#### IRB SYNOPSIS OF PROPOSAL

Every application submitted for review and approval shall have attached to it a page organized in numerical brief paragraph form as outlined below.

**A TEST OF INTERACTIONAL THEORY AND THE INTERACTIVE EFFECT OF CLOSE PEERS ON DELINQUENCY**

1. Identify the sources of the potential subjects, derived materials or data. Describe the characteristics of the subject population, such as their anticipated number, age, sex, ethnic background, and state of health. Identify the criteria for inclusion or exclusion. Explain the rationale for the use of special classes of subjects, such as fetuses, pregnant women, children, institutionalized mentally disabled, prisoners, or others, especially those whose ability to give voluntary informed consent may be in question.

**The subjects have already been selected and interviewed. This study is a secondary data analysis.**

1. Describe the procedures for recruitment of subjects and the consent procedures to be followed. Include the circumstances under which consent will be solicited and obtained, who will seek it, the nature of information to be provided to prospective subjects, and the methods of documenting consent. (Include applicable consent form(s) for review.) If written consent is not to be obtained, this should be clearly stated and justified.

**The subjects have already been selected and interviewed. This study is a secondary data analysis. Also, no personal identifiers are contained in the data I will analyze.**

**For completeness, however, the following descriptions (data from two studies will be analyzed) are offered:**

1. **Data from waves 3-5 of National Youth Survey (Elliott, 1979) will be used. The National Youth Survey (NYS) is a prospective cohort study, and data have been collected at 7 time points from 1976 to 1986. Waves 3-5 were collected annually from 1978-1980, and the previous year is the reference period for each wave. A multistate, cluster sampling technique was employed to select households from the continental United States, the area population, and target subjects were American youth born in the years 1959 through 1965 (Elliott, Ageton, Huizinga, Knowles, & Canter, 1983, p. 5). This design, employed in 1976, generated a sample of 2,360 eligible participants (11 to 17 years old), of which 1,725 (73%) agreed to participate in the study. To address whether nonparticipation resulted in selection bias, characteristics (such as age, sex, and race) of nonparticipating subjects and participating subjects were compared, and the researchers found little difference between the groups (Elliott et al., 1989, p. 3).**
2. **Data from waves 4-6 of the Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS) will be used for replication. The RYDS, like the NYS, is a large-scale and ongoing prospective cohort study, and data have been collected at 14 time points from 1988 to 2008. The RYDS is one of three projects started in 1986 with funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; the others are the Denver Youth Study, and the Pittsburg Youth Study (Thornberry & Krohn, 2003b, p. 6; Thornberry, Lizotte, Krohn, Smith, & Porter, 2003; Huizinga, Weiher, Espiritu, & Esbensen, 2003; Loeber, Farrington, Stouthamer-Loeber, Moffitt, Caspi, White, Wei, & Beyers, 2003). Like the NYS, these studies are widely known and have contributed largely to the developmental or life-course model currently dominating criminology (see Thornberry & Krohn, 2003b, pp. 1-9).**

**Subjects in the RYDS were selected on exposure variables. The RYDS oversampled subjects who were at high-risk for drug use and serious delinquency, and did this in three ways. First, census tracts were stratified by the proportion of residents who had been arrested by the Rochester Police in 1986. Subjects living in tracts with higher resident arrest rates had higher probabilities of being selected. Second, males are overrepresented (75% male) since they are more likely to engage in crime (Thornberry et al., 1991, p. 15). Third, the target population was 7th and 8th grade public-school-students in the Rochester, New York system. This age group allows for monitoring the onset and development of delinquent behavior.**

**Although the target sample size was 1,000, the investigators allowed for a 25% refusal rate. Before refusals took place, 1,334 subjects were selected and eligible. As cited in Rivera (2002, p. 84), the refusal rates did not greatly affect demographic distributions or disrupt the study’s sample design (Farnworth, Thornberry, Lizotte, & Krohn, 1991, p. 9).**

**The first 9 waves were conducted at 6 month intervals from 1988 to 1992. By wave 12 in 1997, about 85% of the original 1,000 were reinterviewed (846 of 1,000). A variety of techniques for sample retention were used, and attrition remained relatively low. More importantly, little evidence exists for systematic attrition. The demographic makeup of the sample did not change much by even the twelfth wave of collection (Thornberry, Lizotte et al., 2003, pp. 16-21). Overall, the investigators report relatively low attrition and little evidence for selection bias.**

1. Describe the project’s methodology in detail. If applicable, detail the data collection procedures, the testing instruments, the intervention(s), etc. If using a survey, questionnaire, or interview, please provide a copy of the items or questions.

**This project will simply be a secondary analysis of existing data. The analysis will include applying various multiple regression techniques to include OLS, Tobit, Negative Binomial, and Logistic regression. SPSS and Stata will be used.**

**In terms of the hypotheses guiding the research, this research will either support or reject each of the following statements. (1) Being delinquent in the past increases the chance of being delinquent in the future. (2) Being delinquent in the past increases the chance of hanging around with delinquents in the future. (3) Hanging around with delinquents in the past increases the chances of hanging out with delinquents in the future. (4) Hanging around with delinquents in the past increases the chances of being delinquent in the future. (5) Hanging around heavily with delinquents in the past heavily increases the chances of being delinquent in the future.**

**Each of the above statements can be thought of in terms of a diagram. In this diagram, arrows are drawn departing from the cause and arriving at the effect. For example, an arrow will be drawn from the amount of delinquency in the past to the amount of delinquency in the future. Because this arrow connects the cause to the effect, it is known as a causal pathway. The statistical part, or the quantitative method that will be used, is called a structural equation model. A special case of this technique and a more descriptive name for it is path analysis. In path analysis, the paths, or the causal arrows, are analyzed. More specifically the arrows or paths are quantified. In other words, a number value will be given to each arrow. A larger cause and effect relationship will correspond to a larger number value assigned to the arrow.**

1. Describe any potential risks — physical, psychological, social, legal or other — and state their likelihood and seriousness. Describe alternative methods, if any, that were considered and why they will not be used.

**This project will simply be a secondary analysis of existing data.**

1. Describe the procedures for protecting against or minimizing any potential risks and include an assessment of the likely effectiveness of those procedures. Include a discussion of confidentiality safeguards, where relevant, and arrangements for providing mental health or medical treatment, if needed.

**The data have been stripped of any personally identifiable information. The National Youth Survey is available from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data housed by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. The data from the RYDS are available by request and the publicly available data have no personal identifiers.**

1. Describe and assess the potential benefits to be gained by the subjects, as well as the benefits that may accrue to society in general as a result of the proposed study.

**Society in general may benefit from knowing the nature of the role peers play in explaining adolescent behavior.**

1. Clearly describe any compensation to be offered/provided to the participants. If extra credit is provided as an incentive, include the percentage of extra credit in relation to the total points offered in the class. Also, if extra credit is provided, describe alternatives to participation in your research for earning extra credit.

**No compensation is offered to subjects in this secondary data analysis.**

1. Discuss the risks in relation to the anticipated benefits to the subjects and society.

**There will be no contact with the subjects for the proposed study and no way to identify subjects. The proposed study poses a low risk.**

1. Identify the specific sites/agencies to be used as well as approval status. Include copies of approval letters from agencies to be used (note: these are required for final approval). If they are not available at the time of IRB review, approval of the proposal will be contingent upon their receipt.

**This is not applicable for the proposed study.**

1. If you are a student, indicate the relationship of the proposal to your program of work and identify your supervising/sponsor faculty member.

**N/A**

1. In the case of student projects, pilot studies, theses, or dissertations, evidence of approval of Supervising Professor or Faculty Sponsor should be included. Thesis and dissertation proposals must be approved by the student’s committee before proceeding to the IRB for review.

**N/A**

1. If the proposed study has been approved by another IRB, attach a copy of the letter verifying approval/disapproval and any related correspondence. If the proposed study has not been reviewed/approved by another IRB, please state this explicitly.

**The proposed research has been approved by the Office of Research Compliance at the University at Albany, State University of New York. The copy of the letter verifying this approval is attached in pdf form.**

1. Identify all individuals who will have access, during or after completion, to the results of this study, whether they be published or unpublished.

**The principal and co-principal investigators and the research team and staff for the Rochester Youth Development Study will have access to this research. In addition, upon successful publication, the readership of the publication outlet will have access to the results of the study.**

**In addition to this synopsis, you are required to submit all relevant documentation for review. This may include, but is not necessarily limited to: 1) recruiting documents (e.g., flyers, letter, e-mails, brochures, etc.), 2) a consent form, 3) an assent form, 4) letters of approval from relevant organization(s), 5) surveys/instruments/questionnaires, esp. those created by the researcher, 6) a list of questions that the researcher may ask (e.g., focus groups questions, questions for qualitative studies, etc.), and 7) all documents in translated versions.**