and adult offending. For males, as in model 1, alcohol use and loud and rowdy remain significantly related to adult offending. For females, however, while all the status offense variables are significant in model 1, including abuse in the model eliminates the significance of runaway, although the other status offenses remain positive. This indicates a unique relationship between abuse and the status offense of running away for girls not found with other status offenses, or in the male sample. This finding also supports the previous literature indicating a unique relationship between abuse and running away for girls and requires future inquiry (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004).

As reported earlier in this dissertation, some feminist criminologists have reported running away is a status offense that may not only be an indication of abused juveniles, but being abused can increase the chances of future criminality among those who status offend (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998). As shown in the above analyses, both running away and being abused are significantly related to further offending. One question to explore is whether abused runaways are more likely to commit further offending than runaways who are not abused. A related question is if experiencing abuse is less detrimental in terms of future offending for those individual who do not run away, possibly because this prevents contact with delinquent peers, negative labeling, or the reliance on deviant survival strategies. (Of course, abused juveniles who runaway may experience more severe or appalling maltreatment than those abused juveniles who do not run away, and the severity of abuse may lead to different outcomes. Since this study uses a dichotomized abuse variable, the effects of frequency or intensity of abuse are not measured. Perhaps an equally important factor in the lives of runaways is the level of exposure to and duration of abuse.)

To explore the issue of abuse and running away on adult criminality, Tables 12a and 12b present the prevalence of offending for runaways and non-runaways by their abuse experience. (Unlike previous prevalence tables, the two genders are combined for this analysis due to small sample size. And, since the runaway group is much smaller than the non-runaway group, differences in sample size may affect the significance.) In Table 12a, the prevalence of juvenile

offending and delinquency (Wave I) is presented. Among those juveniles who reported a runaway occurrence, being abused does not significantly increase the prevalence of offending in all categories. For those juveniles who did not report a runaway episode, subsequent delinquency and offending is significantly higher among those juveniles who experienced abuse.

Furthermore, in general, the ratio between the abused and non-abused juveniles is greater in the non-runaway group than in the runaway group. The results of Table 12a indicate that while abuse significantly increases deviance among non-runaways as a group, and the runaway group has higher rates of offending than the non-runaway group, abuse is not significantly related to an increase in juvenile offending among runaways. In fact, some of the offending responses show no difference or even lower prevalence in the abuse runaway group, although the difference is not significant. Of course, these finding should be appreciated with reference to the small sample size resulting from the selected sub-sample of abused runaways.

Table 12b continues the above analyses with an exploration of the prevalence of adult offending (Wave III) in the various sub-samples of runaway and abused respondents. For many offenses in the runaway group, abused runaways have significantly higher frequency than non-abused runaways. Finally, for all offenses among non-runaways, abused respondents report a higher frequency of offenses as adults than non-runaways who were not abused. Although the descriptive statistics presented for the runaway sample in Table 12a question the theory that abuse further increases delinquency in all juvenile groups regardless of offending history, the findings of 12b follow other research previously presented in this dissertation: Experiencing abuse as a juvenile has severe, negative and long-term effects on juvenile delinquent offending and future criminal behavior. Hypothesis V stated: Abused runaways will have higher rates of deviance and criminal justice system contact than non-abused runaways, both as juveniles and adults. Hypothesis V is partially supported.

CHAPTER VIII

STUDY FINDINGS: POWER-CONTROL THEORY

The following analyses evaluate Power-Control Theory as an adequate explanatory theory of juvenile status offending. In review, the main premise of Power-Control Theory is power in the work-place will lead to power in the family. Power-Control Theory is formulated using ideal family types: Patriarchal families have a father who holds an authority position in the workplace and a mother who does not work for pay or does not have authority in the workplace. In a balanced family, on the other hand, both parents are employed in similar authority level positions, from either obey or command classes. Parents from different family types use different control practices over daughters and sons, and this produces different levels of parental supervision and risk socialization on the part of the juvenile. This difference in parental control and risk socialization leads to different gender differences in delinquency rates among household categories.

According to the theory, patriarchal families, which supervise and control daughters more closely than sons, would have a larger gender difference (or gender gap) in common delinquency than other family types. Balanced command families will have a smaller gender difference in offending, due to the fact sons and daughters are more similarly socialized into risk taking attitudes and experience more similar types of parental control. As Hagan and Gillis (1987) write: "In egalitarian families, daughters become more like sons in their involvement in such forms of risk taking as delinquency". Therefore, gender should be more strongly related to status offending among juveniles in patriarchal households than in balanced households. Furthermore, juveniles in command class households should have more delinquency than those adolescents from obey class households, due to their socialization into greater risk taking.

Before a regression analysis testing Power-Control, I first present the correlations of gender with the various status offenses, as well as a scale delinquency variable and variables related to parental control, taste for risk and abuse. The bivariate correlations are presented in Table 13. (As before, male is coded 0 and female is coded 1.) As shown in Table 13, gender is not correlated with individual status offenses, with the exception of truancy in two of the

household categories, and loud and rowdy in the balanced command category. The status offense scale variable is significantly related to gender in only the balanced command household.

The delinquency scale variable correlates most strongly with gender in the balanced command class household. This finding is opposite the prediction of Power-Control Theory, and follows the findings of other tests of Power-Control Theory where command class families have the largest, not the smallest, gender gap in offending (see Avakame, 1997; Leiber & Wacker, 1997; Singer & Levine, 1988; Uggen 2000). However, as predicted by Power-Control Theory, taste for risk negatively correlates with gender, and the smallest gender correlation is in the balance command household. The abuse variable is also correlated with gender, and persists in the same direction for all household types.

To further explore the gender-offense relationship between the various household classes, additional descriptive statistics are provided. Table 14 presents the means for various offenses of males and females by household class. Independent T-tests were conducted to measure significant differences between the groups. The only status offense with a gender difference in two of the household categories is truancy. In the third category, the balance command category, there was no significant gender difference in the truancy offense, (although this household category had the lowest truancy rates). This finding is consistent with Power-Control Theory, which would predict a smaller gender difference in offending in the balance command category than in the other two household categories. However, the other status offending categories and the status scale variable show no gender differences in any of the household types.

Also, although the gender difference in delinquent offending is significant in all gender groups, the largest gender difference is in the balance command household category, another finding in conflict with the predictions of Power-Control Theory. Furthermore, the parental control variable shows no gender difference in any of the household categories. Finally, while the variable measuring risk taking attitudes shows a gender difference in the expected direction for all household categories, the smallest gender difference is in the balance command category. This finding is in agreement with the prediction of Power-Control Theory; however the difference between the household types is not significant. In aggregate, the conclusions of Table 14 are not favorable toward Power-Control Theory: While some of the underlying assumptions of Power-Control Theory, such as taste for risk and gender, are correct and in the hypothesized direction, the gender gap and household type categorization hypotheses are not supported.

Many studies of juvenile deviance include measures of parental control and monitoring as these factors are assumed to explain a large part of juvenile offending, either through the development of low-self control (Unnever, Cullen & Agnew, 2006), or supervision (Jensen & Eve, 1976). In this analysis, the absence of a gender-parental control correlation persists throughout the household class categories. However, since many delinquency theories rely on the assumption girls are more supervised and controlled in the family than boy, and thus girls have less autonomy, this finding was unexpected. For this reason, gender correlations were run for each of the parental control variables comprising the scale variable to see if there is a specific pattern of individual parental control variable correlation. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 15.

As was revealed by the control scale variable presented earlier, most of the individual parental control variables reported in Table 15 are not significantly correlated with gender across the household types. The strongest correlation with gender is found with the curfew variable, and was significant in the patriarchal and balance obey class households. The gender-curfew correlation is not significant in the command balance households. The absence of a gender/curfew relationship in this household type would be expected by the predictions of Power-Control Theory.

Furthermore, the curfew variable is the only significant variable where boys were given more autonomy than girls. In the other areas of parental control, including decisions regarding TV viewing and bedtimes, girls are given greater autonomy, although the relationship is not always significant. This indicates the traditional assumptions about parental control and gender in traditional delinquency theories, where daughters experience more parental controls and less individual autonomy than sons, may be misguided by narrow definitions of parental controls which overlook the many diverse facets of adolescent autonomy. Daughters may mature more quickly than sons, and therefore are given more autonomy in many areas of daily life, with the exception of curfews.

To further examine the relationships between gender and status offending in the three household categories, Table 16 presents the prevalence of delinquency, status offending and runaway behavior by gender for each household category. As expected, in the delinquency findings there was a significant gender difference in all household categories. However, there is no significant gender difference in the status offense or in the runaway analysis for any

household categories. When the prevalence of each gender was compared among the household categories, only one offense presented a significant difference for one gender: Females in the balance command class were significantly less likely to runaway than females in the other two household categories. This finding is contrary to the predictions of Power-Control Theory, and again, the general conclusions of Table 16 fail to support the theory.

Since logistic regression is used when the dependent variable is binary (Agresti & Finlay, 1997), this type of analysis will describe the relationship of the independent variables on the likelihood of status offending. However, before evaluating Power-Control Theory as an adequate explanation of status offending, I will test the theory's utility using delinquency as the dependent variable. This analysis will not only test Power-Control theory on delinquency, but also allow for a comparison of the predictive variables of status and delinquent offending. Table 17 uses self-report delinquency in Wave I as the dependent variable.

As shown in Table 17 model 1, the gender relationship in self-reported delinquency between males and females, while significant in all household categories, is largest in the balance command class households. The smallest gender coefficient is found in the balance obey household. Furthermore, there is a significant difference between the gender coefficient for the balance command household and both the balance obey and patriarchal households. There is no significant difference between the gender coefficients for the balance obey and patriarchal households. The findings of this initial level of analysis are contrary to the predictions of Power-Control Theory, which would predict the smallest gender gap in delinquent offending in balance command-class households.

Table 17, model 2 provides an assessment of the importance of adding the parental control scale variable to gender. (Because the absence of a correlation between gender and the parental control scale variable, the individual variable curfew, which did show a gender correlation in two of the household categories, was substituted in place of the scale parental control variable. No notable differences were found when the curfew variable was used as the measure of parental control in place of the scale variable in any of the analyses.) The addition of the parental control variable did not reveal a significant relationship of parental control and delinquency, or influence the effect of gender on delinquency, in any of the household categories. In model 3, a variable indicating the respondents' risk taking preferences in included. In model 3, the effects of gender are no longer significant in the balance obey households, while

gender remains significant in the balance command and the patriarchal households. This indicates some of girls' delinquency in the balance obey households is explained by these girls' self-reported taste for risk.

The logistic regression presented in Table 18 repeats the analysis in Table 17, using status offending (Wave I) instead of delinquency as the dependent variable. Power-Control Theory has never been tested as an adequate explanation of exclusively status offenses. However, if the theory is indeed an adequate explanation of common juvenile offending, and is sufficient to explain girls offending, status offenses need to be evaluated as well as delinquent offenses. In model 1 of Table 18, two of the household categories show gender is not significant; while gender is significant, and negative, in the balance command households. This finding is also in conflict with the expectations of Power-Control Theory, which would predict the smallest gender relationship in the balance command household category.

In model 2 of Table 18, the addition of the parental control variable to the model does not change the significance or direction of gender reported in model 1 in any household category. However, while parental control was not a significant predictor variable when delinquency was the dependent variable, using status offending as the dependent variable presents a different picture. In fact, parental control has a consistent, negative effect on status offending which persists across all models and all household types. This possibly indicates the family dynamics, especially in terms of parental control and adolescent autonomy, predictive of status offending may be different from those predictive of delinquency.

The introduction of the taste for risk variable in model 3 changes the effects and significance of the gender coefficient in all three household types. In the patriarchal and balance obey households, gender becomes significant and positive. On the other hand, in the command balance households, gender, which was negative and significant in model 2, is no longer significant. The parental control variable remains significant and largely unchanged in all household categories in model 3. The change in the gender significance after including the taste for risk variable in model 3 of Table 18 reveals an important relationship between attitudes toward risk taking and gender in status offending. This finding indicates some of the effects of gender on status offending are explained by the risk taking attitudes of the adolescent.

Since part of the purpose of this study is to evaluate whether theories useful in the explanation of criminal delinquency are equally useful in predicting status offending, comparing

Table 17 and Table 18 reveals the effects of the same predictor variables (as indicated by Power-Control) on the two dependent variables of status offending and delinquent offending. The comparison highlights several issues: Most notably, parental control, a variable not significant in predicting delinquency, is significant when the dependent variable is changed to status offending. Also, when taste for risk is added to the model with delinquency as the dependent variable, the effect of gender, while decreased, remains negative. In the logistic regression explaining status offending, on the other hand, gender becomes positive for two of the household categories when taste for risk is added to the model, and becomes non-significant for command balance households. The comparison of status and delinquent offending analyses indicates variables common in the explanation of delinquent offending may be useful in explaining status offending, but may involve different levels or conditions of these same correlates.

The above analyses provide little support for concluding Power-Control Theory is a useful theory of status offending. The logistic regression presented in Table 18 indicates some aspects of Power-Control Theory, specifically the variables of parental control and taste for risk, do have a significant relationship with status offending, and also gender. These same variables have found consistent support in previous studies on Power-Control as well as this one, and so these finding were expected. Yet the unique aspect of Power-Control Theory involves including household class, and the relationship of parents' occupational status in the family. This unique feature of Power-Control Theory did not find support in this dissertation, as household class was often either unrelated to gender and delinquency, or related in the opposite direction the theory would predict. In fact, this analysis provided additional support to previous researcher's evaluations of Power-Control Theory which found girls in patriarchal households have higher rates of offending than balanced command households (see Lieber & Wacker, 1997).

In addition, as found by the application of Power-Control Theory household category groups to this data set, many adolescents are not classifiable in one of the household type categories. The diversity of adolescents' living situations is much more varied than these parental household categories allow. For example, in their own analyses, Hagan et al., ignore single father-headed households, as well as those households where mothers hold command class occupations while fathers hold obey class positions. Of course, some adolescents in these household arrangements offend, and as in this analysis, these adolescents would be eliminated from study because they do not classify into a specific household category. A theory that does

not acknowledge these juveniles is myopic and has little utility as a general, predictive theory. Furthermore, many adolescents do not live in any types of parental 'family structure' at all, but other types of living arrangements including various friends or relatives, or even group homes. Runaways may be particularly likely to be living in a non-traditional living situation. Adequate theories of status offending need to consider these juveniles as well.

Finally, abused adolescents, while perhaps living in a specific parental family household, may experience a type of gender socialization different than the traditional 'patriarchal' or 'egalitarian' household gender socialization patterns of non-abused boys and girls. In other words, the socialization into risk attitudes and adolescent autonomy of abused juveniles may not reflect the traditional gender patterns of their household categorization. The abuse, both sexual and physical that many juveniles experience is not acknowledged by Power-Control Theory, and, prior tests and evaluations of the theory have ignored abuse in their analyses as well. Therefore, how the variables taste for risk and parental control are related to both abused and non-abused adolescents is unclear. For this reason, I test the independent variables and the two dependent variables (status offending and delinquent offending) analyzed above with a split sample of abused and non-abused adolescents, regardless of household category, to examine how a history of abuse affects these variables.

Table 19 presents the results of the gender, parental control and taste for risk variables with the dependent variable of delinquency on a split-sample of abused and non-abused juveniles. In model 1 of Table 19, gender is significantly related to delinquency in the expected direction for both the abused and non-abused samples. The addition of the parental control variable in model 2, however, shows parental control is significantly related to delinquent offending only for the non-abused sample. However this significant relationship is eliminated when the taste for risk variable is added in model 3. In model 3 of Table 19, the taste for risk variable is significant for both the abused and non-abused sample, and, gender is no longer significant in the abused sample. This indicates risk taking attitudes among abused girls explains some of the delinquency of this group.

In Table 20, the same analyses reported in Table 19 are presented with status offending as the dependent variable. Model 1 shows gender is not significantly related to status offenses, regardless of abuse history. This was expected from the results of the previous analyses. Furthermore, for both abused and non-abused samples, parental control has a negative and

significant relationship to status offending. This also was expected from previous analyses. However, adding the taste for risk variable in model 3 reveals a different effect on the gender variable between the abused and non-abused samples. As in all the previous analyses, taste for risk is significantly related to status offending in all sub-samples. And for abused respondents, gender becomes significant and positive in model 3. As in Table 19 where delinquency was the dependent variable, the significance of gender on the dependent variables is different in the abused and the non-abused samples when taste for risk is included in the model.

In summary, the presented analyses provide little support for the gender and class relationship hypothesis of Power-Control Theory. In fact, several findings concerning the household class and gender gap in offending were actually in the opposite direction predicted by the theory. Furthermore, the analysis of this data set revealed that parents do not seem to control their daughters more than sons when a comprehensive measure of parental control is employed. In support of a Power-Control approach toward status offending, measures of parental control and attitudes toward risk taking do hold significant relationships to status offending, and also interact with gender in all household categories. And, parental control does decrease status offending for both males and females. In addition, attitudes toward risk taking are important in explaining the delinquent offending as well as the status offending of both males and females.

However, these relationships were not the result of household class category, and parental occupational category does not appear to hold the explanation to levels of parental control or the socialization into attitudes toward risk taking. Hypothesis VI stated: Power Control theory is an adequate feminist general theory of delinquency able to explain status offending behavior. There should be a smaller gender gap in offending in balance command households than in patriarchal households. While the above findings indicate some aspects of Power-Control Theory are beneficial in uncovering some explanatory factors of status offending, these analyses fail to provide full support for Hypothesis VI.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

This dissertation contributes to the existing literature by exploring two currently understudied areas in delinquency; gender inclusive delinquency theory and status offenses. One purpose of this dissertation is to discover the relationship between status offenses and other types of offending through the life course, and how this relationship is affected by gender. In doing so, I analyzed the three waves of the Add Health data set in order to explore the relationship between status offenses and other types of offending. The second purpose of this study is to test the utility of Power-Control Theory in explaining status offenses. Again, the Add Health data set was used to examine the theory's ability to explain both status offending and delinquent offending. In this last chapter of my dissertation, I summarize the findings of my analyses and report the conclusions derived from these findings, and how this information adds to the existing literature about running away, status offenses, and gender and delinquency. In addition, I evaluate how these findings are both consistent and inconsistent with the previous literature on this subject. Last, the limitations of this study and data set, the policy implications for justice system officials working with juveniles, and suggestions for future research are discussed.

Summary of Status Offenses Findings

The first set of analyses presented in this dissertation examined the prevalence and frequency of status and delinquent offending for each gender, the gender gap in different offenses, and compared the offending rates of runaways to non-runaways in concurrent and subsequent offenses. The male to female prevalence ratios presented from this data set are consistent with the previous literature: Males have higher prevalence of delinquent offenses and drug use, and while there was little or no gender difference in most status offenses, females reported higher prevalence of runaway episodes. Running away was the only offense with a higher prevalence for females. As mentioned throughout this dissertation, previous literature has found the gender gap for delinquent offenses to be larger than for status offenses, and running away to be the only juvenile offense where girls consistently outnumber boys.

Because one objective of this study is to examine the differences in prevalence of delinquent offenses between runaways and non-runaways, the sample was split into two groups; runaways and non-runaways. There is little prior research on the relationship between running away and further deviance both as a juvenile and as an adult. The analyses reported in this study found the juvenile offending rates of runaways were consistently higher than non-runaways, and this increased prevalence of offending is true both for concurrent (Wave I) and subsequent (Wave II) delinquency. In addition, runaways' higher rates of offending are found for both male and female juveniles.

One interesting finding in this analysis is the prevalence rates for two status offense categories, smoking and alcohol use, are higher for female runaways than both male runaways and non-runaways of both genders. This is true in the concurrent year as well as the subsequent year. The higher rate of these status offenses among female runaways indicates the consequences of running away are an important area of study in the understanding of other female status offenses, and the prevention of further female offending. Furthermore, this indicates status offenders, such as female runaways, are at high risk of future life-long health problems from high rates of tobacco and alcohol use. This group of juveniles, then, might benefit the most from early intervention juvenile public health campaigns about the deleterious effects of substance use.

To further examine the relationship between status offenses and later delinquency, a logistic regression analyzing the predictive ability of different status offenses on the dependent variable, delinquency, was included after the prevalence tables. The results confirm the findings of the previous analysis, and also reveal this relationship holds when the socio-demographic variables age and race are included. Running away was significantly related to subsequent delinquency for both males and females. Furthermore, each of the other four status offenses has a significant relationship with subsequent delinquency, even when runaway was included in the model, for both genders.

Finally, including the interaction term gender-by-runaway in the logistic regressions predicting both subsequent delinquent and status offending did not change the previous significant relationships. There is no prior research on how running away may be differently related to the delinquency of girls and boys. The findings of this dissertation indicate the effect of running away on further offending is similar for girls and boys. In sum, based on this study,

there appears to be a positive and similar relationship between running away and delinquency for both males and females, and the relationship between the other status offenses and delinquency was also positive for males and females. Because of these findings, Hypothesis I was supported.

Even though there is little prior research on the relationship between runaways and status offending and other forms of deviance, this finding was expected since prior studies on delinquency consistently find juveniles who commit one form or act of delinquency are more likely to commit further delinquency, and even adult crimes. The results of this dissertation indicate this increased risk for further delinquent offending is also applicable to those juveniles who participate in status offenses as well as prior delinquent acts. While several criminologists hypothesize status offenders, and specifically runaways, do not escalate into delinquent offenders but are status-limited offenders (see Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004), this analysis indicates there is a relationship between the two types of juvenile deviance for both genders. In addition, this increased risk for delinquent offending is true for both the concurrent year of the runaway episode as well as the subsequent year.

The next objective in discovering the subsequent effects of status offending was to study the different offending rates when the respondents are adults (Wave III). In order to examine this relationship, Hypothesis II stated: Runaways will have higher rates of self-reported deviance and criminal justice system contact than non-runaways as adults (Wave III). The initial descriptive statistics on Wave III revealed a gender gap in offending expected by the findings of previous literature: Males have significantly higher rates of adult offending for all offenses except intentionally writing a bad check.

When the sample was split into runaway (Wave I or Wave II) and non-runaway groups, however, the gender difference in smoking, alcohol and drug use was no longer significant for runaways. This finding was similar to the rates of alcohol and cigarette use among runaways as juveniles, where the rates of these two substance use offenses for female runaways were actually higher than for males. This indicates female runaways are at increased risk for alcohol and tobacco use as adults as well as juveniles, and further exploration into the alcohol and cigarette use of female runaways would be useful in preventing future problems from abuse of these substances, as this increased usage appears to be long-term. Finally, the offending rates of runaways and non-runaways for each gender were examined. With the exception of alcohol use, male runaways have higher prevalence rates in all offenses than male non-runaways. For

females, three offenses that showed a significant difference for males, both types of theft and stolen property, did not show a significant difference for females. This may be due to the small sample size of female offenders in those sub-groups.

Unlike the logistic regression predicting juvenile offending, the effects of status offending on adult offending were different by gender in the logistic regression predicting Wave III deviance. While all of the status offenses were significant for females, the model predicting adult offending for males showed only two status offenses, alcohol use and loud and rowdy, were significant. This gender variation shows different types of status offending as juveniles have different implications for males and females as adult offenders. Furthermore, these findings indicate status offenses are not a homogenous group of offenses, but each separate offense may have different motivations or effects, and these will differ by gender. In addition, the relationship between a status offense and adult offending may be mediated by other independent variables related to either running away or adult criminality. For example, Table 7 findings on the specific status offense of running away indicate there is a relationship between running away and adult offending for females. However, this relationship no longer exists when the independent variables delinquency or abuse are included in the model. Perhaps, then, for girls the effects of running away are only criminogenic when coupled with abuse or delinquency.

Although this study found different status offense variables to be important in explaining male and female crime, overall, the findings for both genders are consistent with the conclusion status offenders are more likely to engage in further delinquency and adult crime than non-status offenders. There was no previous literature on the long-term or life-course effects of status offending; however, as mentioned above, a major predictor of adult criminal offending is delinquent offending as a juvenile (see Sampson & Laub, 2003). The findings presented indicate status offending has a similar positive relationship to adult offending as delinquent offending, and support the conclusion of the continuity of deviance from adolescence to adulthood is true for juvenile status offenders as well. In sum, these findings indicate that status offending as a juvenile is also significant in predicting the occurrence of adult deviance. Therefore, Hypothesis II was supported.

The previous analyses found a relationship between status offenses, specifically running away, and other types of deviance both as a juvenile and as an adult. There are many possible explanations for this relationship: Personal attributes such as low self-control among juveniles

may lead to both status offending and delinquent offending, and also subsequent adult offending (see Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Another possibility is status offenses put juveniles in contact with deviant peers, and from these contacts delinquent behaviors are learned (see Akers, 1997). However, since previous research has indicated juvenile delinquency is a significant predictor of adult criminal behavior, and this dissertation has found a significant relationship between status offenses and delinquent behavior, the possibility of a spurious relationship between status offenses and adult offending needed to be addressed. In other words, the relationship between running away or other status offenses and adult offending could exist because each is related to delinquency. For this reason, Hypothesis III was included. Hypothesis III stated: Among non-delinquents, status offenders will have higher rates of adult criminal behavior and criminal justice system contact than non-status offenders. Therefore, uncovering the relationship between status offenses and adult criminal behavior, while controlling for reported delinquent behavior, was the next objective.

To find the relationship between status offenses and adult criminality among non-delinquents, the same logistic regressions run on the whole sample were run on a sample of only non-delinquents. The results of the analyses on the non-delinquent sample were different than the analyses on the whole sample. While some of the status offenses were still significant, others were not, and this pattern differed by gender. Among non-delinquents, running away was not significant for either gender, although loud and rowdy in public was significant for both males and females. The other status offenses did show a gender difference. Smoking was significantly related for females, but not for males, while alcohol use was related for males, but not for females. Therefore, like the results of Table 7, model 3 in the whole sample regression, the findings of the non-delinquent sample conclude, although a large part of the explanation for the status offense and adult criminality explanation is the juvenile's delinquent history, some status offenses continue to be significant while controlling for reported delinquent behavior. For this reason, Hypothesis III was supported.

One status offense, being loud and rowdy in a public place, is significantly related to adult offending for both genders (Table 9 model 2, see also Table 7). This significant relationship remains for both males and females even after socio-demographic variables and the variables of abuse and delinquency, as well as the other status offenses, are added to the model. The persistent significance of loud and rowdy in a public place for both genders is notable since

being loud and rowdy is usually a juvenile behavior performed in groups. Many studies have concluded spending time with peers who engage in delinquent behavior increases future delinquency through a variety of mechanisms (see Akers, 1997). Also, much of juvenile delinquent offending is committed in peer groups (Jensen & Rojek, 1998).

This peer effect is thought to be true of both males and females, although the importance of the delinquent peer association has been found to be a better predictor of male delinquency than female delinquency, and the mechanism of this effect may vary by gender (Jensen, 2003; Piquero et al., 2005). Possibly, the significant relationship of this status offense to future delinquency is because this behavior establishes a juvenile's contact with delinquent or status offending peer groups. And, once the juvenile's delinquent peer contacts are established, further delinquency results, and this behavior continues into adulthood. The possibility of developing delinquent peer contacts through status offending, and the deleterious results of these relationships, requires further inquiry.

As mentioned above, loud and rowdy was the only status offense that was persistently and significantly related to other offending throughout the analyses for both genders. For two of the status offenses, alcohol and smoking, the significant status offense pattern differed by gender. Why a status offense is related to adult offending for one gender but not the other is interesting for two reasons: First, this may indicate certain types of status offenses increase later offending only for one gender, through unique gender-specific criminogenic pathways. For example, alcohol use may place only males in contact with delinquent peers, while smoking does the same for females. Second, the gender difference may indicate male and female juveniles with the same adult offending risk factors choose to express deviance through one form of status offense over another. This would happen because boys and girls are socialized into gender appropriate self-identities (DeCoster, 2003). And although the causes of delinquency are the same for both genders, the deviance is channeled into gender-specific status offenses for those juveniles with delinquent offending risk factors (DeCoster, 2003). In sum, while the causes of status offending may be the same for males and females, the specific status offense is shaped by the adolescent's perceived gender role; alcohol use for boys and smoking for girls.

Previous literature on gender patterns in general delinquency concludes boys and girls learn the appropriate definition of delinquency for their gender the same way girls and boys learn other information about their gender role (DeCoster, 2003). In the explanation of status offense

patterns, while both genders would experience the same motivations for deviance, girls would learn the gender appropriate status offense for their gender is smoking, while boys would choose alcohol. The findings of this study indicate this gender appropriate self-identity explanation may be useful in the explanation of gendered status offenses patterns as well delinquent offending.

The next issue to be addressed by this research was the role of the juvenile justice system contact in the relationship between status offending as a juvenile and later delinquent and adult offending. Several researchers have indicated juvenile justice system contact, both formal and informal, can have long-term effects on the deviance patterns of juveniles. In addition, some juvenile delinquency literature has been critical of the differential treatment girls have received in the juvenile justice system, both from informal justice system contact and formal court processing (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001). Furthermore, research indicates female status offenders, and especially runaways, are particularly vulnerable to the negative effects of informal and formal justice system contact (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Therefore, the effect of both formal and informal justice system contact on the subsequent delinquency of status offenders is an important topic in the study of girls and status offending.

There are no studies on how juvenile justice system contact affects the deviance patterns of status offenders. However, employing the theoretical frameworks of labeling theory and deterrence theory may be useful in understanding the relationship between justice system contact and later offending. As mentioned earlier in this dissertation, some criminologists view justice system contact as reducing further deviance among status offenders, by deterring further offending (see Akers, 1997; Jensen & Roject, 1998). In contrast to this deterrence perspective, others view justice system contact as increasing further delinquency either through labeling or contact with delinquent peers (see Akers, 1997; Schur, 1973). Both the deterrence and labeling perspective have received support in the delinquency literature. In either case, the relationship between status offenses, the juvenile justice system and future deviance is important to girls since, as mentioned above, girls charged with status offenses are often more harshly processed and treated than boys once in the justice system (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004).

To explore how juvenile justice system contact affects the future offending of status offenders, there were three juvenile justice system variables included in this analysis; juvenile contact, juvenile custody, and juvenile conviction. The first variable, juvenile contact, asked if

the respondent was ever stopped and questioned by justice system officials, other than a traffic violation. Among respondents in both the whole sample as well as the non-delinquent only sample, this variable was significantly and positively related to adult offending. Furthermore, including this variable into the models did not affect the significance or direction of the status offending variables. One possible explanation for this relationship is because this variable serves as another indirect measure of contact with delinquent peers. Juveniles who are stopped and questioned may be more likely to have been in a group with other juveniles, who may have been delinquent and were questioned by police about their activities. Again, this contact with delinquent peers facilitates later forms of deviance.

The next juvenile justice system contact included in the model was juvenile justice system custody, and asked the respondent if he or she had ever been arrested or taken into police custody, not simply stopped, detained or questioned. This juvenile custody variable was added in the logistic regression predicting adult criminal behavior in the non-delinquent sample. This variable was significantly related to adult offending for boys even when juvenile contact was included in the model, but this relationship did not hold for girls. None of the status offending variables were significantly changed by including juvenile custody in the model for either gender. The gender difference in the juvenile custody variable indicates girls and boys experience deleterious effects from informal justice system contact, and boys experience further negative consequences from formal justice system processing.

The final juvenile justice system contact variable included in the analyses was juvenile conviction. This variable was constructed from the respondents' report of a conviction or guilty plea in juvenile court. When included in the model, juvenile conviction had a significant, positive relationship to adult offending for both males and females. The other variables in the model were not changed for either gender. The role of the juvenile justice system on female status offending is important since research concludes girls are more likely to have justice system contact than boys for status offending (Chesney-Lind, 2001b; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998). And, once in the justice system, many researchers have argued girls are treated differently in the justice system than boys, although several researchers disagree on whether or not this differential treatment is more favorable and lenient (paternalistic) or harsher for their gender (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998). This finding

supports previous research concluding girls' experience with the justice system has negative, long-term effects. However, this relationship is true for boys as well.

Of course, previous research on the experience of girls in the juvenile justice system also concludes the experience and effects of the justice system are very different for girls of color than not only boys of color, but also Caucasian girls (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Interestingly, in this dissertation, among non-delinquents when justice system contact is included in the model, race becomes significant for girls. Although prior research is limited on race and status offenses, African American girls report being stopped and question for curfew violations more frequently than other demographic groups (Brunson & Miller, 2006), and females of color are more likely to undergo formal justice processing than Caucasian girls for status offenses (Gilbert, 2001). And once processed, girls of color are more likely than white girls to be institutionalized (Chesney-Lind, 2001b). The findings of this study add support to the prior studies that conclude girls of color have a different experience with the justice system than Caucasian girls.

Hypothesis IV stated: Status offenders with juvenile justice system contact would have higher rates of adult offending than status offenders who do not have juvenile justice system contact. Hypothesis IV was supported. The general conclusion from the above analyses is justice system contact, both formal and informal, increases adult criminal activities. This is true for both males and females, and highlights the unique experiences of girls of color. As mentioned above, there is no literature on juvenile justice system contact and status offending specifically. This finding was expected, however, since there is a large body of research on delinquent offenders which indicates contact with the juvenile justice system has negative consequences on future offending patterns. The findings of this dissertation indicate the negative effects of juvenile justice system contact apply to status offenders as well as delinquent offenders.

As mentioned throughout the dissertation, previous literature on status offending, running away and delinquency indicates abuse is a major issue in the lives of female offenders, and there is a clear link between victimization and delinquency (Chesney-Lind, 2001; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). For this reason, Hypothesis V was necessary for a thorough examination of status offending and girls. Hypothesis V stated: Abused runaways will have significantly higher rates of deviance than non-abused runaways, both as juveniles and adults. A dichotomized

abused variable was constructed to explore the interaction of abuse with status offenses and delinquency. Approximately 30% of respondents reported at least one sexual and/or physical abuse episode by a parent or parental figure. While this number is shocking, this percentage is not inconsistent with the abuse rates found in other recent research (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006).

To discover the relationship between abuse and deviant behavior as both a juvenile and adult, bivariate associations between abuse and status and delinquent offenses, as well as adult offenses were examined. The bivariate relationship between abuse and almost all types of juvenile and adult offending was positive and significant. This finding is in agreement with previous literature on status offenses indicating abuse plays a significant role in the lives of female status and delinquent offenders, specifically runaways, as well as female adult offenders. While little research has focused on the role of abuse in the lives of male status offenders and delinquents, the findings of this dissertation indicate abuse is detrimental in the lives of male offenders as well. Therefore, although in previous literature the abuse to offending relationship has focused on females, this victimization to offender relationship may be as productive in explaining male offending as female offending.

There does appear to be a unique relationship between running away and adult offending for abused girls. This supports the work of several researchers who conclude many runaway episodes are actually indicators of abused girls, and running away is a status offense particularly prevalent among abused girls (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1996). In the logistic regression (Table 5) predicting adult criminal behavior, including the abuse variable in the model eliminates the significant relationship between adult offending and running away for females, while the other status offenses remain significant. The relationship between abuse and running away is further examined in a prevalence table comparing the effects of abuse on delinquent offending among runaways. In Table11a, abuse did not significantly increase the juvenile deviance rates among runaways; on the other hand, abuse did significantly increase the offending among non-runaways. One possible explanation for this lack of significant relationship is the negative consequences of abuse supersede the negative consequences of running away, and therefore running away does not have an additional deleterious effect. In sum, however, this research supports prior research indicating the running away and abuse connection requires further examination.

Table 11b provided similar abuse and offending descriptive statistics with adult offending behavior instead of juvenile behavior. Unlike the findings of juvenile behavior, runaways who experienced abuse as a juvenile reported significantly higher offending rates as adults than runaways who did not experience abuse. This indicates abuse experienced early in life has long-term negative effects on both runaways and non-runaways; and as predicted by previous literature, increases offending as an adult. This finding is in support of other research which has found female adult offenders have higher rates of abuse in early childhood than non-abused adults (Widom, 1989a). The findings of this research concluded that while abuse does increase offending rates among juvenile non-runaways, the offending rates of abused runaway are not significantly higher than non-abused runaways as juveniles. However, there is a significant increase in offending among abused runaways as an adult. Hypothesis V stated: Abused runaways will have significantly higher rates of deviance than non-abused runaways, both as juveniles and adults. Overall, the findings of this research indicate the relationship between running away and abuse is unique and requires further inquiry. Hypothesis V was partially supported.

Summary of Power-Control Findings

The second objective of this dissertation was to evaluate the applicability of a feminist delinquency theory to explain status offending for both males and females. To date there is limited literature on the relationship between a juvenile's household structure and status offenses, or the family dynamics that increase juveniles' status offending behavior. For this reason, little is known about the factors that both protect and facilitate status offending, or if the factors related to status offending are the same factors related to delinquent offending. Furthermore, Power-Control Theory had never been tested using a dependent variable of exclusively status offenses, although because the theory was formulated specifically for adolescent common delinquency and with an appreciation of female offenders, the theory should be well suited to explaining status offending. Therefore, a series of analyses explored the usefulness of the Power-Control Theory in explaining status offending behavior among male and female juveniles, and in doing so, highlighted those variables related to status offending.

The first analysis was a bivariate relationship between the individual status offenses and gender for the three household category groups as instructed by Power-Control Theory (Table

10). Overall, gender was not related to status offending in any of the three household categories. As expected, delinquency was indeed significantly related to gender in all household categories, with girls reporting lower offending rates in every group. However, the largest bivariate relationship between gender and delinquency was in the balance command household, a finding opposite the predictions of Power-Control Theory. In addition, while this finding is not supportive of Power-Control Theory, this result is in agreement with previous literature testing Power-Control Theory, as several studies conclude balanced command class families actually have the largest, not the smallest, gender gap in delinquent offending (Avakame, 1997; Leiber & Wacker, 1997; Singer & Levine, 1988; Uggen, 2000).

The bivariate correlations of two variables related to the explanation of Power-Control Theory, taste for risk and parental control, were also examined by household category. The variable taste for risk was significantly related to gender, and in the expected direction, with boys reporting higher levels of favorable risk taking attitudes than girls. This is in agreement with Power-Control Theory, as well as previous literature on risk-taking attitudes and gender which concludes some of males' higher offending rates are explained by males' risk taking attitudes (Singer & Levine, 1988). The variable measuring parental control was not significantly related to gender for any of the household categories. This was unexpected, since many delinquency theories rely on the general assumption girls are the recipients of greater parental control than boys, and this leads to girls' lower rates of offending (Hill & Atkinson, 1988; Jensen & Eve, 1976). Because of this unexpected finding, further exploration into the gender and parental control relationship was warranted.

One possible explanation for the unexpected absence of a gender and parental control relationship in Add Health data is generational. This data set is more recent than other data sets which have found a gender difference in parental control. Currently, daughters and sons may be experiencing more gender-neutral upbringing than in previous years. Possibly, the assumptions about daughters being the recipients of greater parental control than sons may be out of date for the study of gender and delinquency in the future.

Another possible explanation for the absence of a gender and parental control relationship found in prior delinquency research is a narrow definition of parental control and supervision in previous studies. Using this data set, bivariate correlations between gender and the seven individual parental control questions comprising the parental control scale were presented in

Table 12. The only individual parental control variable where boys were given more autonomy than girls was deciding their own curfews for the patriarchal and balance obey household categories. This finding is in agreement with previous research on parental control and adolescent autonomy, which indicates girls have less autonomy in choosing curfews than boys (Hill & Atkinson, 1988). In addition, this household category finding would be expected by Power-Control Theory, as girls and boys are governed more equally with regard to curfew regulations in the command balance households.

The other individual parental control variables either showed no gender difference, or a gender difference indicating girls had more autonomy than boys. Often, past studies operationalized total parental control with only a single variable measuring curfew regulations, a variable that does have a significant gender difference in two of the household categories in this data set. Because curfew limits are one area where traditionally girls are given less autonomy than boys, reliance on curfew standards as an indication of parental control may bias the gender and adolescent autonomy relationship in delinquency studies.

While less academic attention has been directed at comparing the adolescent autonomy levels of girls and boys, research has concluded the types and amounts of familial control differs by gender (Seydlitz, 1991). Girls are more often the objects of maternal support and curfew regulations, while boys more often experience personal appearance rules (Hill & Atkinson, 1988). The absence of a significant gender and overall parental control relationship indicates future gender and delinquency research should adopt a more gender comprehensive view of parental control and supervision. This broader measure of parental control would include a variety of measures of adolescent autonomy and responsibility, for example unsupervised internet access. A more gender appreciative and comprehensive measure of parental control would appreciate the many ways in which daughters, who may be seen as more responsible by their parents than sons, are given more autonomy in their daily lives.

Returning to the analyses, the first logistic regression evaluated Power-Control Theory using reported delinquency as the dependent variable. As predicted by previous literature, gender was negatively related to delinquency for all household categories. However, contrary to the predictions of Power-Control Theory, the largest gender relationship was in the balance command household category, not the patriarchal household category. Power-Control Theory would predict the smallest gender relationship to be in the balance command category. The next

variable added to the model was parental control. Unexpectedly, parental control was not significantly related to delinquency for any of the household categories. (As mentioned earlier, because of the lack of gender difference in the parental control scale variable, the individual curfew variable was used in place of the parental scale control variable. There were no notable differences in any of the models when the individual curfew variable was used.) In contrast to the previous literature, parental control as defined by the scale variable constructed from this data set does not have a significant relationship with either gender delinquency. The final variable in the Power-Control model, taste for risk, was significantly related to delinquency for all household categories and in the predicted direction.

Since part of the purpose of this dissertation was to explore the usefulness of delinquency theories to explain status offending, the above analysis was repeated using status offending as the dependent variable. Because life-course studies conclude those individuals who commit one form of deviance are more likely to commit other types of offending, the same variable related to delinquent offending should be related to status offending. As predicted from the relationship found in the bivariate relationships, there is no relationship between gender and status offending for two of the household categories, patriarchal and balance obey. There was a significant relationship between gender and status offenses in the balance command category, with girls less likely offend than boys. This gender and status offense relationship in the balance command category is contrary to the predictions of Power-Control Theory, which would predict the smallest gender relationship would be in the balance command households.

Unlike the logistic regression using delinquency as the dependent variable, the variable of parental control is significantly, negatively related to status offending in all household categories. This finding indicates a difference in the effects of adolescent autonomy on status offending than delinquent offending in this data sample. The variable taste for risk was significant and positive for all household types. This finding is similar to the results of the delinquency logistic regression, and follows the predictions of Power-Control Theory. Including taste for risk in the model changed the significance of the gender variable for all household categories. For two categories, patriarchal and balance obey family structure, gender becomes significant. For the balance command households, gender is no longer significant. This indicates there is a unique relationship between taste for risk attitudes and gender in status offending not present in the delinquency model. In addition, since risk taking attitudes were significantly, positively related

to status offending and interacted with gender in all of the household categories, further research in the explanation of female status offending should include analysis on how gender socialization into risk taking attitudes affects the occurrence and form of status offending.

Hypothesis VI was included in this dissertation to evaluate the utility of Power-Control Theory in explaining status offending. Hypothesis VI stated: Power Control theory is an adequate feminist general theory of delinquency able to explain status offending behavior. There should be a smaller gender gap in offending in balance command households than in patriarchal households. Overall, the findings of this dissertation failed to support Hypothesis VI. However, there were some interesting relationships uncovered by analyses using Power-Control Theory, and these factors are useful in further study and explanation of status offending.

For example, levels of parental control, as well as socialization into risk taking attitudes, are significant predictors of status offending and these relationships are mediated by gender. Parental control did decrease the prevalence of status offending; indicating juveniles without adequate supervision may be at increased risk for this form of deviance. This finding is in agreement with past research on parental control and supervision and running away (Wells & Rankin, 1991). In addition, favorable attitudes toward risk taking are also positively related to status offending, and while there is no literature on risk taking and status offending, there is prior research indicating risk taking attitudes are related to juvenile delinquency (Singer & Levine, 1988). The findings of this logistic regression, while not supportive of Power-Control Theory indicate some of the aspects of the theory do have significance and utility in the explanation of status offending, and can be useful for further exploration.

However, many other factors in the lives of females, and especially female status offenders, are absent. Feminist criminologists argue that to adequately understand female offending; a feminist delinquency theory must not only appreciate patriarchy as central to the causes of delinquency, but also appreciate the differences in the experiences and realities of girls' lives (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006). As indicated by the positive relationship between abuse and status offending, abuse is an example of an important occurrence in the lives of deviant girls. However, although the majority of literature on status offending, delinquency and abuse focuses on female juveniles, this research as well as others (see Belknap & Holsinger, 2006), indicates abuse is also a major factor in the lives of deviant males. And, this abuse has significant deleterious consequences for male adolescent deviance as well.

Power-Control theory fails to acknowledge the relationship between juveniles and parents is often tainted with abuse. Therefore, as feminist researchers would criticize, Power-Control theory is not sensitive to the realities of girls' lives. But because some of the variables in Power-Control Theory, such as risk taking attitudes and parental control, are related to status offending, the explanatory variables used in Power-Control Theory were tested on a split sample of abused and non-abused juveniles to see if the explanatory abilities are influenced by abuse history. The dependent variables of status offending and delinquent offending were examined to discover any difference in the gender interaction of these variables.

The results of these analyses show gender has a different relationship to the dependent variables for abused and non-abused groups when taste for risk was included in the model. This indicates delinquency among abused girls is largely explained by their socialized taste for risk. Similarly, when controlling for risk taking attitudes, gender becomes positive for status offenses. In sum, risk taking attitudes increase both status and delinquent offending for abused girls. Further research should examine if experiencing abuse early in life increases risk taking attitudes, and how this might affect offending patterns.

Summary of Research Contributions

While little research has studied status offending and the relationship between status offending such as running away and other types of deviance, these offenses are an appropriate area of deviance to evaluate the usefulness of gender delinquency theory. Status offending, and especially running away, is one of the few areas of deviance where females are substantially represented, in contrast to other areas of deviance where there are proportionately fewer females to study. Furthermore, because of females' proportionally higher rates of running away, and the unique and controversial role this offense has in girls' deviance, status offending is particularly important in the study of girls' offending. The purpose of this dissertation was to contribute to the academic literature on running away and other types of status offending, and in doing so, evaluate the ability of traditionally-based delinquency theories formulated with the intention of explaining male delinquency, to explain girls' status offending. The results of the conducted analyses provide three main contributions to the literature in this area, and are described below.

First, the results of this dissertation indicate much of the information prior research has provided on delinquent behavior is applicable to status behavior. Little research has examined

any explanatory factors of status offending; however, the findings of this dissertation conclude the correlates related to status offending are similar to those factors previous literature has uncovered about delinquent offending. This dissertation concludes the causes and consequences of running away and other types of status offending are not distinctly different from delinquent offending, and much of the literature on delinquent offending is applicable to the status offending of boys and girls. For example, theoretical elements such as parental control and supervision, and taste for risk, which have received previous support in delinquency literature, are also relevant and significant to an explanation of the causes of status offending.

Furthermore, as found in the literature on female delinquent and adult offenders, abuse is a frequent factor in the history of status offenders for both males and females. In addition, factors related to liberation-type explanations, such as maternal employment, which have received limited support in delinquency explanations, are not supported in an explanation of status offending, either. Also, the results of this dissertation indicate status offending behavior, like delinquent behavior, is prevalent and common among the juvenile population. And, like most juvenile behavior, much of status offending is committed in juvenile peer groups. Therefore, as in delinquent offending, a juvenile's peers play a possible role in status offending in both the onset of status offending behavior, and in the escalation from status offending into delinquent behavior. Finally, although the prevalence of status offending is high among the juvenile population, as is true for the majority of delinquent juveniles, many status offenders in both gender groups desist from deviant activities with age.

In sum, this paper provides information on what was unclear about the relationship between status offending and subsequent delinquent behavior. Prior literature on the role of status offending in subsequent deviance was not conclusive: Some theorists believed status offenders, and particularly female status offenders, do not commit other forms of deviance, while other evidence found a relationship between the two types of offending. This dissertation found a positive relationship between running away and other forms of delinquency and drug use, both concurrently and in subsequent years. Overall, this finding was true for both males and females, and both abused and non-abused juveniles. As in delinquent offending, where prior deviance is a strong predictor of future deviance, juveniles who commit any form of deviant act, even running away, are at increase risk for further offending. This indicates status offenders, and female runaways, do participate in other forms of deviance, both as juveniles and adults. Therefore, the

consequences of status offending are often similar to the results of delinquent offending; future deviance, as the best predictor of future delinquency is past deviant behavior (Akers, 1997). This reduces support for the status offense-limited hypothesis of female runaways offered by previous literature.

What does the above finding indicate about the need for separate theories of deviance and delinquency by gender? Because of the generally positive relationship between status offenses and other forms of deviance for both genders, a relationship that remains when other, possibly spurious relationships are included, one can assume the social processes that escalate status offenders may be the same for males and females. The status offense of loud and rowdy in a public place for example, was significant for both genders even when other variables were included in the model. If this activity put juveniles in contact with delinquent peers, and peers are a method of escalation, the mechanisms from status offending to delinquency are the same for both genders. Similarly, abuse increases both types of offending for males and females, possibly by increasing risk-taking attitudes.

The evidence presented in the previous paragraph supports a general theory of delinquency perspective, and questions the need for separate theories of delinquency for males and females. However, some gender differences were also uncovered by analysis in this dissertation. For example, there were areas of gender difference indicating a different deviance process: For example, among non-delinquents, alcohol remained a significant predictor of adult offending when other variables were included, while alcohol was never significant for females in this group. The fact that some individual status offenses are not an important predictor of future offending for one gender, while significant for the other, suggests developing separate explanations by gender would be productive in explaining gender variation in life-course offending.

The second contribution of this study involves the role of abuse in an explanation of male and female deviance. As in delinquent offending, the results of this dissertation conclude abuse is a major factor in the lives of status offenders, and adds to the literature indicating abuse increases deviant offending among female juveniles (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Goodkind, Ng & Sarri, 2006; Heck & Walsh, 2000). Unfortunately, although traditional theories of delinquency have focused on parental efficacy and parental attachment in preventing the delinquency of juveniles, these same theories have largely ignored the reality of abuse in

juveniles' lives. Because of this oversight, current delinquency theories may not be capable of explaining the abuse and deviance relationship among juveniles (Rebellon & Van Gundy, 2005). An effective theory of status offending sensitive to the needs of female juveniles needs to appreciate abuse in the lives of girls, and boys.

As mentioned throughout this dissertation, much of the criticism of using traditional delinquency theories in the explanation of female offending surrounds the absence of an appreciation of abuse in the lives of girls. And, theories that do not appreciate abuse as a reality of girls' lives, and the relationship the abuse experience has to subsequent offending, are not adequate explanations. This study supports the conclusion of other studies on female delinquency (see Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004), that abuse plays a larger role in the offending of females than males, although the results of this dissertation indicate abuse plays a significant part in the deviance of males as well. Often in delinquency literature, sexual abuse is seen as an experience unique to girls. However, prevalence analyses of this data set indicate rates of sexual abuse among male juveniles is almost as high as among female respondents, and the rates of physical abuse for males is higher than for females.

The high prevalence of abuse in the lives of both males and females, and the positive relationship between abuse and offending for both males and females, indicates traditional theories that do not appreciate the role of abuse in juvenile offending are not sufficient for the explanation of male status offending, either. Understanding the victimization to offending pathway is necessary not only for an adequate theory of female offending, but also for an adequate explanation of male offending. Often, studies examining the role of sexual abuse in the delinquent offending of juveniles and adults have been limited to female respondents. Limiting further criminological research on abuse and delinquency to only the deviance of females ignores a reality in which males are also abused and experience the deleterious and criminogenic consequences of that experience.

Third, this dissertation adds further evidence liberation based theories are inadequate in the study of female offending. Another of the objectives of this dissertation was to uncover explanatory variables useful in an understanding of female status offending. Related to this goal, a discussion of the factors which have not received support and should not be included in an adequate theory of female offending is important; for uncovering what is unrelated to an adequate feminist theory of delinquency is as valuable as what is necessary. As mentioned

previously, while abuse has not been a focus of delinquency theories, issues such as household class, gender oppression and economic structure have been a focus of girls and delinquency theory research. Power-Control Theory is an example of a delinquency theory grounded in the delinquency perspective of liberation theory explanations. However, analyses of this dissertation, as well as other research testing liberation-type theories, concludes factors in the lives of girls beyond parents' occupational status are significant in explaining status offending.

Prior research has shown some factors of family dynamics and household structure matters in the explanation of juvenile deviance (Demuth & Brown, 2004). However, as found by this dissertation, Power-Control Theory is not an effective explanation of status offending, although several of the theory's variables were significantly related to both delinquent and status offending. What was not related to status offending for girls was the class or employment category of the juvenile respondents' mothers. In fact, girls in the balance command household category, where mothers are employed in higher earning occupations and have more education, reported lower status and delinquent offending rates than girls in the other household categories. Often, this lower offending rate was true for males as well. Furthermore, the high rates of abuse among status offenders of both genders question the belief these juveniles are empowered or liberated. The results of this dissertation add further evidence to the literature concluding economic oppression or liberation-based theories, such as Power-Control Theory, hold little utility in explaining female offending of any form (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Steffensmeier, 1980b; Steffensmeier & Steffensmeier, 1980).

However, the liberation hypothesis theme, believing that as girls and women become more "masculine" in terms of educational and economic gains, females' offending rates will also increase to be more "masculine" as well, remains prevalent in both academic criminology and popular media (Chesney-Lind, 2006). While the theory has received little support from the literature, the popularity of Power-Control remains in academic criminology. The resilience of liberation-based explanations is curious since, as mentioned above, liberation type theories receive little support from the literature. However, the popularity of this hypothesis may be due to the appeal of a simple, parsimonious explanation for female offending: This idea allows for researchers to simply ignore gender and utilize the "add women and stir" explanation of crime, since females offend for the same reason as males, and deviant females are simply more masculine than non-deviant females (Chesney-Lind, 2006).

Unfortunately, the liberation explanation has also become embedded in the popular media (Chesney-Lind, 2006). Despite the fact self-report data show girls' rates of violence and offending are not increasing or becoming more "masculine", and are in fact declining (Chesney-Lind, 2006; Steffensemeier, Schwartz, Zhong & Akerman, 2005), the popular media continues to report there is an emerging crisis of a new violent girl offenders. Underlying these reports are liberation or emancipation type explanations, finding feminism encourages girls to become "equals" with boys in all areas, from the soccer field to violence and delinquency (Chesney-Lind, 2006). For example, a recent best selling popular book, *See Jane Hit: Why Girls are Growing More Violent and What We Can Do about It*, by Loyola University Professor James Garbarino (2006), attributes the 'dramatic increase' in girls' offending to new opportunities for girls in education and participation in sports such as martial arts.

In conclusion, while much of the causes and consequences of status offending appear to be similar to delinquent offending, current deviance theory does not provide a comprehensive explanation for female status offending, although status offending is a necessary area of study for a thorough understanding of girls' deviance. Traditional delinquency theories are based on narrow assumptions about male delinquents, and while aspects of these theories may apply to girls, many of the underlying assumptions are sexist and irrelevant. In addition, since the gender pattern in status offending is more similar than other forms of offending, this area of juvenile deviance should be more amenable to gender inclusive explanations. The causes of status offending may be similar for boys and girls; abuse, family relationships, peer contacts. Yet, while the correlates may be the same for both males and females, these events and the subsequent delinquent outcomes take on a unique aspect because of girls' gender role in society. Furthermore, factors, such as abuse, which are currently viewed as only unique and relevant for females may also be useful in the explanation of male offending as well.

The relationship between gender and juvenile offending is complicated: The pattern of offending between boys and girls is both remarkably different and remarkably similar, and both the gender similarities and differences are relevant to an effective explanation of status offending. An effective explanation of gender and status offending should recognize the known and proven correlates of offending for both genders, and incorporate rather than ignore gender. This explanation would involve useful and proven factors from traditional delinquency theory, and at the same time be sensitive to the reality of girls' lives, and eliminating traditional and

outdated assumptions about gender and offending which have consistently failed to received support. Since, as Chesney-Lind and Pasko (2004) conclude, in status offending as in life generally, gender matters.

Study Limitations and Policy Implications

Of course, the results of this study need to be evaluated with the appreciation of several limitations of both the data set and the analysis. First, as with most longitudinal analysis, this study is limited by the problem of sample attrition. It is unclear if those individuals who drop from the panels are different from those individuals who continue to be included. Furthermore, most of the offending questioned asked about the respondent's behavior in the "past 12 months". There are periods of time between Wave II and Wave III, as well as the period of time before the study began, where the respondents' behavior is not recorded. Offending episodes in these periods of time would be of significance. For example, delinquent offenses committed by a respondent either several years before or several years after the interviews would not be included, and this respondent would be classified as a non-delinquent even though he or she has committed delinquent offenses. This of course, would affect the conclusions of this dissertation.

In addition, the data in this study utilizes self-report questionnaires. By definition, this method of data collection relies on the respondent to honestly and accurately report his or her behavior. Previous research indicates juveniles generally report honest and accurate accounts of their behavior, although the underreporting of deviant acts may occur more often in certain race and gender demographic groups than others (Hindelang, Hirschi & Weis, 1981). If the respondent omits or invents certain acts due to poor memory or a variety of other reasons, the respondent's data will not be accurate. These inaccuracies will also affect this dissertation's conclusions.

The above conclusions have obvious policy implications for those individuals working with runaways, status offenders and other juveniles in the social service and justice systems. The findings of this study indicate runaways, and even those status offenders without delinquent histories, are at higher risk of future delinquency and adult offending, as well as health consequences from long-term substance abuse. In addition, some specific status offenses have a significant relationship to adult offending for males or females, but not necessarily both genders. The most notable example of this in the above analysis is alcohol use for males, and smoking for

females. And, running away appears to be a particularly salient issue for abused girls. Based on this and other findings, officials working with the juvenile population may want to orient their programs to meet the unique needs of specific groups; exclusively status offenders to prevent delinquency, and males and females individually.

Furthermore, as the positive relationship between abuse and status offenses indicates, the home life and past family histories of status offenders should be investigate for abuse. Likewise, abused juveniles should be monitored for future status offending behavior. Identifying these juveniles by gender and individual status offense early may provide early indication of which juveniles are most at risk for further offending, and targeting those juveniles most likely to have further deviant behaviors would make prevention programs most effective. Like the application of male-based delinquency theories to girls' offending, justice system responses formulated on the needs of male offenders cannot simply be applied to female offenders (Sharp, 2006). Because of differences in the past histories and risk factors of male and female offenders, juvenile correctional programs designed for delinquency boys may provide some support for female status offenders' needs, but will ignore other important aspects.

Suggestions for Future Research

In these final paragraphs, I present my suggestions for future research. As mentioned several times in this dissertation, status offenses have been ignored in juvenile delinquency research, although these offenses are prevalent among adolescents of both genders. Considering the behavior's prevalence and potential negative effects, for this reason alone, more research is needed. Research replicating the findings of this dissertation using other data sets and other measures of offending is necessary. But there are several other specific areas where more exploration would be most useful and go beyond the findings of this paper.

This dissertation examined the relationship between status offending and further deviant behavior, and uncovered a link between running away and later deviance. Yet, there are still many facets of status offending to be examined. Further exploration of the pathways from status offending to delinquency and crime by gender is necessary to understand the exact relationship of status offending to crime. For example, although a possible reason for the running away and delinquency connection is low-self-control (see Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), another possible pathway from status offenses criminal offending is contact with delinquent peers. This is very

probable since, as explained above, juvenile status offenses, particularly loud and rowdy in public places, are often committed in groups. Identifying the pathways of escalation would provide information to facilitate the prevention of status to delinquent offending for juveniles.

Furthermore, although this study concludes status offenders do escalate to delinquency and crime, most status offenders, like most delinquent offenders desist from deviant activities and do not continue a delinquent or deviant life-course into adulthood. What makes status offense-limited offenders different from those who continue to engage in offending and escalate to other forms of deviance is not clear. In addition, if pathways of escalation or the persistence of deviant careers differ by gender, it follows that the reasons for desistance from deviance may vary by gender as well (Giordano et al, 2002; Uggen & Kruttschnitt, 1998). More research should study the protective factors significant to both preventing status offenders from escalating into criminal offending, as well as preventing the onset of status offending behavior among both juvenile gender groups in early adolescence.

In addition, like all females in criminology, the delinquency and juvenile justice experience of girls of color has been overlooked (Chesney-Lind, 2001b; Gilbert, 2001; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998; Mack & Lieber, 2005). Just as females experience society very differently than males; girls of color have different experiences than their white counterparts in the justice system, although some studies indicate minority girls may be treated more leniently (Guevara, Herz & Spohn, 2006). Little is known about how traditional delinquency theories apply across racial groups, especially when gender is also involved (Mack & Lieber, 2005). Research has indicated girls of color have significantly lower rates of status offending than Caucasian girls, a finding supported by this dissertation, although minority girls' rates of delinquent offending are often higher. Therefore, further examination of the relationship between race and status offending would add to the literature on both status offending and girls of color, and perhaps highlight protective factors which decrease status offending.

In sum, the findings of this dissertation draw attention to several areas in the study of juvenile delinquency requiring further academic study. First, similar to the conclusions of most studies on females and delinquency, this dissertation finds there is more work to be done on the study of girls and status offending. In addition, because of the discovered link between running away and future deviance for both genders, status offending is an important area for future research in juvenile delinquency, and cannot continue to be ignored in deviance literature.

Furthermore, because of the large proportion of female offenders in status offending, effective studies and theories of female deviance need to be sensitive to the issues of female status offenders. These effective studies and theories need to appreciate the realities of girls' lives, such as their abuse experiences, and desist from liberation theory based explanations which have consistently failed to receive support in the literature.

Table 1a: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Delinquent and Status Offenses: Whole Sample (Wave I)

	Males n=10163		Females n=10406		M:F
	Prev	(Freq)	Prev	(Freq)	Ratio
Delinquency:					
Shoplift	28	(1.62)	22**	(1.55)**	1.27
Steal < $50	24	(1.63)	17**	(1.59)	1.43
Steal > $50	8	(1.54)	4**	(1.42)	2.05
Burglar	7	(1.45)	3**	(1.45)	2.28
Use weapon	6	(1.41)	3**	(1.33)	2.19
Sell drugs	11	(1.95)	5**	(1.68)**	2.25
Graffiti	12	(1.56)	7**	(1.37)**	1.66
Damage prop	24	(1.40)	12**	(1.22)**	2.02
Steal car	12	(1.49)	9**	(1.35)**	1.38
Delinq scale	49	(2.69)	36**	(2.24)**	1.35
Status Offen:					
Runaway	7	(1.30)	10**	(1.33)	.72
Loud/rowdy	48	(1.52)	48	(1.45)**	1.00
Truancy	34	(1.97)	28**	(1.92)	1.20
Smoke cig	20	(1.63)	20	(1.59)	1.02
Alcohol	47	(1.52)	46**	(1.38)**	1.02
Status Scale	75	(2.24)	73**	(2.19)	1.03
Drug Use:					
Marijuana	16	(2.11)	13**	(1.96)**	1.31
Cocaine	2	(1.64)	1**	(1.62)**	1.60
Inhale	2	(1.69)	1	(1.56)	1.31
Other drugs	5	(2.00)	3**	(1.61)	1.35
Drug Scale	17	(1.37)	14**	(1.31)	1.26

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 1b: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Delinquent and Status Offenses: Non-Runaways Sample (Wave I)

	Males n=9407		Females n=9354		M:F
	Prev	(Freq)	Prev	(Freq)	Ratio
Delinquency:					
Shoplift	25	(1.58)	19**	(1.51)**	1.33
Steal < $50	22	(1.60)	14**	(1.55)	1.53
Steal > $50	6	(1.47)	3**	(1.38)	2.31
Burglar	6	(1.39)	2**	(1.39)	2.65
Use weapon	5	(1.34)	2**	(1.25)	2.32
Sell drugs	9	(1.89)	3**	(1.60)**	2.80
Graffiti	10	(1.52)	6**	(1.32)**	1.66
Damage prop	22	(1.38)	10**	(1.17)**	2.13
Steal car	10	(1.42)	7**	(1.31)**	1.44
Delinq scale	45	(2.51)	32**	(2.10)**	1.43
Status Offen:					
Loud/rowdy	46	(1.49)	45	(1.39)**	1.03
Truancy	32	(1.93)	25**	(1.86)	1.25
Smoke cig	18	(1.59)	17**	(1.53)	1.09
Alcohol	46	(1.50)	44**	(1.35)**	1.05
Status Scale	73	(2.09)	71**	(1.95)**	1.04
Drug Use:					
Marijuana	15	(2.07)	10**	(1.88)**	1.43
Cocaine	1	(1.51)	<1**	(1.50)	1.89
Inhale	1	(1.59)	2	(1.46)	1.32
Other drugs	4	(1.96)	2**	(1.65)	1.60
Drug Scale	16	(1.32)	11**	(1.25)	1.37

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 1c: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Delinquent and Status Offenses: Runaways Only Sample (Wave I)

	Males n=756		Females n=1052		M:F
	Prev	(Freq)	Prev	(Freq)	Ratio
Delinquency:					
Shoplift	56	(1.84)	47**	(1.72)**	1.21
Steal < $50	48	(1.77)	38**	(1.74)	1.28
Steal > $50	29	(1.70)	14**	(1.50)	2.07
Burglar	24	(1.64)	11**	(1.57)	2.18
Use weapon	22	(1.61)	9**	(1.47)	2.42
Sell drugs	32	(2.16)	18**	(1.80)**	1.77
Graffiti	27	(1.70)	18**	(1.53)**	1.50
Damage prop	46	(1.58)	25**	(1.42)**	1.84
Steal car	40	(1.69)	25**	(1.45)**	1.63
Delinq scale	82	(3.93)	69**	(2.95)**	1.18
Status Offen:					
Loud/rowdy	65	(1.73)	69	(1.75)	.94
Truancy	56	(2.23)	54	(2.21)	1.04
Smoke cig	43	(1.91)	46	(1.86)	.93
Alcohol	65	(1.74)	71**	(1.56)**	.91
Status Scale	91	(3.68)	92	(3.07)	.98
Drug Use:					
Marijuana	36	(2.35)	32	(2.19)	1.13
Cocaine	7	(1.90)	4**	(1.78)	1.71
Inhale	7	(1.96)	4**	(1.77)	1.75
Other drugs	14	(2.00)	12	(2.12)	1.17
Drug Scale	37	(1.64)	34**	(1.47)	1.09

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 1d: Prevalence of Delinquent and Status Offenses: Runaways and Non-runaways (Wave I)

	Males			Females		
	Run%	No-run%	Ratio	Run%	No-run%	Ratio
Delinquency:						
Shoplift	56	25**	2.22	47	19**	2.47
Steal < $50	48	22**	2.21	38	14**	2.71
Steal > $50	29	6**	4.96	14	3**	5.51
Burglar	24	6**	4.08	11	2**	5.53
Use weapon	22	5**	4.41	9	2**	4.59
Sell drugs	32	9**	3.53	18	3**	5.63
Graffiti	27	10**	2.65	18	6**	3.08
Damage prop	46	22**	2.06	25	10**	2.38
Delinq scale	82	45**	1.80	69	32**	2.15
Status Offen:						
Loud/rowdy	65	46**	1.41	69	45**	1.53
Truancy	56	32**	1.76	54	25**	2.12
Smok cig	43	18**	2.37	46	17**	2.77
Alcohol	65	46**	1.41	71	44**	1.61
Status scale	91	73**	1.24	92	71**	1.30
Drug Use:						
Marijuana	36	15**	2.42	32	10**	3.26
Cocaine	7	1**	5.46	4	<1**	6.13
Inhale	7	1**	5.32	4	1**	3.97
Other drugs	14	4**	3.70	12	2**	4.99
Drug Scale	37	16**	2.41	34	11**	3.09

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 2a: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Delinquent and Status Offenses: Whole Sample (Wave II)

	Males n=7182		Females n=7556		M:F
	Prev	(Freq)	Prev	(Freq)	Ratio
Delinquency:					
Shoplift	20	(1.55)	18**	(1.55)	1.13
Steal < $50	18	(1.60)	13**	(1.61)	1.32
Steal > $50	6	(1.53)	3**	(1.51)	2.00
Burglar	5	(1.47)	3**	(1.46)	2.00
Use weapon	5	(1.42)	2**	(1.32)	2.36
Sell drugs	11	(1.97)	4**	(1.66)**	2.70
Graffiti	9	(1.50)	5**	(1.43)	1.80
Damage prop	18	(1.37)	9**	(1.22)**	2.06
Steal car	9	(1.39)	7**	(1.30)	1.34
Delinq scale	40	(2.55)	29**	(2.16)**	1.35
Status Offen:					
Runaway	5	(1.28)	7**	(1.29)	.69
Loud/rowdy	40	(1.52)	39	(1.40)**	1.02
Truancy	29	(1.91)	29	(1.82)	1.00
Smoke cig	32	(1.97)	31	(1.99)	1.04
Alcohol	48	(1.52)	46	(1.41)**	1.00
Status Scale	78	(1.97)	78	(1.98)	1.00
Drug Use:					
Marijuana	26	(2.42)	25**	(2.33)**	1.09
Cocaine	3	(1.85)	2**	(1.75)	1.19
Inhale	3	(1.75)	2	(1.73)	1.10
Other drugs	6	(2.06)	6	(1.92)	1.03
Drug Scale	28	(1.33)	27**	(1.33)	1.04

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 2b: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Delinquent and Status Offenses (Wave II): Non-runaway Sample (Wave I or Wave II)

	Males n=6777		Females n=6979		M:F
	Prev	(Freq)	Prev	(Freq)	Ratio
Delinquency:					
Shoplift	18	(1.52)	16**	(1.50)	1.16
Steal < $50	16	(1.57)	12**	(1.56)	1.38
Steal > $50	5	(1.50)	2**	(1.48)	2.13
Burglar	4	(1.43)	2**	(1.45)	2.21
Use weapon	4	(1.35)	1**	(1.17)	2.86
Sell drugs	10	(1.90)	3**	(1.59)**	3.26
Graffiti	8	(1.49)	4**	(1.43)	1.91
Damage prop	17	(1.35)	8**	(1.19)**	2.17
Steal car	8	(1.32)	5**	(1.25)	1.49
Delinq scale	38	(2.40)	27**	(2.01)**	1.42
Status Offen:					
Loud/rowdy	38	(1.49)	37	(1.37)**	1.02
Truancy	28	(1.90)	29	(1.79)**	1.00
Smoke cig	32	(1.95)	29	(1.79)**	1.09
Alcohol	46	(1.59)	45**	(1.37)**	1.03
Status Scale	77	(1.89)	75	(1.85)	1.03
Drug Use:					
Marijuana	26	(2.42)	23**	(2.28)**	1.15
Cocaine	2	(1.86)	2**	(1.73)	1.28
Inhale	4	(1.73)	3	(1.64)	.98
Other drugs	5	(2.05)	5	(1.87)	1.13
Drug Scale	27	(1.30)	24**	(1.28)	1.12

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 2c: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Delinquent and Status Offenses (Wave II): Runaway Sample (Wave I)

	Males n=405		Females n=577		M:F
	Prev	(Freq)	Prev	(Freq)	Ratio
Delinq:					
Shoplift	53	(1.70)	43**	(1.78)	1.23
Steal < $50	43	(1.77)	33**	(1.81)	1.30
Steal > $50	29	(1.58)	13**	(1.56)	2.26
Burglar	27	(1.57)	13**	(1.42)	2.12
Use weapon	25	(1.57)	11**	(1.54)	2.20
Sell drugs	32	(1.97)	18**	(1.80)	1.78
Graffiti	28	(1.57)	16**	(1.45)	1.81
Damage prp	43	(1.52)	22**	(1.33)	1.98
Steal car	39	(1.61)	23**	(1.43)	1.71
Delinq scale	82	(3.92)	66**	(2.91)*	1.24
Status Off:					
Loud/rowdy	65	(1.77)	64	(1.65)	1.02
Truancy	31	(2.06)	28	(1.97)	1.09
Smoke cig	53	(2.17)	58	(2.33)	.91
Alcohol	61	(1.78)	71**	(1.72)	.86
Status Scale	92	(3.11)	93	(3.26)	.99
Drug Use:					
Marijuana	48	(2.49)	53**	(2.58)	.90
Cocaine	10	(1.82)	9	(1.80)	1.22
Inhale	9	(1.86)	7	(1.97)	1.37
Other drugs	18	(2.11)	21	(2.05)	.88
Drug Scale	53	(1.62)	58	(1.55)	.92

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 2d: Prevalence of Delinquent and Status Offenses (Wave II): Runaways (Wave I) and Non-runaways (Wave I and Wave II)

	Males			Females		
	Run%	No-run%	Ratio	Run%	No-run%	Ratio
Delinquency:						
Shoplift	53	18**	2.94	43	16**	2.73
Steal < $50	43	16**	2.69	33	12**	2.81
Steal > $50	29	5**	5.80	13	2**	5.29
Burglar	27	4**	6.75	13	2**	6.79
Use weapon	25	4**	6.25	11	1**	8.14
Sell drugs	32	10**	3.20	18	3**	5.77
Graffiti	28	8**	3.50	16	4**	3.71
Damage prop	43	17**	2.53	22	8**	2.78
Steal car	39	8**	4.88	23	3**	4.34
Delinq scale	82	38**	2.16	66	27**	2.48
Status Offen:						
Loud/rowdy	65	38**	1.71	64	37**	1.71
Truancy	31	28**	1.11	28	28	1.02
Smoke cig	53	32**	1.66	58	29**	2.04
Alcohol	61	46**	1.33	71	46**	1.54
Status scale	92	77**	1.20	93	76**	1.24
Drug Use:						
Marijuana	48	26**	1.85	53	23**	2.34
Cocaine	10	2**	5.00	9	2**	4.72
Inhale	9	2**	4.50	7	2**	3.78
Other drugs	18	5**	3.61	21	5**	4.33
Drug Scale	53	27**	1.96	58	24**	2.38

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 3: Logistic Regression of Prevalence of Delinquent Behavior (Wave II) on Status Offenses and Abuse Variables (Wave I)

Model	1male	1female	2male	2female	3male	3female	4male	4female
Age	.033	-.046**	-.027	-.069**	-.146**	-.172**	-.125**	-.159**
Non-white	0	.191**	0	.198**	.286**	.459**	.280**	.431**
Runaway			1.34**	1.24**	.990**	.760**	1.042**	.717**
Loud/rowdy					.840**	.769**	.831**	.774**
Alcohol					.958**	.904**	.976**	.871**
Truancy					.624**	.551**	.574**	.531**
Smoke					.336**	.563**	.307**	.530**
Abuse							.333**	.355**
R2	0	0	.03	.05	.22	.22	.22	.22
X2	5.32	24.8**	230**	434**	1657**	1841**	1463**	1638**
Constant	-.783	.355	-.748	.707	1.68	1.59	1.13	1.24

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 4: Logistic Regressions of Prevalence of Self-reported Status Offenses (Wave II) on Gender, Runaway and Gender-by-Runaway

	n=20772		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Age	.249**	.245**	.245**
Non-white	-.355**	-.349**	-.348**
Gender	-.032	-.052	.060
Runaway		1.29**	1.17**
GenXrun			.286
R2	0	.07	.07
X2	428**	579**	568**
Constant	-2.56	-2.56	-2.56

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 5: Logistic Regressions of Prevalence of Self-reported Delinquent Behavior (Wave II) on Gender, Runaway and Gender-by-Runaway

	n=20772		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Age	0	0	0
Non-white	.045	.060	.060
Gender	-.504**	-.561**	-.571**
Runaway		1.63**	1.48**
GenXrun			.200
R2	.02	.07	.07
X2	170**	579**	581**
Constant	-.258	-.198	-.191

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 6a: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Crime, Drug Use and Criminal Justice System Contact (Wave III): Whole Sample (Wave I and Wave II)

	Males n=7206 Prev	(Freq)	Females n=7969 Prev	(Freq)	M:F Ratio
Crime:					
Steal < $50	10	(1.40)	5**	(1.35)	2.13
Steal > $50	5	(1.45)	2**	(1.40)	2.40
Burglar	3	(1.36)	1**	(1.39)	2.80
Use weapon	3	(1.28)	1**	(1.12)	3.10
Sell drugs	11	(2.06)	4**	(1.95)	3.17
Stolen prop	7	(1.30)	2**	(1.30)	4.00
Damage prop	14	(1.23)	4**	(1.15)	3.14
Credit card	2	(1.44)	1**	(1.38)	2.38
Bad check	4	(1.29)	4	(1.28)	1.00
Crime scale	29	(1.97)	15**	(1.56)	1.95
Drug/alchol:					
Smoke cig	41	(2.58)	36**	(2.54)	1.15
Alcohol	73	(1.89)	70**	(1.59)**	1.06
Binge drink	36	(1.90)	32**	(1.56)**	1.13
Marijuana	36	(1.58)	26**	(1.34)**	1.38
Cocaine	11	(1.05)	7**	(1.05)	1.69
Other drugs	8	(1.12)	5**	(1.05)**	1.72
Crystal meth	4	(1.11)	2**	(1.07)	2.11
Just system:					
Custody	19		4**		4.48
Mean age cus	17.9		18.4*		
Juven arrest	8	(1.15)	1**	(1.06)	5.58
Juven convict	4	(1.13)	.5**	(1.11)**	7.40
Adult arrest	9	(1.15)	2**	(1.06)**	5.69
Adult convict	4	(1.08)	.4**	(1.05)	10.0

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 6b: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Crime, Drug Use and Criminal Justice System Contact (Wave III): Non-runaway Sample (Wave I and Wave II)

	Males n=6635 Prev	(Freq)	Females n=7225 Prev	(Freq)	M:F Ratio
Crime:					
Steal < $50	10	(1.39)	5**	(1.33)	2.06
Steal > $50	5	(1.34)	2**	(1.42)	2.42
Burglar	3	(1.37)	1**	(1.38)	2.89
Use weapon	3	(1.28)	1**	(1.12)	3.22
Sell drugs	11	(2.08)	4**	(1.16)	3.24
Stolen prop	7	(1.31)	2**	(1.30)	4.12
Damage prop	13	(1.22)	4**	(1.16)	3.41
Credit card	2	(1.47)	1**	(1.33)	2.13
Bad check	4	(1.30)	4	(1.29)	1.00
Crime scale	29	(1.92)	14**	(1.53)**	2.07
Drug/alchol:					
Smoke cig	40	(2.58)	34**	(2.53)*	1.19
Alcohol	74	(1.89)	69**	(1.59)**	1.06
Binge drink	37	(1.90)	32**	(1.66)**	1.15
Marijuana	35	(1.57)	25**	(1.32)**	1.41
Cocaine	8	(1.04)	4**	(1.05)	1.81
Other drugs	11	(1.12)	6**	(1.06)**	1.72
Crystal meth	4	(1.12)	2**	(1.07)	2.25
Just system:					
Custody	18		4**		4.97
Mean age cus	18.1		18.5*		
Juven arrest	7	(1.23)	1**	(1.05)	6.64
Juven convict	3	(1.13)	.4**	(1.00)**	8.51
Adult arrest	8	(1.15)	1**	(1.04)**	6.64
Adult convict	4	(1.07)	.3**	(1.05)**	11.6

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 6c: Prevalence and (Frequency) of Crime, Drug Use and Criminal Justice System Contact (Wave III): Runaway Sample (Wave I and Wave II)

	Males n=571		Females n=744		M:F
	Prev	(Freq)	Prev	(Freq)	Ratio
Crime:					
Steal < $50	15	(1.34)	4**	(1.60)	3.39
Steal > $50	8	(1.40)	3**	(1.30)	2.61
Burglar	6	(1.29)	2**	(1.44)	2.68
Use weapon	5	(1.29)	2**	(1.12)	2.22
Sell drugs	18	(1.92)	7**	(2.02)	2.67
Stolen prop	12	(1.19)	3**	(1.29)	4.11
Damage prop	16	(1.30)	8**	(1.14)	2.12
Credit card	3	(1.31)	2**	(1.63)	2.29
Bad check	7	(1.21)	6	(1.27)	1.10
Crime scale	36	(2.45)	21**	(1.75)**	1.71
Drug/alchol:					
Smoke cig	57	(2.60)	56	(2.62)	1.01
Alcohol	73	(1.89)	72	(1.56)**	1.02
Binge drink	49	(1.92)	35**	(1.66)**	1.41
Marijuana	44	(1.70)	36*	(1.39)**	1.24
Cocaine	13	(1.05)	8*	(1.05)	1.81
Other drugs	16	(1.05)	9	(1.03)*	1.72
Crystal meth	7	(1.09)	4*	(1.07)	1.88
Just system:					
Custody	32		10**		3.30
Mean age cus	17.3		17.8		
Juven arrest	15	(1.37)	4**	(1.16)	3.57
Juven convict	9	(1.13)	1**	(1.44)	6.92
Adult arrest	19	(1.15)	4**	(1.13)	5.30
Adult convict	11	(1.11)	1**	(1.00)	9.25

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 6d: Prevalence of Crime, Drug Use and Criminal Justice System Contact (Wave III): Runaways and Non-runaways (Wave I and Wave II)

	Males			Females		
	Run%	No-run%	Ratio	Run%	No-run%	Ratio
Crime:						
Steal < $50	15	10**	1.36	4	4	1.09
Steal > $50	8	5**	1.76	3	2	1.83
Burglar	6	3**	2.27	2	1**	2.44
Use weapon	5	3**	1.76	2	1**	2.56
Sell drugs	18	11**	1.60	7	3**	1.94
Stolen Prop	12	7**	1.64	3	2	1.65
Damage prop	16	13**	1.23	8	4**	1.97
Credit card	3	2	2.00	2	1	2.50
Bad check	7	4**	1.80	6	4**	1.62
Crime scale	36	29**	1.25	21	14**	1.45
Drug/alchol:						
Smoke cig	57	40**	1.40	56	34**	1.64
Alcohol	73	74	1.00	72	69	1.04
Binge drink	49	37	1.35	35	32	1.14
Marijuana	44	35**	1.25	36	25**	1.42
Cocaine	13	8**	1.74	8	4**	1.95
Other drugs	16	11**	1.46	9	6**	1.48
Crystal meth	7	4**	1.89	4	2**	2.25
Just system:						
Custody	32	18**	1.77	10	4**	2.67
Mean age cus	17.3	18.1**		17.8	18.5**	
Juven arrest	15	7**	2.06	4	1**	3.82
Juven convict	9	3**	2.65	1	.4**	3.25
Adult arrest	19	8**	2.37	4	1**	2.69
Adult convict	11	4**	2.75	1	.3**	4.01

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 7: Logistic Regression of Prevalence of Self-reported Criminal Behavior (Wave III) on Status Offenses (Wave I), Delinquency (Wave I), Abuse and Justice System Contact

Model	1male	1female	2male	2female	3male	3female	4male	4female	5male	5female
Age	-.237**	-.234**	-.242**	-.242**	-.226**	-.225**	-.232**	-.220**	-.213**	-.200**
Non-white	.057	.204	-.018	.156	.013	.163	-.059	.114	-.070	.156
Runaway	.148	.253**	.098	.175	-.058	.085	-.104	.017	-.106	-.007
Alcohol	.451**	.236**	.447**	.208**	.302**	.079	.303**	.058	.259**	.041
Loud/rwdy	.479**	.518**	.479**	.483**	.279**	.358**	.285**	.329**	.274**	.296**
Smoke	.115	.343**	.003	.309**	.004	.211*	.179	.179*	-.086	.167*
Abuse			.546**	.686**			.523**	.665**	.494**	.643**
Delinquent					.182**	.219**	.117**	.213**	.163**	.206**
Juv contct							.		.494**	.964**
Juv convct									.608**	.581*
R2	.05	.03	.06	.05	.06	.04	.08	.05	.09	.06
X2	304**	222**	346**	342**	419**	296**	512**	406**	594**	461**
Constant	3.72**	2.49**	3.67**	2.42**	3.46**	1.98**	3.45**	1.96**	2.97**	1.15**

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 8: Logistic Regressions of Prevalence of Self-reported Criminal Behavior (Wave III) on Gender, Runaway and Gender-by-Runaway

	n=15772		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Age	-.175**	-.178**	-.178**
Non-white	0	0	0
Gender	-1.12**	-1.14**	-1.14**
Runaway		.452**	.382**
GenXrun			.114
R2	.09	.09	.09
X2	606**	626**	623**
Constant	1.67	1.69	1.71

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 9: Logistic Regression of Prevalence of Self-reported Criminal Behavior (Wave III) on Status Offenses (Wave I) and Justice System Contact: Non-Delinquents Only

Model	1male	1female	2male	2female	3male	3female	4male	4female
Age	-.220**	-.241**	-.277**	-.257**	-.258**	-.236**	-.253**	-.238**
Non-white	.014	.168	.014	.184	.004	.244*	.002	.249*
Runaway	-.083	-.017	-.218	-.325	-.186	-.318	-.211	-.204
Alcohol			.399**	.076	.376**	.056	.379**	.056
Loud/rowdy			.208*	.500**	.191*	.472**	.186*	.470**
Smoke			.114	.503**	-.127	.496**	-.165	.482**
Truancy			.250*	-.012	.228*	-.021	.202*	-.014
Juv contact					.630**	1.28**	.410**	1.24**
Juv custody							.880**	.346
R2	.02	.01	.03	.02	.04	.03	.05	.03
X2	82**	65**	115**	97**	135**	128**	156**	128**
Constant	3.41**	2.73**	4.41**	2.77**	3.96**	2.26**	3.84**	2.28**

**p<.001
*p<.05

Table 10a: Bivariate Associations (standardized) between Juvenile Delinquent, Status and Drug Use Offenses and Abuse (Wave I)

	Males	Females
Delinquency:		
Shoplift	.085**	.109**
Steal < $50	.066**	.087**
Steal > $50	.090**	.074**
Burglar	.065**	.061**
Use weapon	.066**	.049**
Sell drugs	.057**	.039**
Graffiti	.086**	.053**
Damage prp	.072**	.080**
Status Off:		
Runaway	.098**	.159**
Loud/rowdy	.042**	.072**
Truancy	.073**	.079**
Smoke cig	.076**	.083**
Alcohol	.032**	.057**
Drug Use:		
Marijuana	.102**	.069**
Cocaine	.058**	-
Inhale	.042**	-
Other drugs	.052**	.045**

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 10b: Bivariate Associations (standardized) between Adult Criminal Behavior and Drug Use Offenses and Abuse (Wave III)

	Males	Females
Crime:		
Damage prp	.113**	.108**
Steal < $50	.084**	.086**
Steal > $50	.126**	.075**
Burglar	.131**	.056**
Use weapon	.151**	.075**
Sell drugs	.125**	.069**
Stolen prop	.122**	.113**
Credit card	.123**	.061**
Bad check	.081**	.057**
Drug Use:		
Alcohol	-	-
Binge drink	.044**	.043**
Smoke	.074**	.093**
Marijuana	.087**	.089**
Crystal Meth	.133**	.085**
Cocaine	.069**	.069**
Other drugs	.060**	-

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 11a: Prevalence of Status Offenses, Delinquency and Drug Use (Wave I): Abused and Non-abused Respondents

	Males			Females		
	Abus% n=2089	No-ab% n=6681	Ratio	Abus% n=2183	No-ab% n=5923	Ratio
Delinquency:						
Shoplift	34	25**	1.32	28	18**	1.55
Steal < $50	30	22**	1.32	23	14**	1.63
Steal > $50	10	6**	1.56	5	3**	1.69
Burglar	9	6**	1.47	4	3**	1.74
Use weapon	7	5**	1.37	4	2**	1.61
Sell drugs	13	9**	1.45	5	4*	1.33
Graffiti	15	10**	1.58	9	6**	1.54
Damage prop	30	21**	1.40	16	10**	1.53
Delinq scale	56	45**	1.27	45	31**	1.44
Status Offen:						
Runaway	10	5**	1.92	14	7**	1.98
Loud/rowdy	54	46**	1.17	55	45**	1.21
Truancy	37	30**	1.22	32	25**	1.27
Smok cig	22	18**	1.22	23	17**	1.28
Alcohol	52	45**	1.16	52	44**	1.28
Status scale	80	73**	1.10	80	71**	1.88
Drug Use:						
Marijuana	20	14**	1.39	15	11**	1.40
Cocaine	2	1	1.25	1	<1	1.34
Inhale	2	1	1.33	2	1**	1.85
Other drugs	5	4*	1.36	4	3**	1.48
Drug Scale	20	15**	1.34	17	12**	1.41

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 11b: Prevalence of Crime and Drug Use (Wave III): Abused and Non-abused Respondents

	Males			Females		
	Abuse% n=2089	No-ab% n=6681	Ratio	Abuse% n=2183	No-ab% n=5923	Ratio
Crime:						
Steal < $50	17	8**	2.02	9	4**	2.44
Steal > $50	8	4**	2.14	3	1**	2.49
Burglar	5	3**	3.17	2	1**	2.51
Use weapon	6	2**	2.80	2	1**	2.79
Sell drugs	18	9**	1.75	5	3**	1.86
Stolen Prop	12	5**	2.29	4	1**	3.67
Damage prop	20	10**	1.85	8	3**	2.41
Credit card	4	1**	3.36	2	1**	2.51
Bad check	7	3**	1.79	6	4**	1.62
Crime scale	41	25**	1.61	24	12**	2.04
Drug/alchol:						
Smoke cig	57	39**	1.49	42	34**	1.22
Alcohol	80	72**	1.09	77	68**	1.13
Marijuana	44	32**	1.35	36	23**	1.48
Cocaine	13	7**	1.71	7	4**	1.88
Crystal meth	7	3**	2.67	3	1**	1.88

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 12a: Prevalence of Delinquent and Status Offenses by Abuse: Runaways and Non-runaways (Wave I)

	Runaways			Non-runaways		
	Abus% n=499	No-ab% n=1122	Ratio	Abus% n=3750	No-ab% n=9285	Ratio
Delinquency:						
Shoplift	56	48	1.14	28	20**	1.40
Steal < $50	45	41	1.09	24	16**	1.45
Steal > $50	22	20	1.07	5	4**	1.47
Burglar	15	14	1.05	6	3**	1.57
Use weapon	14	13	1.04	4	3**	1.43
Sell drugs	24	22	1.08	7	5**	1.37
Graffiti	24	21	1.22	10	7**	1.53
Damage prop	35	30	1.13	21	14**	1.48
Steal Car	32	30	1.04	11	8**	1.40
Delinq scale	77	73	1.07	48	35**	1.38
Status Offen:						
Loud/rowdy	69	69	1.00	53	44**	1.19
Truancy	54	54	1.02	31	25**	1.26
Smok cig	46	45	1.01	19	16**	1.27
Alcohol	70	69	1.01	50	43**	1.18
Status scale	91	92	.99	77	69**	1.13
Drug Use:						
Marijuana	60	59	1.03	30	23*	1.29
Cocaine	6	4	1.47	1	1	1.38
Inhale	5	5	1.00	2	1**	1.60
Other drugs	14	13	1.11	3	3	1.26

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 12b: Prevalence of Crime and Drug Use (Wave III) by Abuse: Runaways and Non-runaways (Wave I)

	Runaways			Non-runaways		
	Abuse% n=499	No-ab% n=1122	Ratio	Abuse% n=3750	No-ab% n=9285	Ratio
Crime:						
Steal < $50	13	5**	2.51	12	5**	2.13
Steal > $50	9	2**	3.51	5	2**	2.08
Burglar	5	2*	2.16	3	1**	2.91
Use weapon	6	2**	3.63	3	1**	2.62
Sell drugs	13	9*	1.48	10	5**	1.88
Stolen Prop	10	4**	2.80	8	3**	2.56
Damage prop	14	8**	1.81	13	7**	2.05
Credit card	4	1**	5.00	2	1**	2.86
Bad check	8	5*	1.58	5	3**	1.64
Crime scale	35	21**	1.69	31	18**	1.78
Drug/alchol:						
Smoke cig	61	59	1.11	42	35**	1.18
Alcohol	77	71*	1.09	78	71**	1.11
Binge drink	64	54**	1.19	62	57**	1.14
Marijuana	45	34**	1.30	38	27**	1.42
Cocaine	13	9*	1.50	9	5**	1.77
Crystal meth	6	5	1.24	5	2**	2.76

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 13: Bivariate Relationships between Status Offenses and Gender (Wave I)

	Patriarchal n=6079	Bal obey n=3291	Bal Com n=1765
Runaway	.024	.032	-
Loud/rowdy	-	.031	-.057*
Truancy	-.054**	-.065**	-
Smoke	-	-.018	-.023
Alcohol	-.025*	-	-.044
Status Scale	-	.029	-.052
Delinquency	-.127**	-.093**	-.193**
Parental control	-	-	-.016
Taste for risk	-.274**	-.296**	-.258**
Abuse	-.051**	-.044*	-.079**

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 14: Mean Status Offenses, Delinquency and Power-Control Variables by Gender and Household Class

	Patriarchal			Balance Obey			Balance Command		
	Males n=3092	Females n=2987	ratio	Males n=1656	Females n=1635	ratio	Males n=880	Females n=885	ratio
Runaway	.07	.09	.85	.08	.09	.81	.06	.05	1.05
Loud/rowdy	.47	.46	.98	.44	.47	.93	.54	.48	1.12
Truancy	.30	.26**	1.19	.33	.27**	1.22	.21	.21	1.02
Alcohol	.47	.46	1.03	.47	.48	.99	.48	.44	1.10
Smoke	.20	.18	1.11	.21	.19	1.07	.16	.15	1.12
Status Scale	1.49	1.43	1.04	1.51	1.49	1.01	1.46	1.34	1.09
Delinquen	.47	.34**	1.37	.45	.36**	1.25	.49	.30**	1.43
Parent Cont	1.87	1.87	1.00	1.91	1.91	1.01	1.71	1.66	1.01
Taste Risk	2.82	1.84**	1.53	2.85	1.81**	1.58	2.94	1.98**	1.48

**p>.001
*p>.01

Table 15: Bivariate Relationships between Parental Controls and Gender (Wave I)

	Patriarchal n=6079	Bal obey n=3291	Bal Com n=1765
Choose curfew	-.105**	-.130**	-.057
Choose friends	-	-	.038
Choose clothes	.023	.029	.015
Amount TV	.029	.046	.028
TV programs	-	.025	.040
Choose bedtime	.045**	.031	.083**
Choose foods	.039**	.040**	.023

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 16: Prevalence of Delinquent, Status and Runaway Behavior by Household Class and Gender

	Patriarchal		Balance Obey		Balance Command	
	Males n=3092	Females n=2987	Males n=1656	Females n=1635	Males n=880	Females n=885
No Delinq	53%	66%	55%	64%	51%	66%
Delinquent	47%	34%	45%	36%	49%	34%
No Status	27%	28%	28%	26%	24%	28%
Status Off	73%	72%	72%	74%	76%	72%
No Run	93%	91%	92%	91%	94%	93%
Runaway	7%	9%	8%	9%	6%	7%

Table 17: Logistic Regression of Prevalence of Self-reported Delinquent Behavior (Wave I) on Gender, Parental Control and Taste for Risk

	Patriarchal n=6079			Balance Obey n=3291			Balance Command n=1765		
Model	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Gender	-.522**	-.519**	-.334**	-.379**	-.377**	-.206	-.813**	-.804**	-.731**
Par Contrl		-.036	-.026		-.055	-.044		-.039	-.029
Taste Risk			.258**			.223**			.253**
R2	.02	.03	.06	.01	.01	.05	.04	.04	.09
X2	98**	101**	106**	28**	33**	42**	68**	67**	46**
Constant	.384	.450	-.324	.182	.284	-.318	.781	.834	.237

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 18: Logistic Regression of Prevalence of Self-reported Status Offending Behavior (Wave I) on Gender, Parental Control and Taste for Risk

	Patriarchal n=6079			Balance Obey n=3291			Balance Command n=1765		
Model	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Gender	-	-	.547**	.070	.071	.667**	-.257**	-.270**	.022
Par Contrl		-.193**	-.132**		-.217**	-.183**		-.239**	-.253**
Taste Risk			.268**			.273**			.369**
R2	00	.02	.07	00	.03	.08	00	.04	.13
X2	00	122**	81**	.77	77**	48**	1.6	47**	41**
Constant	.789	1.17	-.209	.89	1.33	-.013	1.39	1.85	.753

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 19: Logistic Regression of Prevalence of Self-reported Delinquent Behavior (Wave I) on Gender, Parental Control and Taste for Risk: Abused and Non-abused Samples

	Abused n=4280			Non-abused n=9983		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Gender	-.460**	-.461**	-.201	-.545**	-.543**	-.387**
Par Contrl		-.020	-.009		-.065*	-.040
Taste Risk			.251**			.224**
R2	.02	.03	.08	.02	.03	.07
X2	56**	56**	93**	170**	187**	195**
Constant	.714	.768	-.241	.325	.446	-.263

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 20: Logistic Regression of Prevalence of Self-reported Status Offending Behavior (Wave I) on Gender, Parental Control and Taste for Risk: Abused and Non-abused Samples

	Abused n=4280			Non-abused n=9983		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Gender	.119	.131	.471**	-.010	-.027	.150
Par Contrl		-.189**	-.147**		-.191**	-.151**
Taste Risk			.261**			.282**
R2	00	.03	.07	00	.03	.08
X2	.10	74**	71**	2.13	194**	207**
Constant	.990	1.35	.219	.727	1.11	.300

**p<.001
*p<.01

Table 21: Correlation Matrixes of Relevant Variables for Males and Females

Males	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Runaway							
2. Alcohol	.099**						
3. Smoke	.165**	.301**					
4. Loud/rowdy	.100**	.224**	.148**				
5. Truancy	.132**	.260**	.220**	.097**			
6. Delinquent (Wave I)	.190**	.291**	.202**	.505**	.189**		
7. Adult Off (Wave III)	.039**	.078**	.042**	.125**	.005**	.181**	
8. Abuse	.086**	.065**	.047**	.070**	.064**	.110**	.152**

Females	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Runaway							
2. Alcohol	.164**						
3. Smoke	.203**	.328**					
4. Loud/rowdy	.145**	.216**	.141**				
5. Truancy	.186**	.262**	.220**	.116**			
6. Delinquency (Wave I)	.230**	.272**	.216**	.336**	.201**		
7. Adult Off (Wave III)	.055**	.045**	.052**	.108**	.030**	.157**	
8. Abuse	.101**	.067**	.058**	.088**	.069**	.124**	.153**

**p<.001

Appendix

Status Offenses (Wave I):

Runaway
In the past 12 months, how often did you run away from home? (dummy coded 0,1)
Loud and Rowdy
In the past 12 months, how often were you loud, rowdy, or unruly in a public place? (dummy coded 0,1)
Smoke
During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes? (dummy coded 0,1)
Alcohol
During the past 30 days, on how many days did you drink alcohol? (dummy coded 0,1)
Truancy
During this school year how many times have you skipped school for a full day without an excuse? (dummy coded 0,1)

Delinquency (Wave I):

Graffiti
In the past 12 months, how often did you point graffiti or signs on someone else's property or in a public place? (dummy coded 0,1)
Damage Property
In the past 12 months, how often did you deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you? (dummy coded 0,1)
Shoplift
In the past 12 months, how often did you take something from a store without paying for it? (dummy coded 0,1)
Steal Car
In the past 12 months, how often did you drive a car without its owner's permission? (dummy coded 0,1)
Steal <$50
In the past 12 months, how often did you steal something worth more than $50? (dummy coded 0,1)
Burglar
In the past 12 months, how often did you go into a house or building to steal something? (dummy coded 0,1)
Use Weapon
In the past 12 months, how often did you use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone? (dummy coded 0,1)
Sell Drugs
In the past 12 months, how often did you sell marijuana or other drugs? (dummy coded 0,1)
Steal >$50
In the past 12 months, how often did you steal something worth less than $50? (dummy coded 0,1)

Drug Use (Wave I):

Marijuana
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use marijuana? (dummy coded 0,1)
Cocaine
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use cocaine? (dummy coded 0,1)
Inhale
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use inhalants? (dummy coded 0,1)
Other Drugs
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use any of these types of illegal drugs (LSD, PCP, ecstasy, mushrooms, speed, ice heroin, or pills without a doctor's prescription)? (dummy coded 0,1)

Status Offenses (Wave II):

Runaway
In the past 12 months, how often did you run away from home? (dummy coded 0,1)
Loud and Rowdy
In the past 12 months, how often were you loud, rowdy, or unruly in a public place? (dummy coded 0,1)
Smoke
During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes? (dummy coded 0,1)
Alcohol
During the past 30 days, on how many days did you drink alcohol? (dummy coded 0,1)
Truancy
During this school year how many times have you skipped school for a full day without an excuse? (dummy coded 0,1)

Delinquency (Wave II):

Graffiti
In the past 12 months, how often did you point graffiti or signs on someone else's property or in a public place? (dummy coded 0,1)
Damage Property
In the past 12 months, how often did you deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you? (dummy coded 0,1)
Shoplift
In the past 12 months, how often did you take something from a store without paying for it? (dummy coded 0,1)
Steal Car
In the past 12 months, how often did you drive a car without its owner's permission? (dummy coded 0,1)
Steal <$50
In the past 12 months, how often did you steal something worth more than $50? (dummy coded 0,1)

Burglar
In the past 12 months, how often did you go into a house or building to steal something? (dummy coded 0,1)
Use Weapon
In the past 12 months, how often did you use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone? (dummy coded 0,1)
Sell Drugs
In the past 12 months, how often did you sell marijuana or other drugs? (dummy coded 0,1)
Steal >$50
In the past 12 months, how often did you steal something worth less than $50? (dummy coded 0,1)

Drug Use (Wave II):

Marijuana
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use marijuana? (dummy coded 0,1)
Cocaine
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use cocaine? (dummy coded 0,1)
Inhale
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use inhalants? (dummy coded 0,1)
Other Drugs
During the past 30 days, how many times did you use any of these types of illegal drugs (LSD, PCP, ecstasy, mushrooms, speed, ice heroin, or pills without a doctor's prescription)? (dummy coded 0,1)

Adult Offending (Wave III)

Damage Property
In the past 12 months, how often did you deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you? (dummy coded 0,1)
Steal > $50
In the past 12 months, how often did you steal something worth more than $50? (dummy coded 0,1)
Burglar
In the past 12 months, how often did you go into a house of building to steal something? (dummy coded 0,1)
Use Weapon
In the past 12 months, how often did you use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone? (dummy coded 0,1)
Sell Drugs
In the past 12 months, how often did you sell marijuana or other drugs? (dummy coded 0,1)
Steal < $50
In the past 12 months, how often did you steal something worth less than $50? (dummy coded 0,1)
Stolen Property
In the past 12 months, how often did you buy, sell, or hold stolen property? (dummy coded 0,1)

Credit Card
In the past 12 months, how often did you use someone else's credit card, bank card, or automatic teller card without their permission or knowledge? (dummy coded 0,1)
Bad Check
In the past 12 months, how often did you deliberately write a bad check? (dummy coded 0,1)

Drug/Alcohol Use (Wave III)

Smoke
During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes? (dummy coded 0,1)
Alcohol
During the past 30 days, on how many days did you drink alcohol? (dummy coded 0,1)
Binge Drink
During the past 12 months, on how many days did you drink five or more drinks in a row? (dummy coded 0,1)
Marijuana
In the past year, have you used marijuana?
Cocaine
In the past year, have you used any kind of cocaine?
Crystal Meth
In the past year, have you used crystal meth?
Other Drugs
In the past year, have you used any of these types of illegal drugs? (LSD, PCP, ecstasy, mushrooms, inhalants, ice, heroin, or prescriptions medicines not prescribed for you)

Justice System Contact:

Juvenile Contact
How many times have you been stopped or detained by the police for questioning about your activities? Don't count minor traffic violations. (dummy coded 0,1)
Juvenile Custody
Have you ever been arrested or taken into custody by the police?
Juvenile Arrest
How many times were arrested before you were 18? (dummy coded 0,1)
Juvenile Conviction
Have you even been convicted of or pled guilty to a crime, or been found delinquent, in juvenile court?
Adult Arrest
Have you ever been arrested since you turned 18?
Adult Conviction
Have you ever been convicted of or pled guilt to a crime in adult court?

Abuse:

Physical Abuse
How often had your parents or other adult care-givers slapped, hit, or kicked you?
Sexual Abuse
How often had one of your parents of other adult care-givers touched you in a sexual way, forced you to touch him or her in a sexual way, or forced you to have sexual relations?

Parental Control:

Curfew
Do you parents let you make your own decisions about the time you must be home on weekend nights?
Friends
Do your parents let you make your own decisions about the people you hang around with?
Clothes
Do your parents let you make your own decisions about what you wear?
Amount TV
Do your parents let you make your own decisions about how much television you watch?
Program TV
Do your parents let you make your own decisions about which television programs you watch?
Bedtime
Do your parents let you make your own decisions about what time you go to bed on weeknights?
Food
Do your parents let you make your own decisions about what you eat?

Power-Control Household Types:

Mother's Occupation
What kind of work does she (the woman who functions as the mother in the respondent's household) do? If she does more than one kind of work, tell me the one for which she is paid the most or at which she spends the most time.

Father's Occupation
What kind of work does he (the man who functions as the father in the respondent's household) do? If he does more than one kind of work, tell me the one for which he is paid the most or at which he spends the most time.

Propensity for Risk:

In each pair of sentences, choose the one that better describes what you like or how you feel by entering a 1 to indicate the first sentence or a 2 to indicate the second sentence. If you do not like either one, choose the one you dislike less.

1. 1. I like wild, uninhibited parties.
   2. I like quiet parties with good conversation.

2. 1. I often like to drink alcohol or smoke marijuana.
   2. I don't like to drink alcohol or smoke marijuana.

3. 1. I am not interested in experience of its own sake.
   2. I like to have new and exciting experiences and sensation, even if they are a little frightening, unconventional, or illegal.

4. 1. I like to date people who are physically exciting.
   2. I like to date people who share my values.

5. 1. A person should have considerable sexual experience before marriage.
   2. It's better if two married people begin their sexual experience with each other.

6. 1. Even if I had the money, I would not want to just fly around the world and have fun like some rich people do.
   2. If I had lots of money, I would fly around the world and have fun like some rich people do.

7. 1. I feel best after having a couple of drinks.
   2. Something is wrong with people who need liquor to feel good.

REFERENCES

Aaisma, M. C. (2000). *An empirical typology of adolescent delinquency*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University.

Acoca, L. (1998). Outside/inside: The violation of American girls at home, on the streets and in the juvenile justice system. *Crime and Delinquency*, 44, 560-589.

Acoca, L., & Austin, J. C. (1996). *The hidden crisis: The women offenders sentencing study and alternative sentencing recommendations project*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Acoca, L., & Dedel, K. (1998). *No Place to Hide: Understand and meeting the needs of girls in the California juvenile justice system.* San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Adams, G. L., Gullotta, T., & Clancy, M. (1985). Homeless adolescent: A descriptive study of similarities and differences between runaways and throwaways. *Adolescence,* 20, 715-724.

Adams, G. & Munro, G. (1979). Portrait of the North American runaway: A critical review. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 8(3), 359-373.

Akers, R. L. (1997). *Criminological theories: Introduction and evaluation*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Akers, R. L. (1998). *Social learning and social structure: A general theory of crime and deviance*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Agnew, R. (1991). A longitudinal test of social control theory and delinquency. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency,* 28(2), 126-156.

Agresti, A., & Finlay, B. (1997). *Statistical methods for the social sciences*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Avakame, E. F. (1997). Modeling the patriarchal factor in juvenile delinquency. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24(4), 477-494.

Ayers, C., Williams, J. P., Hawkins, J., Peterson, P.L., Catalano, R.C., & Abbott, R. (1999). Assessing correlates of onset, escalation, de-escalation, and desistance of delinquent behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* 15(3), 277-306.

Ayres, M. (1988). AIDS and juveniles: Policy issues and problems. *National Sheriff,* 40(4), 53-54.

Bachman, R. & Peralta, R. (2002). The relationship between drinking and violence in an adolescent population: Does gender matter? *Deviant Behavior,* 23, 1-19.

Bartuch, D. & Matsueda, R. L. (1996). Gender, reflected appraisals, and labeling: A cross-group test of an interactionist theory of delinquency. *Social Forces*, 75, 145-176.

Baskin, D. & Sommers, I. (1998). *Casualties of community disorder: Women's' careers in violent crime.* Boulder, CO: Westview Publishing.

Berger, R. R., & Hoffman, H. (1998). The role of gender in detention dispositioning of juvenile probation violators. *Journal of Crime and Justice,* 21(1), 173-188.

Bishop, D.L., & Frazer, C. (1992). Gender bias in juvenile justice processing: Implication of the JJDP. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 82, 1162-1186.

Bradley, J. (1997). *Runaway Youth.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Brame, R., Bushway, S., & Paternoster, R. (1999). On the use of panel research designs and random effects models to investigate static and dynamic theories of criminal offending. *Criminology,* 37(3), 599-641.

Brunson, R. K., & Miller, J. (2006). Gender, race and urban policing: The experience of African American youths. *Gender & Society*, 20(4), 531-552.

Belknap, J. (1996). *The invisible women: Gender, crime and justice*. Cincinnati, OH: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Belknap, J. & Holsinger, K. (1998). An overview of delinquent girls: How theory and practice failed and the need for innovative changes. In R.T. Zaplin (Ed.), *Female Offenders: Critical Perspectives and Effective Interventions* (pp. *37-69)*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.

Belknap, J., & Holsinger, K. (2006). The gendered nature of risk factors for delinquency. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 48-71.

Belknap, J., Holsinger, K. & Dunn, M. (1997). Understanding incarcerated girls: The results of a focus groups study. *Prison Journal*, 77, 381-404.

Bentham, J. (1948). An introduction to the principles of moral and legislation. New York, NY: Hafner Publishing Co.

Blackwell, B.S. (2000). Perceived sanction threats, gender and crime: A test and elaboration of power-control theory. *Criminology,* 38, 439-88.

Blackwell, B.S., & Reed, M.D. (2003). Power-control as a between and within family model: Reconsidering the unit of analysis. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 32(5), 385-399.

Blokland, A. J., Nagin, D., & Nieuwbeerta, P. K. (2005). Life span offending trajectories of a Dutch conviction cohort. *Criminology*, 43(4), 919-954.

Blokland, A. J., & Nieuwbeerta, P. K. (2005). The effects of life circumstances on longitudinal trajectories of offending. *Criminology*, 43(4), 1203-1244.

Bloom, B. L., Owen, B., Deschenes, E., & Rosenbaum, J. (2002). Improving juvenile justice for females: A statewide assessment in California. *Crime and Delinquency*, 48(4), 526-552.

Blumstein, A., Cohen, J., & Farrington, D.P (1988a). Criminal career research: Its value for criminology. *Criminology*, 26(1), 1-35.

Blumstein, A., Cohen, J., & Farrington, D.P (1988b). Longitudinal and criminal career research: Further clarification. *Criminology*, 26(1), 57-74.

Bonger, W. (1916). *Crime and economic conditions*. Boston, MA: Little Brown Publishers.

Bottcher, J. (2001). Social practices of gender: How gender relates to delinquency in the everyday lives of high-risk youths. *Criminology*, 39(4), 893-932.

Brennan, T., Huizinga, D., & Elliot, D. (1978). *The social psychology of runaways.* Toronto, Canada: Lexington Books.

Britton, D. M. (2000). Feminism in Criminology: Engendering the outlaw. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 571(1), 57-76.

Broidy, L. M. (1995). Direct supervision and delinquency: Assessing the adequacy of structural proxies. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23, 541-554.

Brown, S. (1984). Social class, child maltreatment and delinquent behavior. *Criminology*, 22, 259-78.

Bucy, J., & Nichols, N. (1991). Homeless youth: statement of problems and suggested policies. *Journal of Health Social Policy*, 2, 65-71.

Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersections of race, class, gender and crime. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 27-47.

Burton, V.S., Cullen, F. T., Evand, T. D., Alarid, L. F., & Dunaway, R. G. (1998). Gender, self-control, and crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 35(2), 123-147.

Cain, M. (1990). Towards transgression: New directions in feminist criminology. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 18(1), 1-18.

Campbell, A. (1981). *Girl delinquents*. New York, NY: St Martin's Press.

Canter, R. (1982). Family correlates of male and female delinquency. *Criminology*, 20, 373-93.

Carlson, B. (1990). Adolescent observers of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5(4), 285-99.

Carlson, B. (1991). Outcomes of physical abuse and observation of marital violence among adolescents in placement. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 6, 526-534.

Carolina Population Center. (1998). *Add health data set*. Retrieved September 5, 2002, from www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth.

Chen, X., Tyler, K., Whitbeck, L., & Hoyt, D. (2004). Early sexual abuse, street adversity and drug use among female homeless and runaway adolescents in the Midwest. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 34(1), 1-21.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1973). Judicial enforcement of the female sex role: The family court and the female delinquent. *Issues in Criminology*, 8(2), 51-69.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1989). Girls' crime and woman's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency*, 35, 5-29.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1997). *The female offender: girls, women and crime.* United States of America: Sage Publications.

Chesney-Lind, M. (2001a). What about the girls? Delinquency programming as if gender mattered. *Corrections Today*, 63(1), 38-45.

Chesney-Lind, M (2001b). Out of sight, out of mind: Girls in the justice system. In C.M. Renzetti & L. Goodstein, (Eds.), *Women, crime and criminal justice: Contemporary perspectives*. (pp. 27-43). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). Patriarchy, crime and justice: Feminist criminology in an era of backlash. *Feminist Criminology,* 1(1), 6-26.

Chesney-Lind, M., & MacDonald, J.M. (2001). Gender bias and juvenile justice revisited: A multiyear analysis. *Criminology*, 47(2), 173-195.

Chensey-Lind, M., & Okamoto, S. K. (2001). Gender Matters: Patterns in girls' delinquency and gender responsive programming. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 1(3), 241-266.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (2004). *The female offender: Girls, women and crime*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R.G. (1996). *Girls, delinquency and juvenile justice*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R. G. (2004). *Girls, delinquency and juvenile justice*, (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning

Cernkovich, S. A., & Giordano, P. C. (1979). A comparative analysis of male and female delinquency. *Sociological Quarterly*, 20, 131-145.

Cernkovich, S. A., & Giordano, P. C. (1987). Family relationships and delinquency. *Criminology*, 25(2), 295-314.

Cernkovich, S. A., & Giordano, P. C (2001). Stability and change in antisocial behavior: The transition from adolescence to early adulthood. *Criminology*, 39(2), 371-410.

Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L.E. (1960). *Delinquency and opportunity*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Cohen, A. (1955). *Delinquent Boys: The culture of the gang*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Covington, S. (1988). The relational theory of women's psychological development: Implications for the criminal justice system. In R. T. Zaplin (Ed.). *Female offenders: Critical perspectives and effective interventions*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.

Cowie, J., Cowie, V., & Slater, E. (1968). *Delinquency in girls*. London: Heinemann.

Crespi, T., & Sabatelli, R. (1993). Adolescent runaways and family strife: A conflict-induced differentiation framework. *Adolescence*, 28(112), 867-878.

Cull, J.G. & Hardy, R. E. (1976). *Problems of runaway youth*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Cullen, F. C. (1983). *Rethinking crime and deviance theory: The emergence of a structuring tradition*. New Jersey: Rowman & Allanheld.

Daddis, M. K., Braddock, D., Cuers, S., Elliott, A., & Kelly, A. (1993). Personal distress in homeless adolescents. *Community Mental Health Journal,* 29, 413-422.

Daly, K. (1994). *Gender, crime and punishment*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly*, 5(4), 497-535.

Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1996). Feminism and criminology. In P. Cordella and L. Siegel (Eds.) *Readings in Contemporary Criminological Theory* (pp. 340-364). Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Datesman, S., & Aickin, M. (1984). Offense specialization and escalation among status offenders. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 75, 1246-1275.

Dean, R., & Thomson, M. (1998). *Teen prostitution*. San Diego, CA: Lucent Books, Inc.

Deane, G., Armstrong D. P., & Felson, R. B. (2005). An examination of offense specialization using marginal logit models. *Criminology*, 43(4), 955-979.

Demuth, S., & Brown, S. (2004). Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 41(1), 58-81.

Denoff, M. (1987). Cognitive appraisal in three forms of adolescent maladjustment. *Social Casework*, 68, 579-588.

Deschenes, E. P. (1990). Longitudinal research designs. In K. Kempf (Ed.) *Measurement issues in Criminology*. (pp. 152-166). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Deschenes, E. P., & Esbensen, F. (1999). Violence and Gangs: Gender differences in perceptions and behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 15(1), 63-96.

Dugan, L.P. (2002). Identifying unit-dependency and time-specificity in longitudinal analysis: A graphical methodology. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* 18(3), 213-237.

Dunford, F., & Brennan, T. (1976). Taxonomy of runaway youth. *Social Service Review*, 50(3), 457-470.

Durkheim, E. (1966). *Suicide: A study in sociology*. (A. G. Spaulding & G. Simpson, Trans.). Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press. (Original work published 1865)

Englander, S. W. (1984). Some self-reported correlates of runaway behavior in adolescent females. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 52, 484-485.

Faith, K. (1993). *Unruly women*. Vancouver, Canada: Press Gang Publishers.

Farnworth, M. (1984). Male-female differences in delinquency in a minority group *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 21, 191-212.

Farrington, D., Snyder, H., & Finnegan, T., (1988). Specialization in juvenile court careers. *Criminology,* 269(3), 461-487.

Feld, B. C. (1999). *Bad kids*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Finkelhor, D. (1993). Epidemiological factors in the clinical identification of child sexual abuse. *Child abuse and neglect*, 17, 67-70.

Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G., & Sedlack, A. (1990). *Missing, abducted, runaway and throwaway children in America. First report: Numbers and characteristics, national incidence studies.* Washington, DC: OJJDP.

Fiueria-McDonough, J. (1984). Feminism and delinquency. *British Journal of Criminology*, 24, 325-342.

Flowers, R. (1995). *Female crime, criminals and cellmates: An exploration of female criminality and delinquency*. USA: McFarland and Co.

Free, M. D. (1991). Clarifying the relationship between the broken home and juvenile delinquency: A critique of the current literature. *Deviant Behavior,* 12, 109-167.

Gaarder, E., & Belknap, J. (2002). Tenuous borders: Girls transferred to adult court. *Criminology*, 40(3), 481-492.

Gilbert, E. (2001). Women, race and criminal justice processing. In C.M. Renzetti and L. Goodstein, (Eds.). Women, crime and criminal justice: contemporary perspectives (pp. 222-237). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Gilfus, M. (1992). From victims to survivors to offenders: Women's routes of entry and immersion into street crime. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 4, 63-89.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giordano, P., Millhollin, T.L, Cernkovich, S., Pugh, M., & Rudolph, J. (1999). Delinquency, identity, and women's involvement in relationship violence. *Criminology*, 37(1), 17-36.

Giordano, P., Cernkovich, S. A., & Rudolph, J.L. (2002). Gender, crime and desistance: toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(4), 990-1064.

Greene, N., & Esselstyn, T. (1972). Beyond control girls. *Juvenile Justice*, 23(3), 13-19.

Greenberg, D. (1985). Age, crime and social explanation. *American Journal of Sociology,* 91, 1-2.

Goodkind, S., Ng, I., & Sarri, R. (2006). The impact of sexual abuse in the lives of young women involved or at risk of involvement with the juvenile justice system. *Violence Against Women*, 12(5), 456-477.

Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1988). Science, public policy and the career paradigm. *Criminology*, 26(1), 37-55.

Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gove, W., & Crutchfield, R. (1982). The family and juvenile delinquency. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23, 301-19.

Guevara, L., Herz, D., & Spohn, C. (2006). Gender and juvenile justice decision making: What difference role does race play? *Feminist Criminology*, 1, 4, 258-282.

Haas, H., Farrington, D., Killias, M., & Sattar, G. (2004). The impact of different family configurations on delinquency. *British Journal of Criminology,* 44, 520-432.

Hagan, J. (1988). *Structural Criminology*. Padstow, U.K.: T.J. Press Ltd.

Hagan, J. (1990). The structuration of gender and deviance: A power-control theory of vulnerability to crime and the search for deviant role exits. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 27(2), 137-156.

Hagan, J. (1991). Destiny and drift: Sub-cultural Preferences, status attainment and the risks and rewards of youth. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 567-582.

Hagan, J., Boehnke, K., & Merkens, H. (2004). Gender differences in capitalization processes and the delinquency of siblings in Toronto and Berlin. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 659-676

Hagan, J., & McCarthy, B. (1994). Double jeopardy: The abuse and punishment of homeless youth. In G.S. Bridges & M. A. Myers (Eds.). Inequality, crime and social control. (pp. 195-211). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hagan, J., & McCarthy, B. (1997). *Mean streets: Youth crime and homelessness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hagan, J., & Gillis, A.R. (1987). Class in the household: A power-control theory of gender and delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(4), 788-816.

Hagan, J., Simpson, J. & Gillis, A.R. (1988). Feminist scholarship, relational and instrumental control and a power-control theory of gender and delinquency. *British Journal of Sociology*, 39(3), 301-336.

Hagan, J., Gillis, A.R., & Simpson J. (1985). The class structure of gender and delinquency: Toward a power-control theory of common delinquent behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 1151-1178.

Hagan, J., Gillis, A.R., & Simpson, J. (1990). Clarifying and extending power-control theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 1024-1037.

Harlow, C. W. (1999). *Prior abuse reported by inmates and probationers*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Heck, C., & Walsh, A. (2000). The effects of maltreatment and family structure on minor and serious delinquency. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 44(2), 178-193.

Heidensohn, F. (1987). Women and crime: Questions for criminology. In P. Carlen & R. Worral (Eds.). *Gender, crime and justice*. (pp. 131-165). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Heir, S., Korboot, P., &. Schweitzer, R. (1990). Social adjustment and symptomatology in two types of homeless adolescents: runaways and throwaways. *Adolescence*, 25(100), 761-772.

Heimer, K. L. (1999). Gender, interaction and delinquency: Testing a theory of differential social control. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(1), 39-61.

Herman, R. (1988). Center provides approach to major social ill: Homeless urban runaways and throwaways. *JAMA*, 260(3), 311-13.

Herrera, V., & McCloskey, L. (2001). Gender differences in the risk for delinquency among youth exposed to family violence. *Child Abuse and Neglect*. 25, 1037-1051.

Hil, R., & McMahon, A. (2001). Families, crime and juvenile justice. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Hill, G., & Atkinson, M. (1988). Gender, familial control and delinquency. *Criminology,* 26(1), 127-150.

Hindelang, M., Hirshi, T., & Weis, J. (1981). *Measuring delinquency*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Hoffman, J., & Cerbone, F. G. (1999). Stressful life events and delinquency escalation in early adolescence. *Criminology,* 37(2), 343-373.

Holsinger, K. (2000). Feminist Perspectives on female offending: Examining real girls' lives. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 12(1), 23-51.

Holsinger, K. & Holsinger, A. M. (2005). Differential pathways to violence and self-injurious behavior: African American and white girls in the juvenile justice system. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 42(2), 211-242.

Holtfreter, K., Reisig, M., & Morash, M. (2004). Poverty, state capital, and recidivism among women offenders. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 3(2), 185-208.

Horowitz, R., & Pottieger, A.E. (1991). Gender bias in juvenile justice handling of serious crime-involved youth. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 28, 75-100.

Hoyt, D., Ryan, K., & Cauce, A. (1999). Personal victimization in a high-risk environment: Homeless and runaway adolescents. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 36(4), 371-392.

Hoyt, S., & Scherer, D. (1998). Female juvenile delinquency: Misunderstood by the juvenile justice system, neglected by social science. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22(1), 81-107.

Ireland, T., Smith, C., & Thornberry, T. (2002). Developmental issues in the impact of child maltreatment on later delinquency and drug use. *Criminology*, 40(2), 359-393.

Ireland, T., & Widom, C. (1994). Childhood victimization and risk for alcohol and drug arrests. *The International Journal of the Addictions*, 2(2), 235-245.

Imm, K.M. (1998). *Coping strategies and locus of control among adolescent runaway and non-runaways.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.

Janus, M., Burgess, A., & McCormack, A. (1987). Histories of sexual abuse in adolescent male runaways. *Adolescence*, 22, 405-417.

Janus, M., McCormack, A., Burgess, A., & Hartman, C. (1987). *Adolescent runaways: Causes and consequences*. Boston, MA: Lexington Books.

Janus, M., Archambault, F., Brown, S., & Welsh, L. (1995). Physical abuse in Canadian runaway adolescents. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 19(4), 433-47.

Jenkins, R. (1971). The runaway reaction. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 128(2), 168-173.

Jensen, G. F. (1993). Power-control vs. social control theories of common delinquency: A comparative analysis. In Freda Adler & William Laufer, (Eds.)., *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Jensen, G. F. (2003). Gender variation in delinquency: Self-image, beliefs and peers, a mediating mechanism. In R.L. Akers & G.F. Jensen (Eds.), *Advances in criminological theory a guide for the new century: Social learning theory and the explanation of crime.* (pp. 151-177). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Jensen, G. F., & Eve, R. (1976). Sex difference in delinquency: An examination of popular sociological explanations. *Criminology,* 13, 427-448.

Jensen, G. F., & Rojek, D. (1998). *Delinquency and Youth Crime*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Jensen, G.F., & Thompson, K. (1990). What's class got to do with it? A further examination of power-control theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(4), 1009-1023.

Jessor, R., Donovan, J., & Costa, F. (1991). *Beyond adolescence: Problem behavior and young adult development*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Justice, B., & Duncan, D. (1976). Running away: An epidemic problem of adolescence. *Adolescence*, 11(43), 363-371.

Juvenile Justice Bulletin. (2000, June). *Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1997*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Jones, L.P. (1988). A typology of adolescent runaways. *Child and Adolescent Social Work*, 1(5), 16-29.

Johnson, L., Simons, R., & Conger, R. (2004). Criminal justice system involvement and continuity of youth crime. *Youth & Society*, 36(1), 3-29.

Kammer, P., & Schmidt, D. (1987). Counseling runaway adolescents. *School Counselor*. 35, 149-54.

Kaufman, J., & Widom, C. S. (1999). Childhood victimization, running away and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36(4), 347-370.

Katz, R. (2000). Explaining girls' and women's crime and desistance in the context of their victimization experiences. *Violence Against Women*, 6(6), 633-660.

Kennedy, M. (1991). Homeless and runaway youth mental health issues: No access to the System. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 12, 576-579.

Kingree, J. B., Braithwaite, R., & Woodring, T. (2001). Psychosocial and behavioral problems in relation to recent experience as a runaway among adolescent detainees. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(2), 190-205.

Kipke, M., Montgomery, S. B., Simon, T.R., & Iverson, E.F. (1997). Substance abuse disorders among runaway and homeless youth. *Substance Use and Misuse,* 32(7-8), 969-986.

Klein, D. (1973). The etiology of female crime: A review of the literature. *Issues in Criminology*, 8, 3-30.

Drisber, B., & DeComo, R. (1993). *Juveniles taken into custody: Fiscal year 1991*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Kufeldt, K., & Nimmo, M. (1987). Youth on the street: Abuse and neglect in the eighties. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 11, 531-543.

Kulik, L. (2002). The impact of social background on gender-role ideology: Parents and children's attitudes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(1), 53-73.

Kurtz, P., Jarvis, S., & Kurtz, G. (1991). Problems of maltreated runaway youth. *Adolescence*, 26, 543-555.

Kruttschnitt, C. (1996). Contributions of quantitative methods to the study of gender and crime, or bootstrapping out way into the theoretical thicket. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 12(2), 135-161.

Lay, B., Ihle, W., Esser, G., & Schmidt, M. (2005). Juvenile-episodic, continued or adult-onset delinquency? *European Journal of Criminology*, 2(1), 39-66.

Lanier, M., & Henry, S. (2004). *Essential Criminology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

LeBlanc, M., & Kaspy, N. (1998). Trajectories of delinquency and problem behavior: Comparison of social and personal control characteristics of adjudicated boys on synchronous and non-synchronous paths. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* 14(2), 181-195.

LeBlanc, M., & Biron, L. (1980). Status offenses: A legal term without meaning. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21, 114-118.

Leonard, E. (1982). *Women, crime and society: A critique of criminology theory*. New York: Longman Publishing.

Lewis, D., Mallouh, C., & Webb, V. (1990). Child abuse, delinquency and violent criminality. In D. Cicchetti & V. Carlson (Eds.), *Child maltreatment: Theory and research on the causes and consequences of child abuse and neglect*. U.S.A: Cambridge University Press.

Libertoff, K. (1980). The runaway child in America: A social story. *Journal of Family Issues*, 1, 151-64.

Lieber, M., & Wacker, M.E. (1997). A theoretical and empirical assessment of power-control theory. *Youth and Society*, 28(3), 317-350.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. (1995). *Criminological theory: context and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lipschutz, M. (1977). Runaways in history. *Crime and Delinquency*, 23, 321-332.

Liu, X. & Kaplan, H.B. (1999). Explaining the gender difference in adolescent delinquent behavior: A longitudinal test of mediating mechanisms. *Criminology*, 37(1), 195-214.

Maar, J. E. (1984). *Critical factors related to adolescent runaway behavior in the sate of Florida*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.

Mack, K. Y., & Leiber, M.J. (2005). Race, gender, single-mother households, and delinquency: A further test of power-control theory. *Youth & Society*, 37(2), 115-144.

Mann, C. R. (1980). Legal and judicial battles affecting runaways. *Journal of Family Issues*, 1(2), 229-248.

Maughan, B., Pickes, A., Rowe, R.R., Costello, E., & Angold, A. (2000). Developmental trajectories of aggressive and non-aggressive conduct problems. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 16(2), 199-214.

Maxfield, M., & Widom, C. S. (1999). The cycles of violence: Revisited six years later. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine,* 150, 390-395.

Maxfield, M., Weiler, B., & Widom, C.S. (2000). Comparing Self-reports and official records or arrests. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 16(1), 87-110.

Maxwell, B. (1992). Hostility, depression, and self-esteem among troubled and homeless adolescents in crisis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence,* 21, 139-50.

Mazerolle, P., Brame, R., Paternoster, R., Piquero, A., & Dean, C. (2000). Onset age, persistence and offending versatility: Comparisons across gender. *Criminology* 38(4), 1143-1171.

McCarthy, B., & Hagan, J. (1992). Surviving on the street: The experience of homeless youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7(4), 412-430.

McCormack, A., Burgess, A., & Gaccione, P. (1986). Influence of family structure and financial stability on physical and sexual abuse among a runaway population. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 16(2), 251-262.

McCormack, A., Janus, M., & Burgess, A. (1986). Runaway youth and sexual victimization: Gender difference in an adolescent runaway population. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 10, 387-395.

Mears, D. P., Ploeger, M., & Warr, M. (1998). Explaining the gender gap in delinquency: Peer influence and moral evaluations of behavior. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 35(3), 251-266.

Melson, B. (1995). *Runaway Adolescents: A family systems perspective*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing Inc.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). *Masculinities and crime: critique and reconceptualization of theory*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlfield Publishers

Miller, E. (1983). A cross-cultural look at women and crime: An essay review. *Contemporary Crises,* 7, 59-70.

Moffit, T. (1997). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent offending: A complementary pair of developmental theories. In Terence P. Thornberry (Ed.), *Developmental theories of crime and delinquency: Advances in Criminological theory* (pp. 234-257). New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishing.

Morash, M., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1991). A reformulation and partial test of the power control theory of delinquency. *Justice Quarterly*, 8 347-376.

Morris, A. (1987). *Women, Crime, and Criminal justice*. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.

Moyer, I. L. (2001). *Criminological theories: Traditional and nontraditional voices and themes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Murray, J. P. (1983). *Status offenders*. Boys Town, NE: Boys Town Print Shop.

Naffine, N. (1988). *Female crime: The construction of women in criminology*. Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin.

National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. (1996). *The third national incidence study of child abuse and neglect (NIS-3)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Neter, J., Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., & Wasserman, W. (1996). *Applied linear regression models*. USA: Times Mirror Higher Education Group.

Norusis, M.J. (2005). *SPSS 14.0: Statistical Procedures Companion*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nye, F. (1980). A theoretical perspective on running away. *Journal of Family Issues*, 1, 274-299.

Odem, M. (1995). *Delinquent daughters: Protecting and policing adolescent female sexuality in the United States, 1885-1920*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

OJJDP, (2001). *OJJDP Annual Report*. Retrieved January 20, 2003, from http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org.

OJJDP, (2002). *Statistical Briefing Book*. Retrieved January 20, 2003, from http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/html.

OJJDP, (1997). *In the wake of childhood maltreatment*. Retrieved January 20, 2003, from http:/ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs.

OJJDP, (2002). *Juvenile Female Offenders and gender-specific services: A historical Overview*. Retrieved January 20, 2003, from http:/ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/gender.

Pagelow, M. (1984). *Family Violence*. New York, NJ: Praeger Publishing.

Paternoster, R., & Brame, R. (1997). Multiple routes to delinquency: A test of development and general theories of crime. *Criminology*, 31(1), 49- 62.

Paternoster, R., Brame, R., & Farrington, D. (2001). On the relationship between adolescent and adult conviction frequencies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 17(3), 2001-225.

Piquero, A., Brame, R., & Lynam, D. (2004). Studying criminal career length through early adulthood among serious offenders. *Crime & delinquency,* 50(3), 412-435.

Piquero, A., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Haapanen, R. (2002) Crime in emerging adulthood. *Criminology*, 40(1), 137-170.

Piquero, N., Gover, A., MacDondald, J., & Piquero, A. (2005). The influence of delinquent peers on delinquency: Does gender matter? *Youth & Society*, 36(3), 251-275.

Poe-Yamagata, E., & Butts, J.A. (1996). *Female offenders in the juvenile justice system*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Preston, P. (2006). Marijuana use as a coping response to psychological strain: Racial, ethnic, and gender differences among young adults. *Deviant Behavior,* 27, 397-421.

Rankin, J. H. (1983). The family context of delinquency. *Social Problems*, 30(4), 467-479.

Rankin, J. H., & Wells, E. (1985). From status to delinquent offense: Escalation? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 13, 171-80.

Rausch, S. (1983). Court processing versus diversion of status offenders: A test of deterrence and labeling theories. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 20, 39-54.

Rebellon, C. J. (2002). Reconsidering the broken homes/delinquency relationship and exploring its mediating mechanisms. *Criminology*, 40(1), 103-135.

Rebellon, C. J., & Van Grundy, K. (2005). Can control theory explain the link between parental physical abuse and delinquency? A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 42(3), 247-274.

Reilly, P. (1978). What makes adolescent girls flee from their homes? *Clinical Pediatrics*, 17(12), 886-893.

Richards, P., & Tittle, C. (1981). Gender and perceived chances of arrest. *Social Forces*, 59, 1182-1201.

Robert, M., Fournier, L., & Pauze, R. (2004). Victimization and behavior problems: Two components of typical profiles of runaway adolescents. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 28(2), 193-208.

Robertson, M. J. (1991). Homeless youth: An overview of recent literature. In J. H. Kryder-Coe, L.M. Salamon, & J.M. Molnar (Eds.), *Homeless Children and Youth: A New American Dilemma*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.

Rohr, M. (1996). Identifying adolescent runaways: The predictive utility of the personality inventory for children. *Adolescence,* 31(123), 605-23.

Rohr, M., & James, R. (1994). Runaways: Some suggestions for prevention, coordinating services and expediting the reentry process. *The School Counselor*, 42(1), 40-47.

Rojek, D., & Erickson, M. (1988). Delinquent careers: A test of the career escalation model, *Criminology*, 20, 5-28.

Rosenbaum, J.L. (1989). Family dysfunction and female delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency*, 35(1), 31-44.

Rosenbaum, J.L. & Chensey-Lind M. (1994). Appearance and delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(2), 250-61.

Rotheram-Borus, M. (1993a). Serving runaway and homeless youth. *Family and Community Health*, 14(3), 23-32.

Rotheram-Borus, M. (1993b). Suicidal behavior and risk factors among runaway youth. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 150(1), 105-108.

Rotherham-Borus, M. J., Mahler, K.A., Koopman, C. & Langabeer, K. (1996) Sexual abuse history and associated multiple risk behavior in adolescent runaways. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 66, 390-399.

Rotherham-Borus, M. J., Koopman, C., Haignere, C., & Daviews, M., (1991). Reducing HIV sexual risk behaviors among runaway adolescents. *JAMA*, 266(9), 1257-1242.

Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (2003). *Shared beginnings, divergent lives: Delinquent boys to age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schaffner, B., & DeBlassie, B. (1984). Adolescent prostitution. *Adolescence,* 19, 689-696.

Schaffner, L. (1999). *Teenage runaways: broken hearts and bad attitudes*. New York, NY, Haworth Press, Inc.

Schur, E. (1973). *Radical nonintervention: Rethinking the delinquency problem*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schur, E. (1984). *Labeling women deviant: Gender, stigma, and social control*. New York, NY: Random House.

Schwartz, I. M., Steketee, M. W., &Schneider, V.W. (1990). Federal juvenile justice policy and the incarceration of girls. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36(4), 503-520.

Seyditz, R. (1991). The effects of age and gender on parental control and delinquency. *Youth and Society*, 23(2), 175-201.

Shane, P. (1989). Changing patterns among homeless and runaway youth. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 59(2), 208-214.

Shane, P. (1991). A sample of homeless and runaway youth in New Jersey and their health status. *Journal Health Social Policy*, 2, 73-82.

Sharp, S.F., Brewster, D., & Love, S. (2005). Disentangling strain, personal attributes affective response and deviance: A gendered analysis. *Deviant Behavior*, 26, 133-157.

Sheldon, R.G., & Horvath, J. (1986, November). *Processing offenders in a juvenile court: A comparison of males and females*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Society of Criminology, Newport Beach, CA.

Sheldon, R.G., Horvath, J., & Sharon, T. (1989). Do status offenders get worse? Some clarifications on the question of escalation. *Crime and Delinquency*, 35(2), 202-216.

Shinohara, M., & Jenkins, R. (1967). MMPI study of three types of delinquents. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 23, 156-63.

Siegel, J., & Williams, L. (2003). The relationship between child sexual abuse and female delinquency and crime: A prospective study. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(1), 71-94.

Simpson, S. (1989). Feminist theory, crime, and justice. *Criminology,* 27, 607-627.

Simpson, S., & Ellis, L. (1995). Doing gender: sorting out the caste and crime conundrum *Criminology*, 33, 47-82.

Simons, R., Miller, M., & Aigner, S. (1980). Contemporary theories of deviance and female delinquency: An empirical test. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 23, 42-57.

Simons, R., Sterwart, E., Gordon, L., Conger, R., & Elder, G. (2002). A test of the life-course explanations for stability and change in antisocial behavior from adolescence to young adulthood. *Criminology*, 40(2), 401-433.

Simons, R. & Whitbeck, L. (1991). Sexual abuse as a precursor to prostitution and victimization among adolescent and adult homeless women. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 361-79.

Singer, S., & Levine, M. (1988). Power-control theory, gender and delinquency. *Criminology*, 26(4), 627-647.

Smart, C. (1976). *Women, crime and criminology: A feminist critique*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Smart, C. (1979). The new female offender: Reality or myth? *British Journal of Criminology,* 19, 50-59.

Smart, D. H. (1991). Homeless youth in Seattle: Planning and policy-making at the local government level. *Journal of Adolescent Health ,* 12(7), 519-27.

Smart, R.G., & Adlaf, E.M. (1991). Substance use and problems among Toronto street youth. *British Journal of Addiction,* 86, 999-1010.

Smith, C., & Thornberry, T. (1995). The relationship between childhood maltreatment and adolescent involvement in delinquency. *Criminology*, 33, 451-481.

Smith, D. (1979). Sex and deviance: An assessment of major sociological variables. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 20, 183-195.

Smith, D. A., & Paternoster, R. (1987). The gender gap in theories of deviance: issues and evidence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 24(2), 140-72.

Snyder, H. (2002). *Juvenile arrests 2000.* Washington, D.C: OJJDP.

Snyder, H., & Sickmund, M. (1999). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 national report*. Washington DC: OJJDP.

Spergel, I., Reamer, F., & Lynch, J. (1981). Deinstitutionalization of status offenders: Individual outcome and system effects. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18(1), 4-33.

Spillane-Grieco, E. (1984). Characteristics of a helpful relationship: A study of empathic understanding and positive regard between runaways and their parents. *Adolescence,* 19(73), 63-75.

Springer, D. W., (1998). Validation of the adolescent concerns evaluation (ACE): Detecting indicators of runaway behavior in adolescents. *Social Work Research*, 22(4), 241-250.

Stahl, A.L. (1998). *Offenders in juvenile court, 1996*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP.

Staller, K. M. (1999). *Runaway youth: contending cultural voices and policy responses, 1960-1978*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

Staller, K. M. (2003). Constructing the runaway youth problem: Boy adventurers to girl prostitutes, 1960-1978. *Journal of Communications*, 53, 330-346.

Steffensmeier, D. J. (1978). Crime and the contemporary woman: An analysis of changing levels of female property crime, 1960-75. *Social Forces*, 57(2), 566-84.

Steffensmeier, D. J. (1980a). Assessing the impact of the women's movement on sex-based differences in the handling of adult criminal defendants. *Crime and Delinquency*, 26(3), 344-357.

Steffensmeier, D. J. (1980b). Sex differences in patterns of adult crime, 1965-1977: A review and assessment. *Social Forces,* 58(3), 1080-1108.

Steffensmeier, D. J. (1993). National trends in female arrests, 1960-1990. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* 9, 411-441.

Steffensmeier, D.J. & Allan, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 459-487

Steffensmeier, D. J., & Broidy, L. (2001). Explaining female offending. In C.M. Renzetti & L. Goodstein, (Eds.), *Women, crime and criminal justice: contemporary perspectives.* (pp. 111-132). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company

Steffensmeier, D.J., & Steffensmeier R.H. (1980). Trends in female delinquency: An examination of arrest, juvenile court, self-report, and field data. *Criminology*, 18, 62-85.

Steffensmeier, D.J., Schwartz, J., Zhong, H., & Akerman, J. (2005). An assessment of recent trends in girls' violence using diverse longitudinal sources. *Criminology,* 43, 355-406.

Stienheart, D.J. (1996). Status Offenses. *The Future of Children,* 6(3), 86-98.

Stiffman, A. (1989). Physical and sexual abuse in runaway youths. *Child Abuse and Neglect,* 13, 417-426.

Sutherland, E. H. (1947). *Principles of Criminology*. New York, NY: Lippincott.

Svensson, R. (2003). Gender differences in adolescent drug use. *Youth & Society*, 34(3), 300-329.

Tanner, J., Davies, S., & O'Grady, B. (1999). Whatever happened to yesterday's rebels? Longitudinal effects of youth delinquency on education and employment. *Social Problems*, 46(2), 250-274.

Thomas, C. W. (1976). Are status offenders really so different? A comparative and longitudinal assessment. *Crime & Delinquency,* 22(4), 438-455.

Thomas, G., Reifman, A., Barnes, G., & Farrell, M. (2000). Delayed onset of drunkenness as a protective factor for adolescent alcohol misuse and sexual risk taking: A longitudinal study. *Deviant Behavior*, 21, 181-210.

Thompson, K. M., & Braaten-Antrim, R. (1998). Youth maltreatment and gang involvement. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 328-345.

Tittle, C. (1995). *Control balance: Toward a general theory of deviance*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tracy, P., & Kempf-Leonard, K., (1996). Continuity and discontinuity in criminal careers. New York, NY: Plenum Publishing.

Tyler, K. A. (2002). Social and emotional outcomes of childhood sexual abuse. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7(6), 567-589.

Tyler, K., Whitbeck, L., Hoyt, D., & Cauce, A. (2000). Risk factors for sexual victimization among male and female homeless and runaway youth. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(5), 503-520.

Udry, R. (1998). *The national longitudinal study of adolescent health*. Chapel Hill: NC: Carolina Population Center.

Uggen, C. (2000). Class gender, and arrest: An intergenerational analysis of workplace power and control. *Criminology*, 38(2), 835-862.

Uggen, C., & Kruttschnitt, C. (1998). Crime in the breaking: Gender differences in desistance. *Law & Society Review*, 32(2), 339-365.

Unnever, J.D., Cullen, F. T. & Agnew, R. (2006). Why is bad parenting criminogenic? Implication from rival theories. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(1), 3-33.

U. S. Department of Justice. (1993). *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Policies and Practices Regarding Missing Children and Homeless Youth: Research Projec*t. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Justice. (2002). *FBI, Crime in America, Uniform Crime Reports, 1990-2000*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office

USGAO. (1989). *Homelessness: Homeless and runaway youth receiving services at federally funded shelters. Report HRD-90-45*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Van Houten, T., & Golebiewski, T. (1985). *Adolescent life stress as a predictor of alcohol abuse and/or runaway behavior*. Washington DC: National Youth Work Alliance.

Van Vooris, P. F., Cullen, R., Mathers, P., & Garner, C. (1988). The impact of family structure and quality on delinquency: A comparative assessment of structural and functional factors. *Criminology*, 26(2), 235-61.

Vander Ven, T. & Cullen, F. (2004). The impact of maternal employment on serous youth crime: Does the quality of working conditions matter*? Crime and Delinquency*, 50(20), 272-291.

Weisbegr, D.K. (1985). *Children of the night: A study of adolescent prostitution*. Boston, MA: Lexington Books.

Yates, G., Mackenzie, R., Pennbridge, J., & Cohen, E. (1988). A risk profile comparison of runaway and non-runaway youth. *American Journal of Public Health*, 78, 820-821.

Ward, E. (1982). Rape of girl-children by male family members. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 15(2), 90-99.

Wangby, M., Bergman, L.R., &Magnusson, D. (1990). Development of Adjustment Problems in Girls: What Syndromes Emerge. *Child Development*, 70, 678-699.

Weis, J. (1980). *Jurisdiction and the elusive status offender: A comparison of involvement in delinquent behavior and status offenses.* Washington, DC: National Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers.

Wells, L., & Rankin, J.H. (1986). The broken homes model of delinquency: Analytic issues. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 23(1), 68-93.

Wells, L. & Rankin, J.H. (1991). Families and delinquency: A meta-analysis of the impact of broken homes. *Social Problems*, 38, 71-93.

Wells, L., & Sandhu, H. (1986). The juvenile runaway: a historical perspective. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 14(2), 143-47.

Whitbeck, L.B., & Hoyt, D. R. (1999). *No where to grow: Homeless and runaway adolescents and their families*. New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter Press.

Whitbeck, L.B., Hoyt, D.R., & Ackley, K.A. (1997). Families of homeless and runaway adolescents: A comparison of parent/caretaker and adolescent perspectives on parenting, family violence and adolescent conduct. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 21(6), 517-28.

White, H. E. (1992). Early problem behavior and later drug problems. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29(4), 412-429.

Widom, C. S. (1989a). The cycle of violence. *Science,* 244, 160-166.

Widom, C. S. (1989b). Child abuse, neglect and violent criminal behavior. *Criminology*, 27, 251-271.

Widom, C. S. (1995). *Victims of childhood sexual abuse-later criminal consequences. National Institute of justice research in brief*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Widom, C. S., & Ames, M. A. (1994). Criminal consequences of childhood sexual victimization. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 18, 303-313.

Widom, C.S., & Kuhns, J. (1996). Childhood Victimization and subsequent risk for promiscuity, prostitution and teenage pregnancy: A prospective study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 86(11), 1607-1612.

Widom, C. S., & Maxfield, M. (1996). A prospective examination of risk for violence among abused and neglected children. In C.F. Ferris & T. Grisso (Eds.), *Understanding aggressive behavior in children* (pp. 224-237). New York, NY: New York Academy of Sciences.

Windle, M. (1989). Substance use and abuse among adolescent runaways: A four-year follow-up study. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 18(4), 331-45.

Wright, K., & Wright, K. (1994). *Family life, delinquency, and crime: A policy maker's guide*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Juvenile Justice, OJJDP.

Yoder, K., Whitbeck, L. B., & Hoyt, D.R. (2003). Gang involvement and membership among homeless and runaway youth. *Youth & Society*, 34(4), 441-467.