

Prevalence, frequency, onset, desistance and criminal career duration in self-reports compared with official records

DAVID P. FARRINGTON¹, MARIA M. TTOFI¹,
REBECCA V. CRAGO¹ AND JEREMY W. COID², ¹Institute of
Criminology, Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK; ²Violence Prevention
Research Unit, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK

ABSTRACT

Aim *The main aim of this article is to compare prevalence and frequency, ages of onset and desistance, and criminal career duration, according to self-reports and convictions.*

Method *In the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development, 411 London males have been followed up from age 8 to age 48, in interviews and criminal records.*

Results *Virtually all males admitted at least one of eight offences, compared with about one third who were convicted. In self-reports, the number of offences was over 30 times greater, the age of onset was earlier and the career duration was longer, compared with convictions. However, the age of desistance was generally later according to convictions.*

Conclusions *Self-reported ages of desistance may be affected by increasing concealment with age. The gap between the first self-reported offence and the first conviction provides an opportunity for early intervention. Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

Introduction

Surprisingly little is known about the duration of criminal careers, and almost all prior research on this topic has been based on official records of samples of delinquents or criminals. [Piquero et al. \(2004\)](#) reviewed research on career duration and found that it was typically between five and 15 years for offender samples. Unusually, LeBlanc and Frechette (1989) compared career

duration in official records and self-reports in their Montreal Study and concluded that (between adolescence and the early twenties) duration was longer in self-reports. Because official records are only the tip of the iceberg of offending, it might be expected that, in self-reports, the age of onset would be earlier, the age of desistance would be later and the duration of criminal careers would be longer. It would also be expected that the prevalence and frequency of offending would be higher according to self-reports.

In the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (CSDD, described later), criminal career duration based on convictions has been measured several times. When convictions were studied up to age 40, the average conviction career began at age 18.6, ended at age 25.7 and lasted 7.1 years (Farrington et al., 1998). When the follow-up was extended to age 48, the average career began at age 19.1, ended at age 28.2 and lasted 9.1 years (Farrington et al., 2006). When the follow-up was extended to age 56, the average career began at age 19.7, ended at age 29.5 and lasted 9.8 years (Farrington et al., 2013b).

The age of onset has been studied in self-reports compared with official records. [LeBlanc and Frechette \(1989\)](#) in Montreal found that the average age of onset was 10.8 in self-reports and 14.6 in official records (up to the early twenties). Loeber et al. (2003) in Pittsburgh reported average onset ages of 11.9 and 14.5, respectively, whilst Farrington et al. (2003) in Seattle reported corresponding ages of 12.7 and 15.1. In the CSDD up to age 32, [Kazemian and Farrington \(2005\)](#) discovered that, for males with both self-reports and convictions, average self-report onset ages ranged from 10.7 to 15.2, whilst average conviction onset ages for the same offences ranged from 16.8 to 22.7.

The main aim of the present article is to compare criminal career features, and especially career duration, according to convictions and self-reports, in the CSDD up to age 48. There has been no previous comparative study of career duration in convictions and self-reports beyond the twenties. The key questions addressed in this article are:

1. How does the duration of criminal careers according to self-reports compare with the duration of criminal careers according to convictions?
2. To what extent is a man's career duration according to self-reports related to his career duration according to convictions?
3. How do prevalence, frequency, ages of onset and ages of desistance compare in self-reports and convictions?
4. How does the order of committing different types of offences compare in self-reports and convictions?
5. What is the probability of a self-reported offence leading to a conviction?
6. What is the probability of a conviction offence being self-reported?

Method

The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development

The CSDD is a prospective longitudinal survey of the development of offending and antisocial behaviour in about 400 London males from age 8 onwards. The CSDD began in 1961, and for the first 20 years, it was directed by Donald West. David Farrington started working on it in 1969 and began directing the CSDD in 1982. The most recent data collections have been jointly directed by David Farrington and Jeremy Coid. The CSDD has been funded primarily by the Home Office and secondly by the Department of Health. Results of the study have been described in six books (West, 1969, 1982; West and Farrington, 1973, 1977; Piquero et al., 2007; Farrington et al., 2013b) and in five summary articles (Farrington and West, 1981, 1990; Farrington, 1995, 2003; Farrington et al., 2009).

At the time when they were first contacted in 1961–1962, the boys were all living in a working-class area of South London. The vast majority of the sample was chosen by taking all the boys who were then aged 8–9 and on the registers of six state primary schools within a one mile (1.6 km) radius of a research office, which had been established. In addition to 399 boys from these six schools, 12 boys from a local school for educationally subnormal children were included in the sample, in an attempt to make it more representative of the population of boys living in the area. Therefore, the boys were not a probability sample drawn from a population, but rather a complete population of boys of that age in that area at that time.

Most of the boys (87%) were White in appearance and of British origin, in the sense that they were being brought up by parents who had themselves been brought up in England, Scotland or Wales. On the basis of their fathers' occupations when they were aged 8, 94% of the boys could be described as working class (categories III, IV or V on the Registrar General's scale, describing skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled manual workers), in comparison with the national figure of 78% at that time. The majority of the boys were living in conventional two-parent families with both a father and a mother figure; at age 8–9, only 6% of the boys had no operative father and only 1% had no operative mother. This was, therefore, overwhelmingly a traditional White, urban, working-class sample of British origin.

The males have been interviewed nine times, at ages 8, 10, 14, 16, 18, 21, 25, 32 and 48. At all ages except 21 and 25, the aim was to interview all the males who were still alive, and it was always possible to interview a high proportion: 405 (99%) at age 14, 399 (97%) at age 16, 389 (95%) at age 18, 378 (94%) at age 32 and 365 (93%) at age 48. At age 21, the aim was to interview all the convicted males and an equal number of randomly chosen unconvicted males, and 218 of the 241 target males (90%) were interviewed. At age 25, only 85 males were interviewed, so results obtained in that interview are not used in this article.

Criminal record searches

Up to 1994, searches were carried out in the central Criminal Record Office or National Identification Service (CRO/NIS) at Scotland Yard in London to try to locate findings of guilt of the males and their biological relatives. The minimum age of criminal responsibility in England is 10. The Criminal Record Office contained records of all relatively serious offences committed in Great Britain or Ireland and also acted as a repository for records of minor juvenile offences committed in London. In the case of 18 males who had emigrated outside Great Britain and Ireland by age 32, applications were made to search their criminal records in the eight countries where they had settled, and searches were actually carried out in five countries. Only seven males were counted as not at risk of conviction, because they emigrated permanently before age 21, were not convicted and were not searched abroad.

Convictions were only counted if they were for 'standard list' (more serious) offences, thereby excluding minor crimes such as traffic infractions and simple drunkenness. The most common offences included were thefts, burglaries and unauthorised takings of vehicles, although there were also quite a few offences of violence, vandalism, fraud and drug abuse. Twenty males were considered to be missing on the age of desistance and on the duration of criminal careers, because they died or emigrated before age 32.

Further searches of criminal records of the Study males took place in July 2002 and December 2004 in the PNC, at which time most of the males were aged 51. The Home Office report (Farrington et al., 2006) and many previous analyses were based on the criminal records up to age 50 derived from these searches. A further search of the PNC was completed in March 2011, when most males were aged 57. The criminal records of the males are therefore known up to age 56.

It was decided to count officially recorded cautions as well as convictions in the PNC, because cautions were routinely recorded on a national basis from 1995. We have now gone back and included cautions that were recorded in the files at earlier ages. The definition of what is a 'standard list' offence changed over time. In particular, common assault became a standard list offence in July 1995, drunk driving was added to the standard list from January 1996, and drunk and disorderly offences were added in April 1997. We have included all these types of offences in our analyses.

Self-reported offending

During the interviews at ages 14, 16, 18, 21, 32 and 48, the CSDD males were asked to self-report offences that they had committed that had not necessarily come to the notice of the police. The median ages at interview were 14 years 9 months, 16 years 7 months, 18 years 7 months, 21 years 5 months, 32 years

3 months and 47 years 8 months. (The last interview was considered to be at age 48 because the average age at interview was 48.0.)

The self-report offences were presented on cards, and the males were initially asked to sort the cards according to whether or not they had committed each act during a specified reference period. Where the males had reading difficulties, the cards were read out to them. More detailed questions were then asked about the offences reported, such as how many times the person had done it, the age he had first done it and the age he had last done it. The reference periods were: ever (ages 14 and 16), the last 3 years (age 18), the last 2 years (age 21) and the last 5 years (ages 32 and 48). The self-reports at the oldest age are termed self-reports at age 42–47 and are compared with convictions at age 42–47 in this article.

Ten types of offences were enquired about on most occasions: burglary, theft of motor vehicles, theft from motor vehicles, shoplifting, theft from machines, theft from work, fraud, assault, drug use and vandalism. Questions about theft from work and fraud were first asked at age 21, whereas questions about the other eight types of offences were asked from age 14. The exact wording of the items at the different ages are shown in Farrington (1989). These 10 types of self-reported offences have been compared with the corresponding 10 types of offences leading to convictions (Farrington et al., 2013a). However, assault and drug use are not studied in this article because the males were not asked to report the first and last ages at which they had committed these offences.

For each offence, the earliest age of onset and the latest age of desistance that were reported in the six interviews were recorded. Two males who were missing from both of the first two interviews (at ages 14 and 16) were considered to be not known on age of onset, whilst 21 males who were missing from both of the last two interviews (at ages 32 and 48) were considered to be not known on age of desistance (and on duration). In total, 32 males were not known on duration according to either self-reports or convictions, and consequently our analyses focus on the remaining 379 males who were known on both. In the interests of comparability, only convictions up to age 48 are compared with the self-reports up to age 48. Also, where offences were self-reported at two ages with a gap in between (e.g. at 27–32 and 42–47), it was assumed that the males would have committed these offences during the intervening years at the average rate at which they committed them during the known age ranges.

Results

Criminal career features according to self-reports

Table 1 shows the average ages of onset and desistance, together with the average career duration, for the eight offences according to self-reports. It also shows the percentage of males who admitted each offence (prevalence) and the average number of offences committed by each offender (frequency). For example,

Table 1: Criminal career duration in self-reports

Offence	Prevalence	Frequency	Onset	Desistance	Duration	Onset-percentiles			Desistance-percentiles		
						25	50	75	25	50	75
Burglary	30.34	7.45	14.41	18.08	3.67	13	14	17	14	17	20
Theft of vehicle	36.94	8.35	16.35	18.81	2.46	14	16	17	15	17	21
Theft from vehicle	29.02	9.60	15.18	19.11	3.93	13	15	17	15	17	21
Shoplifting	76.52	13.29	11.30	16.53	5.23	9	11	13	13	14	17
Theft from machine	44.85	6.48	14.71	17.29	2.59	12	14	17	15	17	18
Theft from work	55.50	41.19	20.27	32.09	11.82	16	18	22	25	31	40
Fraud	74.53	80.49	22.74	38.18	15.44	18	21	27	31	40	47
Vandalism	87.86	8.61	10.63	15.24	4.60	9	11	13	13	14	17
Total (8)	98.15	112.39	10.27	35.20	24.93	8	10	12	29	37	47
Total (6)	95.78	30.04	9.95	19.50	9.56	8	10	12	14	17	21

Note: Based on 379 males up to age 48. All figures, except prevalence and frequency, show ages. Six offences exclude theft from work and fraud.

30.3% of males admitted at least one burglary, and the average burglar committed 7.5 burglaries up to age 48. The average age of onset of burglary was 14.4, the average age of desistance was 18.1 and the average burglary career duration was 3.7 years. Table 1 also shows percentiles for onset and desistance. For example, the median age of onset for burglary was 14, whilst the median age of desistance was 17.

The offences with the earliest average ages of onset were vandalism (10.6) and shoplifting (11.3). These also had the earliest average ages of desistance: 15.2 for vandalism and 16.5 for shoplifting. Both offences had a median age of onset of 11 and a median age of desistance of 14. The offences with the latest average ages of onset were theft from work (20.3) and fraud (22.7), and both also had the latest average ages of desistance: 32.1 for theft from work and 38.2 for fraud. The shortest criminal careers were for theft of vehicles (2.5 years) and theft from automatic machines (2.6 years), whilst the longest careers were for theft from work (11.8 years) and fraud (15.4 years).

Almost all males (98.2%) committed at least one of these eight offences at some stage, and the average offender committed 112 offences of these eight types. The average criminal career of 24.9 years began at age 10.3 and finished at age 35.2. However, these results are greatly affected by the rather atypical offences of theft from work and fraud. Focusing only on the other six offences, 95.8% of males admitted at least one of them, and the average offender committed 30 offences. The average criminal career of 9.6 years began at age 9.9 and finished at age 19.5. According to self-reports, most males began between ages 8 and 12 and finished between ages 14 and 21.

Criminal career features according to convictions

Table 2 shows prevalence, frequency, onset, desistance and duration information based on convictions. In all cases, conviction careers were shorter than self-report careers. As expected, in all cases, ages of onset were later according to convictions than according to self-reports. However, apart from theft from work and fraud, ages of desistance were also later according to convictions, which was not expected. Theft from machines (17.2) and theft of vehicles (17.5) had the earliest average ages of onset in convictions, whilst vandalism (25.9) and fraud (28.1) had the latest average ages of onset. Theft from machines (17.6) and theft from vehicles (19.1) had the earliest average ages of desistance, whilst vandalism (27.9) and fraud (28.9) had the latest average ages of desistance.

Over all eight offences, the results were as expected: a shorter criminal career according to convictions (from 19.1 to 25.1) than according to self-reports (from 10.3 to 35.2). However, excluding theft from work and fraud, the results were not as expected, because the age of desistance in convictions (23.4) was later than in self-reports (19.5). Over all 18 types of offences that were included as convictions, the average criminal career lasted 9.2 years, from age 18.9 to age

Table 2: Criminal career duration for convictions

Offence	Prevalence	Frequency	Onset	Desistance	Duration	Onset-percentiles			Desistance-percentiles		
						25	50	75	25	50	75
Burglary	15.04	2.02	18.26	20.96	2.70	15	17	20.5	16.5	19	25
Theft of vehicle	15.04	1.70	17.46	19.58	2.12	15	17	18	16	18	22
Theft from vehicle	7.65	1.38	18.14	19.14	1.00	13.5	17	22	15.5	18	22.5
Shoplifting	8.71	1.67	21.55	24.00	2.45	14	18	29.5	14	19	33.5
Theft from machine	2.64	1.60	17.20	17.60	0.40	11.5	16	23.25	11.5	16.5	23.25
Theft from work	4.56	1.12	22.94	23.09	0.12	19	20	27	19	20	27
Fraud	9.12	1.71	28.12	28.94	0.82	22	26	34	22	28	35
Vandalism	7.12	1.33	25.93	27.89	1.96	17	25	31	18	26	36
Total (8)	34.83	3.31	19.13	25.07	5.94	14	17	20	18	22	31
Total (6)	30.87	3.07	18.15	23.38	5.23	14	16	19	17	21	28
Total (18)	43.01	4.87	18.88	28.10	9.22	14	16	20	19	25	37

Note: Based on 379 males up to age 48. All figures, except prevalence and frequency, show ages. Six offences exclude theft from work and fraud.

28.1 on average. Most males began between ages 14 and 20 and finished between ages 19 and 37.

Comparing self-reports and convictions

Table 3 compares criminal career durations according to self-reports and convictions, based on six, eight or 18 offences. On the basis of eight offences, it is obvious that career durations are longer in self-reports; 169 out of 372 offenders (45.4%) had a duration of 30 years or more in self-reports, compared with only three out of 132 offenders (2.3%) in convictions. However, based on six offences, the results are more similar; 44 out of 363 offenders (12.1%) had a duration of 20 years or more in self-reports, compared with 8 out of 117 offenders (6.8%) in convictions.

Table 4 directly compares career durations in self-reports and convictions for each offender, based on six types of offences. For 117 offenders in both self-reports and convictions, it is obvious that durations in self-reports tend to be related to durations in convictions. For example, 95% of males with a self-report duration of 0–5 years also had a conviction duration of 0–5 years, compared with only 43.5% of males who had a self-report duration exceeding 20 years. Conversely, only 5% of males with a self-report duration of 0–5 years had a conviction duration exceeding 10 years, compared with 30.4% of males who had a self-report duration exceeding 20 years. As expected, the percentage of males who were convicted increased with the duration of criminal careers according to self-reports.

Table 5 shows the probability of a self-reported offence being convicted, and the probability of a convicted offence being self-reported, in five age ranges. The

Table 3: Duration of criminal careers

Duration (years)	Self-reports		Convictions		
	8	6	8	6	18
No crimes	7	16	247	262	216
0	10	17	55	54	54
1–2	10	38	10	8	15
3–5	24	87	18	15	19
6–9	19	93	18	14	10
10–14	18	54	11	14	18
15–19	38	30	8	4	12
20–24	50	15	5	4	15
25–29	34	14	4	2	7
30–34	47	6	2	1	12
35–39	98	7	1	1	1
40+	24	2	0	0	0

Note: Based on 379 males up to age 48. Based on six, eight or 18 types of crimes.

Table 4: Duration in self-reports versus convictions

Conviction duration	Self-report duration				Total
	0–5	6–10	11–20	21+	
0–5	19 (95.0)	23 (67.6)	25 (62.5)	10 (43.5)	77
6–10	0 (0.0)	7 (20.6)	4 (10.0)	6 (26.1)	17
11–20	1 (5.0)	3 (8.8)	9 (22.5)	3 (13.0)	16
21+	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)	2 (5.0)	4 (17.4)	7
Total convicted	20	34	40	23	117
Not convicted	122	78	30	16	246
Total	142	112	70	39	363
% convicted	(14.1)	(30.4)	(57.1)	(59.0)	

Note: Based on 379 males up to 48 and six types of crimes (excluding theft from work and fraud). Percentages in parentheses.

Table 5: Relation between convicted and self-reported offences

	Ad + Con	Admitted	% C/A	Ad + Con	Convicted	% A/C
Burglary	45	160	28.13	45	65	69.23
Theft of vehicle	51	182	28.02	51	65	78.46
Theft from vehicle	20	153	13.07	20	29	68.97
Shoplifting	19	408	4.66	19	28	67.86
Theft from machine	7	218	3.21	7	9	77.78
Theft from work	3	230	1.30	3	9	33.33
Fraud	5	356	1.40	5	11	45.45
Vandalism	12	480	2.50	12	20	60.00
Total (8)	162	2187	7.41	162	236	68.64
Total (6)	154	1601	9.62	154	216	71.30
Age 10–14 (6)	38	812	4.68	38	44	86.36
Age 15–18 (6)	83	604	13.74	83	103	80.58
Age 19–21 (8)	24	193	12.44	24	44	54.55
Age 27–32 (8)	15	389	3.86	15	34	44.12
Age 42–47 (8)	2	189	1.06	2	11	18.18

Note: Based on self-reports and convictions in the five age ranges specified. Six offences exclude theft from work and fraud.

Ad + Con = both admitted and convicted.

probability of a self-reported offence leading to a conviction was highest for burglary (28.1%) and theft of vehicles (28.0%). It was lowest for theft from work (1.3%) and fraud (1.4%). It was highest at ages 15–18 (13.7%) and 19–21 (12.4%) and lowest at age 42–47 (1.1%), possibly because burglary and theft of vehicles tended to be committed at younger ages and theft from work and fraud at older ages. The probability of a convicted offence being self-reported was

highest for theft of vehicles (78.5%) and theft from machines (77.8%) and lowest for theft from work (33.3%) and fraud (45.5%). This probability decreased steadily with age, from 86.4% at age 10–14 to 18.2% at age 42–47.

Conclusions

It was expected that the prevalence and frequency of offending would be higher according to self-reports than according to convictions, and this was indeed found. Over eight offences, there were 112 self-reported offences per offender on average, compared with 3.3 convictions, a ratio of 34 to 1. Between 1% and 28% of different types of offences led to convictions.

It was expected that, in self-reports, the age of onset would be earlier, the age of desistance would be later, and the criminal career duration would be longer. This was indeed found over all eight offences studied in this article. The age of onset in self-reports was 9 years earlier, the age of desistance was 10 years later and the career duration was 19 years longer. However, when the analysis was restricted to six offences, the average age of desistance was later in convictions. This may have been caused by increasing concealment of offences as the men became older. Studies of the validity of self-reports of offending suggest that they are extremely valid for young males but less valid for other demographic groups (e.g. older people and females: see Farrington, 2001). In the present analysis, the probability of a convicted offence being admitted decreased from 86% at age 10–14 and 81% at age 15–18 to 44% at age 27–32 and 18% at age 42–47.

Up to now, virtually nothing is known about the duration of criminal careers based on self-reports. Knowledge about career duration is very important for theory and policy. For example, it is a waste of scarce prison resources to lock someone up who is about to finish his/her criminal career. Kazemian and Farrington (2006) and Kazemian et al. (2007) have provided important information about residual career duration according to convictions and about the extent to which it can be predicted. Several criminological theories focus on career duration; for example, Moffitt (1993) distinguished adolescence-limited offenders with a short career from life-course-persistent offenders with a long career. Previous analyses of the CSDD (e.g. Farrington et al., 2006, 2013b) have documented the extent to which an early age of onset predicts a long criminal career (based on convictions). However, this is the first article to study the duration of criminal careers in both convictions and self-reports up to middle age.

Even based on six offences, the age of onset was 8 years earlier in self-reports and the career duration was over 4 years longer. This 8-year gap between the first offence and the first conviction represents an opportunity to intervene to prevent continued offending, using effective early prevention methods (Farrington and Welsh, 2007). More research is needed on the onset, desistance and duration of criminal careers in convictions and self-reports, linked to both theory and

policy. Also, more research is needed on how to maximise the validity of self-reports by demographic groups other than young males.

References

- Farrington DP (1989) Self-reported and official offending from adolescence to adulthood. In Klein MW (ed.) *Cross-National Research in Self-reported Crime and Delinquency*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer pp. 399–423.
- Farrington DP (1995) The development of offending and antisocial behaviour from childhood: Key findings from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* **36**: 929–964.
- Farrington DP (2001) *What Has Been Learned from Self-reports about Criminal Careers and the Causes of Offending?* London: Home Office (Online Report).
- Farrington DP (2003) Key results from the first 40 years of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. In Thornberry TP, Krohn MD (eds) *Taking Stock of Delinquency: An Overview of Findings from Contemporary Longitudinal Studies*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum pp. 137–183.
- Farrington DP, Welsh BC (2007) *Saving Children from a Life of Crime: Early Risk Factors and Effective Interventions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farrington D, West DJ (1981) The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. In Mednick SA, Baert AE (eds) *Prospective Longitudinal Research: An Empirical Basis for the Primary Prevention of Psychosocial Disorders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press pp. 137–145.
- Farrington D, West DJ (1990) The Cambridge study in delinquent development: A long-term follow-up of 411 London males. In Kerner HJ, Kaiser G (eds) *Kriminalität: Persönlichkeit, Lebensgeschichte und Verhalten (Criminality: Personality, Behaviour and Life History)*. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag pp. 115–138.
- Farrington DP, Lambert S, West DJ (1998) Criminal careers of two generations of family members in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention* **7**: 85–106.
- Farrington DP, Jolliffe D, Hawkins JD, Catalano RF, Hill KG, Kosterman R (2003) Comparing delinquency careers in court records and self-reports. *Criminology* **41**: 933–958.
- Farrington DP, Coid JW, Harnett L, Jolliffe D, Soteriou N, Turner R, West DJ (2006) *Criminal Careers up to age 50 and Life Success up to age 48: New Findings from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. London: Home Office (Research Study No. 299).
- Farrington DP, Coid JW, West DJ (2009) The development of offending from age 8 to age 50: Recent results from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. *Monatsschrift für Kriminologie und Strafrechtsreform (Journal of Criminology and Penal Reform)* **92**: 160–173.
- Farrington DP, Auty KM, Coid JW, Turner RE (2013a) Self-reported and official offending from age 10 to age 56. *European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research* **19**: 135–151.
- Farrington DP, Piquero AR, Jennings WG (2013b) *Offending from Childhood to Late Middle Age: Recent Results from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. New York: Springer.
- Kazemian L, Farrington DP (2005) Comparing the validity of prospective, retrospective and official onset for different offending categories. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* **21**: 137–147.
- Kazemian L, Farrington DP (2006) Exploring residual career length and residual number of offences for two generations of repeat offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* **43**: 89–113.
- Kazemian L, LeBlanc M, Farrington DP, Pease K (2007) Patterns of residual criminal careers among a sample of adjudicated French-Canadian males. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* **49**: 307–340.

- LeBlanc M, Frechette M (1989) *Male Criminal Activity from Childhood Through Youth*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Loeber R, Farrington DP, Petechuk D (2003) *Child Delinquency: Early Intervention and Prevention*. Washington, DC: US Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 186182).
- Moffitt TE (1993) Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review* **100**: 674–701.
- Piquero AR, Brame R, Lynam D (2004) Studying criminal career length through early adulthood among serious offenders. *Crime and Delinquency* **50**: 412–435.
- Piquero AR, Farrington DP, Blumstein A. (2007) *Key Issues in Criminal Career Research: New Analyses of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West DJ (1969) *Present Conduct and Future Delinquency*. London: Heinemann.
- West DJ (1982) *Delinquency: Its Roots, Careers and Prospects*. London: Heinemann.
- West DJ, Farrington DP (1973) *Who Becomes Delinquent?* London: Heinemann.
- West DJ, Farrington DP (1977) *The Delinquent Way of Life*. London: Heinemann.

Address correspondence to: David P. Farrington, Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University, Cambridge, CB3 9DA, UK. Email: dpf1@cam.ac.uk