

Intergenerational Transmission of Self-reported Offending



**David P. Farrington
Maria M. Ttofi**

**Institute of Criminology
Cambridge University**

Stockholm Criminology Symposium

June 21, 2017

Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development



To what extent is there intergenerational transmission of self-reported offending?

This question is addressed in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (CSDD)

- a longitudinal study of 411 London males (generation 2)
- their parents (generation 1)
- and their children (generation 3)

Characteristics of the CSDD Sample



- 411 South London males [generation 2]
- Attending 6 schools in a working class area
- Aged 8-9 in 1961-62, mostly born in 1953
- 357 White, British origin [87%]
- 14 Irish, 12 African-Caribbean, 12 from Cyprus, 16 other White
- 94% working class
- 6% no father, 1% no mother

Traditional British White urban lower class sample

Data Collected at Different Ages



- G2 males interviewed at ages 8, 10, 14, 16, 18, 21, 25, 32, and 48
- Whole sample interviewed at all ages except 21 and 25, when sub-samples were interviewed
- G1 parents interviewed once a year when boy aged 8-15
- Peer ratings at ages 8 and 10
- Teacher ratings at ages 8, 10, 12, and 14
- Criminal records up to 56 (searches 1964 to 2011)
- Multiple constructs and multiple data sources

Social Interviews with G2 Males



- Age 18: 389 out of 410 alive [95%]
- Age 32: 378 out of 403 alive [94%]
- Age 48: 365 out of 394 alive [93%]
- Men who are hardest to interview tend to be the most antisocial
- At age 48, out of 411 men:
 - 17 had died [13 convicted]
 - 5 not traced
 - 24 refused(32 died up to age 56; 23 convicted)

Social Interview at age 18



- Demographics, accommodation, employment history, illnesses/injuries, examinations, income, expenditure, debts
- Relationships, parents, girlfriends, sexual behaviour
- Leisure activities, smoking, drinking, drunk driving, traffic offences, gambling, fighting, attitude questionnaire
- Self-reported offending, drug use, height, weight, resting heart rate

Social Interview at age 32



- Demographics, accommodation, relationships, children, child problems, child-rearing methods, child-rearing attitudes questionnaire
- Employment history, income, illnesses/injuries, anxiety/depression (GHQ), debts, parents, siblings
- Evenings out, sexual behaviour, smoking, drinking, drunk driving, gambling, drug use, fighting, attitude questionnaire
- Court appearances, traffic offences, self-reported offending, home conditions, area problems (Int)

Social Interview with G3 Children



- Demographics, accommodation, qualifications, school behaviour, personality Q, empathy Q
- Employment history, income, illnesses/injuries, anxiety/depression (GHQ), debts, parents, siblings, children, child-rearing experienced
- Leisure activities, sexual behaviour, partner violence (CTS), smoking, drinking, drunk driving, gambling, drug use, fighting, attitude questionnaire
- Court appearances, traffic offences, self-reported offending, psychopathy, personality disorder, heart rate, blood pressure, height, weight, home conditions

G3 Children Interviewed



- 691 G3 children with known name and date of birth
- Age at least 18 (born up to 1995, interviewed 2004-2013)
- 38 not eligible: 6 dead, 3 disabled, 20 father refused, 7 father dead, 2 child doesn't know G2 male is his father
- 653 eligible for interview
- 551 interviewed (84.4%): 291 males and 260 females
- 84.8% of males and 83.9% of females
- Median age of interview 25, most 23-27
- 39 child refused, 33 parent refused, 13 child not found, 14 elusive, 3 aggressive/problematic
- 534/624 in UK/Ireland interviewed (85.4%)
- 17/29 abroad interviewed (58.6%)
- Current analyses based on G3 males

Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development

Generation 1

Parents interviewed once a year when boy aged 8-15

Generation 2

411 boys interviewed 9 times up to age 48 (93%)

Generation 3

551 interviewed (84%): 291 males and 260 females

Intergenerational Transmission of Self-Reported Offending

- 1. To what extent does self-reported offending of the G2 males predict self-reported offending of the G3 males? The intergenerational transmission of different types of offences is studied. Self-reported offending of the G2 males at ages 18 and 32 is compared with self-reported offending of the G3 males (at average age 25).
- 2. What variables are significantly related to self-reported offending of the G2 males and to self-reported offending of the G3 males? These variables are potential mediators.
- 3. To what extent does the predictive power of G2 self-reported offending decrease after controlling for these potential mediators (measured when G2 was aged 32)?

Prevalence of SRO: G2 at age 18 versus G3

Offence	% G2	% G3
Burglary	16.7	7.2
Theft of vehicle	25.4	13.4
Theft from vehicle	19.8	10.0
Shoplifting	29.3	42.6
Theft from machine	29.6	6.2
Vandalism	39.3	40.2
Assault	71.7	60.5
Marijuana	28.5	52.6
Class A drug	7.7	42.3
Class B drug	12.6	10.7
Drunk driving	21.9	23.4
High SRD (5+ out of 11)	23.4	23.4

Percent of G3 high SRO vs G2 low or high SRO at 18

Offence	% G2L	% G2H	OR
Burglary	4.9	16.4	3.77*
Theft of vehicle	13.7	12.3	0.89
Theft from vehicle	7.7	21.1	3.20*
Shoplifting	41.1	50.0	1.43
Theft from machine	6.2	7.1	1.15
Vandalism	35.7	45.5	1.50
Assault	41.7	67.0	2.84*
Marijuana	48.8	64.2	1.88*
Class A drug	41.9	45.0	1.14
Class B drug	11.4	6.3	0.52
Drunk driving	21.5	30.1	1.58
High SRO (5+ out of 11)	17.2	42.0	3.48*

Possible Mediators Between G2 and G3 SRO

Mediator	G2OR	G3OR
<u>Parental</u>		
Young father	2.11*	1.49
Young mother	1.24	1.62
Parental conflict	2.15*	1.91*
Divorced	2.27*	2.02*
Child elsewhere	5.17*	2.86*

Possible Mediators Between G2 and G3 SRO

Mediator	G2OR	G3OR
<u>Family</u>		
Physical punishment	0.88	2.23*
Poor supervision	2.28*	2.59*
<u>Socioeconomic</u>		
Low take-home pay	2.95*	2.14*
Low social class	2.37*	1.49
Currently unemployed	9.36*	2.45*
High unemployment	6.30*	2.10*
<u>Housing</u>		
Poor housing	3.57*	2.85*
Renting	4.41*	2.54*
In London	2.93*	3.14*

Possible Mediators Between G2 and G3 SRO

Mediator	G2OR	G3OR
<u>Individual</u>		
High impulsiveness	2.13*	1.31
Anti-establishment attitude	3.26*	2.27*
Aggressive attitude	4.14*	1.19
Alcoholic (CAGE)	3.52*	2.78*
<u>Behaviour</u>		
Heavy drinking	5.95*	2.21*
Binge drinking	6.93*	4.11*

Mediation Analysis for G2 at age 18



- What mediators reduce the strength of the relationship between G2 and G3 SRO?
- No mediators: OR = 3.48*
- Renting: OR = 2.71*
- Add parental conflict: OR = 2.43*
- Add child elsewhere: OR = 2.19*
- Add poor supervision: OR = 2.07
- Add anti-establishment attitude: OR = 2.00
- Add in London (Renting goes out): OR = 1.90
- Add divorced (child elsewhere goes out): OR = 1.89
- Add poor housing: OR = 1.73

Analyses of G2 at age 32



- All analyses were repeated for G2 at age 32
- SRO prevalence was lower at age 32 than at age 18 (except drunk driving: 21.9% at 18, 43.4% at 32)
- Two extra offences included: fraud and theft from work
- Total SRO scales based on 13 offences for G2 and G3
- Significant intergenerational transmission for assault (OR = 1.96) and marijuana use (OR = 3.64), and for the total SRO scale (OR = 3.09)
- Most important mediators between G2 at 32 and G3: renting, anti-establishment attitude, poor housing
- OR decreased from 3.09 to 2.21 but was still significant

Targets for Intervention



- Socio-economic deprivation: low income, poor housing, renting, in London
- High unemployment
- Poor child-rearing, poor parental supervision
- Parental conflict
- Disrupted families: separation of children from father
- Anti-establishment attitude
- Problem drinking
- Target criminal families to reduce intergenerational transmission, and focus on childhood risk factors in these families to identify children who are especially at risk

Possible Intervention Programmes



- Parent training (to improve child-rearing and parental supervision)
- Cognitive-behavioural skills training (to reduce antisocial attitudes and increase self-control)
- Vocational training (to reduce unemployment and socioeconomic deprivation)
- Relationship education (to improve family relationships)
- Other programmes designed to reduce offending (e.g. problem drinking and drug programmes) would be highly desirable (see Farrington & Welsh, 2007, for reviews of effective programmes).

Conclusions



- 1. The intergenerational transmission of self-reported offending was less strong than for convictions but was significant in many cases.
- 2. Intergenerational transmission was strongest for burglary, theft from vehicles, and assault by the G2 male at age 18, and for assault and marijuana use by the G2 male at age 32.
- 3. Self-reported offending scores of the G2 male at ages 18 and 32 significantly predicted the same self-reported offending scores of the G3 male at the average age of 25.

Conclusions (continued)



- 4. The intergenerational transmission of self-reported offending was reduced considerably after controlling for important mediators: the G2 male renting, living in poor housing and in London, parental conflict, divorce, and separation from children, and the G2 male having anti-establishment attitudes at age 32.
- 5. The identified mediators suggest risk factors that could be targeted to reduce the intergenerational transmission of offending: socio-economic deprivation, poor child-rearing, disrupted families, and anti-establishment attitudes.
- What results would be obtained for the intergenerational transmission of other types of antisocial behaviour, e.g. binge drinking, sexual promiscuity, gambling?
- 6. What results would be obtained for G2 and G3 females?