Freemon, K., Katz, C. M., & Cheon, H. (2025). Immigration status and its relationship with delinquency, drug use, and gang membership in the English-speaking Caribbean. Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 23(4), 348-370.

Immigration status and its relationship with delinquency, drug use, and gang membership in the English-speaking Caribbean

Abstract

Research demonstrates that the foreign-born population engages in less offending than their native-born counterparts. Much of the literature, however, originates in the United States and Europe. The current study examines the individual-level immigration-delinquency link among 11,485 youth in seven English-speaking Caribbean nations using bivariate comparisons and multivariate regression analyses by nation focused on six measures of delinquency. With few exceptions, migrants were not significantly more likely to engage in violence, gang membership, or drug sales. However, we observed mixed results regarding the relationship between immigration status and property offending, and alcohol and marijuana use across several nations, with immigration status serving as a risk factor in some countries and a protective factor in others.

Keywords: immigration, generational status, Caribbean, delinquency

Word count: 8,001

Introduction

While scholarship on immigration status and offending has grown significantly, less research has focused on this issue in destinations beyond developed nations. Some scholars have gone as far as to note that the body of literature on the relationship between immigration and offending "is virtually non-existent in developing nations…[and that]… the academic world is all but silent on how increases in immigration might influence social processes and crime in developing regions" (Wickes & Sydes, 2014, pp. 19-20). This has necessarily resulted in a Western-centric understanding of the issue (Borkowska et al., 2018). Immigration within the Global South is substantial, representing more than one-third of international immigration (Crawley & Teye, 2023), and has increased because of improved knowledge about the opportunities and benefits of living in more developed nations (Yahaya, 2019).

Immigration may benefit the destination developing nation and the migrants; however, it may also represent unique challenges to these nations. On the one hand, formal social control mechanisms are often limited in developing nations, with police, courts, and correctional institutions possessing limited capacity (Katz, 2015). On the other hand, informal social control can be robust and is frequently directed through adverse publicity (Braithwaite & Fisse, 1983). This poses especially significant problems for migrants in developing nations, where they are commonly perceived to have a criminogenic effect (in addition to being viewed as a social, economic, and cultural threat) (Mazza & Villarreal, 2024). Consequently, they frequently face discrimination, xenophobia, and hate crimes by native populations, and violence and discrimination by the criminal justice system (UNODC, 2015).

The present study seeks to help fill the void in research on the relationship between immigration and delinquency by examining individual-level differences in self-reported

offending across immigration status in seven English-speaking Caribbean nations. The Caribbean region is characterized by high immigration and violence rates, with robust youth involvement in violence, making it an ideal setting to examine this relationship (Foss et al., 2013; International Organization for Migration [IOM], 2025). As discussed below, we improve upon limited prior research conducted in developing nations by examining the relationship between the generational status of respondents and their involvement in offending. Specifically, we examine whether second and native-born youth engage in significantly more or less self-reported delinquency, substance use, and gang membership than first-generation youth.

The Relationship between Immigrant Status and Delinquency

While a larger, more robust body of literature has focused on macro-level theories for understanding the relationship between immigration and offending at the macro-level (counties, cities, neighborhoods), such as demographics theories, cultural theories, social disorganization theory, and immigrant enclaves (Ousey & Kubrin, 2018), much less attention has been given to micro-level theories that help explain individual-level differences. In this article, we draw on elements of three micro theories – social control theory, self-control theory, and peer influence theory, which have been noted by Kubrin and Ousey (2023) as being particularly influential in understanding the relationship between immigration and offending.

Social control theory explains delinquency through the quality and strength of ties between youth, their families, and social institutions such as schools (Hirschi, 1969). When attachment is weak or absent with family and social institutions, delinquency is more likely to occur. When there is a strong attachment to family and social institutions, delinquency is less likely to occur (Gottfredson, 2006). The theory posits that the more positive the association, the more youth are bound and guided by their expectations and the more likely they are to conform

to legal norms. When social bonds are weak, youth are less emotionally bonded and, subsequently, less interested in conforming to conventional goals and less likely to engage in conventional activities (Hirschi, 1969). Hirschi (1969) argued that social control is invariant across social characteristics, such as immigration status. However, the strength of social bonds may vary between immigrants and non-immigrants, potentially influencing differences in offending behavior.

Much of the past research on immigration and delinquency has examined the attachment of immigrant youth to their parents and school, interested in how acculturation over time (i.e., adopting the social norms of their resident nation often in contrast to their parents) in these bonds affects offending (Jiang & Peguero, 2017). Youths acculturate to new settings in different ways than their parents, which could weaken family bonds and cultural values and increase offending (Sommers et al., 1994). This assimilation process might be conventional, essentially conforming to middle-class values, or youth might be excluded or assimilated to underclass values. Alternatively, youth may feel increased anxiety assimilating to a new culture or become withdrawn. Studies generally support a shift in immigrant youths' parental or school bonds over time, though some findings are mixed (Jiang & Peguero, 2017).

Self-control theory has also been used to explain the relationship between immigration and delinquency. Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) self-control theory holds that low self-control is a significant factor in determining an individual's participation in offending. They posit that self-control is an enduring attribute, which consists of six dimensions: impulsivity, risk-seeking, preference for physical (rather than mental) activity and simple tasks, self-centeredness, and poor emotional regulation (Grasmick et al., 1993). Research has suggested that self-control is one of the more powerful and robust explanations for a variety of offenses, from minor traffic offenses

to severe crimes such as gun violence (Vazsonyi et al., 2017). Self-control theory has been used to assess whether immigrants possess personality traits that make it more likely that they achieve their goals, which are associated with lower delinquency (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). According to the theory, self-control is instilled by parents during childhood; immigrant parents more often demonstrate high self-control and work motivation and might be more likely to model and encourage positive and prosocial behaviors for their children (Hoeve et al., 2012).

During adolescence, youth increasingly prioritize peer groups, which play a significant role alongside the family in shaping their social development. Peer influence theory posits that a youth's interactions with peers influence their involvement in offending. Peers shape opportunities for delinquency through everyday unstructured activities and situations they encounter (Haynie & Osgood, 2005) and by accepting, promoting, and rewarding specific values and experiences (McGloin & Thomas, 2019). While research suggests strong family social control and obligations may limit immigrant youths' exposure to delinquent peers, migrant youth may be particularly susceptible to peer influence, wanting to fit in and not appear "different" than their peers (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001, p. 91). Indeed, in the United States, DiPietro and McGloin (2012) found that first and second-generation youth were more susceptible to deviant peer influence than native-born youth.

Research on Immigrant Status and Delinquency

A robust body of literature examines the link between immigration status and delinquency. However, as described by Caraballo (2024), "inconsistent definitions, categorizations, and measurements of migration and migrant populations mask the complexities of systems, processes, and outcomes" (p. 3). Delinquency research has historically measured immigration status in two ways: a binary measure of whether someone is foreign-born or not and

by generational status (i.e., first, second, or third-plus generation). While the binary measure is more common in research because of limitations in data sources used to study this topic, using this measure may obscure the complicated process of assimilation across generations; indeed, past research examining violent victimization suggests the aggregate measure conceals nuanced relationships by immigrants' legal and national statuses (Caraballo, 2024).

Despite measurement complexity, the academic literature on immigration and crime indicates an unrelated or negative relationship (Ousey & Kubrin, 2018). Described as the 'immigrant paradox,' the idea holds that although immigrants might be more disadvantaged in societies, they commit less crime (MacDonald & Saunders, 2012). Similar mixed, but more often negative, findings exist for the relationship between immigration and youth delinquency (Tilley et al., 2021; Sirin et al., 2022; Juárez et al., 2022; Svensson et al., 2012). These studies nearly exclusively examine migration to the Global North, with most studies conducted in the United States, Europe, Canada, Australia, and Israel.

For instance, Tilley et al. (2021) examined 91 studies conducted in the United States and found that first-generation youth had fewer externalizing problems (which included conduct problems, delinquency, and substance use) than second-generation and native youth. Drawing from 43 studies, all conducted in the United States, Canada, Europe, or Israel, Sirin et al. (2022) found that acculturation is positively associated with alcohol use; second-generation youth have higher alcohol use than first-generation immigrants. Subgroup analyses suggest that the relationship between alcohol consumption and acculturation is only significant in the United States compared to other destination nations. Likewise, Juárez et al. (2022) also found that immigrants have lower odds of smoking or alcohol use compared to native-born youth, drawing from 123 studies of youth in the United States, Canada, Europe, Israel, and Australia. In contrast

to these aggregate findings, in some contexts, immigration is not related to delinquency. Svensson et al. (2012) did not find significant differences between foreign- and native-born youths regarding delinquency in Sweden. However, they found that processes related to delinquency, such as peer association, functioned alike between foreign- and native-born groups.

Most of these perspectives are applied to immigration from low- to high-income nations. It may be, in contrast, that the immigration-delinquency link is situation and circumstance-dependent. For example, Kroneberg (2018) examined delinquency across four European nations, finding differences by country across individuals' generational status and concluding that no clear relationship pattern existed. Marshall and Marshall (2018), using data from 27 nations, reported considerable *between-country* differences more than *within-nation* differences between native and migrant youth on morality and educational experiences. There have been few cross-national comparisons of the immigration and delinquency link, which is an important oversight given potential context-specific variability.

Immigration and Delinquency in the English-speaking Caribbean

Historical immigration has influenced the current ethnic and cultural diversity of the Caribbean. In early European colonial societies, forced and coerced immigration brought enslaved Africans and indentured servants from East India and later China to the region. Movement remains prevalent after independence across nations (Beaton et al., 2017; UN-DESA, 2020; IOM, 2025). Today, nearly 22% of the Caribbean population lives abroad (Beaton et al., 2017).

There are two international immigration paths: immigration out of the region, primarily to the United States and Canada or, less often, to Europe, and inter-regional immigration (i.e., moving from one Caribbean nation to another within the Caribbean). While the first path is most

common, with approximately 75% of Caribbean migrants living outside the region, movement among regional nations has increased in recent years, increasing by 16% since 2020. Individuals from Guyana and Jamaica are most likely to relocate within the region, with Trinidad and Tobago and Antigua and Barbuda being top destination countries (UN-DESA, 2020; IOM, 2025). Within the region, variations exist in the foreign-born population residing in different nations. The World Bank International Migrant Stock 2015 estimates[1] range from 3.7% in Trinidad and Tobago to 30.6% in Antigua and Barbuda. This figure stood at 9.2% in Dominica, 6.6% in Grenada, 13.4% in St. Kitts and Nevis, 6.9% in St. Lucia, and 4.2% in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

The Caribbean Community (CARICOM), an intergovernmental organization comprising 15 nations, established the free movement of people across member states in 2001 through Article 46 of the Revised Treaty of Chaguaramas, facilitating regional mobility. Research suggests that from 2010 to 2019, many of those who immigrated out of the region were educated women who often worked in nursing and other healthcare professions (Jaupart, 2023), and immigrated to the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. A lack of opportunities was a primary motivation for relocation, with highly skilled and unskilled workers leaving their home countries in search of better work and compensation (IOM, 2019; Jaupart, 2023). Another motivation for migration was to access higher education or to reunite with family members who had already relocated. While high violence rates in the Caribbean may serve as a push factor toward immigration, this relationship still needs further research (IOM, 2019). In recent years, large-scale emigration from Cuba, Haiti, and Venezuela has been driven by political repression, declining living conditions, and safety concerns – with Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago as major destinations for Venezuelans based on proximity (Anatol & Kangalee, 2021; IOM, 2025;

Jaupart, 2023). Other more recent trends in migration in the region recognize the impact of natural disasters (i.e., hurricanes) and rising sea levels, which may contribute to future displacement (Jaupart, 2023).

Attention to the relationship between immigration and delinquency in the Caribbean is largely absent in prior literature, with few studies considering any measure of migrant status. Research inquiry has recently grown, possibly due to the exodus of Venezuelan migrants throughout the Latin American and Caribbean region (Anatol & Kangalee, 2021). A sizable number of these migrants have settled in Trinidad and Tobago. In their review, Anatol and Kangalee (2021, p. 262-3) note, "anecdotal evidence suggests that most citizens of Trinidad and Tobago believe that immigration increases crime and even more of them believe that the 'Venezuelan wave' has contributed to the rising crime problem in the county." However, data from Peru and Chile suggest that Venezuelan immigrants are less involved in the criminal justice system than the native population; in contrast, Venezuelan migrants in Colombia have lower arrest rates for violent crimes but higher arrest rates for overall crimes (Bahar et al., 2020). It is unclear if foreign-born youth are overrepresented in justice systems or among offenders.

Whether or not a youth is born outside the nation they reside may not be associated with delinquency when migration occurs within the same region—such as within the English-speaking Caribbean—where cultural and structural similarities may exist. This stands in contrast to migration outside in the region, which often involves greater travel distances and more pronounced cultural changes, potentially influencing delinquency. The English-speaking Caribbean nations in the current study, which stretch from Antigua and Barbuda in the Eastern Caribbean to Trinidad and Tobago off the coast of South America, share cultural, social, and political histories as former colonial nations. Designated small island developing states (SIDS),

their populations similarly experience geographic isolation, poverty, high import and export costs, vulnerability to exogenous shocks like climate change, and distinct social control mechanisms (Scott & Staines, 2021). The presence of "islandness" experienced by each study nation results in limited social networks and shared attitudes and behaviors developed over time into communities with "distinct normative structures and distinct forms of social control" (Scott & Staines, 2021, p. 596). These nations also experience some of the world's highest crime and violence rates, including among youth (Foss et al., 2013).

Method

Data

We examine the association between individual-level immigration status and delinquency in the English-speaking Caribbean, using data collected from Form 5 public secondary school students (comparable to 10th Grade in the United States) between 2014 and 2015 in Trinidad and Tobago and six Eastern Caribbean nations: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.[2] The data were collected as part of a larger project sponsored by USAID, who identified the study nations as part of a larger needs assessment of issues facing youth in the region.

The study utilized a population-based methodological approach in the six smaller nations and employed representative sampling methods in the larger nation. Specifically, all public schools in the six Eastern Caribbean nations were eligible and invited to participate. 100% of schools agreed to participate in Antigua and Barbuda (n=11), Grenada (n=18), St. Kitts and Nevis (n=8), St. Lucia (n=23), and St. Vincent and the Grenadines (n=26); only one school out of 15 declined to participate in Dominica. Because of the size of Trinidad and Tobago, a

nationally representative sample of schools was selected to participate (through random selection), and 74.4% of invited schools agreed to participate (n=99).

All students present in their homerooms on the scheduled day were eligible to participate (the day of the survey differed by school with the survey administered by project staff and contractors). The survey took respondents about 45 to 60 minutes to complete. Of the 17,675 enrolled students, 12,221 completed the survey for a student response rate of about 69%. However, individual response rates varied across nations: Antigua and Barbuda (82.2%), Dominica (87.1%), Grenada (71.6%), St. Kitts and Nevis (70.2%), St. Lucia (74.7%), St. Vincent and the Grenadines (71.5%), and Trinidad and Tobago (63.4%). These rates are comparable to student response rates for prior studies using passive consent procedures in the United States (Esbensen et al., 2001).

The Eurogang Working Group (EWG) created the survey instrument to collect data on the scope and nature of Troublesome Youth Group problems. We only included responses from youth between 15 and 18 years old in the present study See Katz et al. (2023) for a full review of the study methodology.

Measures

Dependent variable: Delinquency. We examine six delinquency outcome measures: violent offending variety, property offending variety, alcohol use, marijuana use, drug selling, and gang membership. For violent and property offending, if the youth engaged in an offense at least once in the previous year, the offense was coded “1”. Variety scores were created by summing all violent and property offenses, respectively. Higher values indicate higher levels of delinquency. Prior research suggests that variety scores are a robust and reliable measure of offending (Sweeten, 2012).

The violence variety score measure relied on five items that asked, "During the past 12 months, how often have you: (a) Hit someone with the idea of hurting them, (b) Carried a hidden weapon (of any kind) for protection, (c) Attacked someone with a weapon (of any kind), (d) Used a weapon (of any kind) or force to get money or things from people, and (e) Been involved in fights with other groups." The property offense variety score measure included six items that asked, "During the past 12 months, how often have you: (a) Avoided paying for something such as movies or the bus, (b) Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you, (c) Illegally spray painted a wall or building, (d) Stolen or tried to steal something worth LESS than EC$100, (e) Stolen or tried to steal something worth MORE than EC$100, and (f) Gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something." As shown in Table 1, the average violent variety score across the sample was 1.52, and the average property variety score was 1.18.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Alcohol use, marijuana use, and drug selling are binary measures coded “1” if the respondent had used alcohol, marijuana, or sold drugs at least once in the past 12 months. These measures were coded “0” if the respondent had not used alcohol, marijuana, or sold drugs in the past 12 months. Most respondents (72.9%) had used alcohol at least once in the prior year, 27.1% had used marijuana, and 9.7% had sold drugs. Gang membership is a binary measure coded “1” if the youth reported current gang membership and “0” if they reported not being currently involved in a gang. Approximately 11.8% of the total sample was gang-involved. A relatively high number of cases (16.7%) were missing for this measure.

Independent variable: Generational status. Respondents were asked: "In which country(ies) were you and your parents born?" with different response options for themselves and their parents. They could select from nine Caribbean nations[3], do not know, or specify another

location. Respondents who did not answer or did not know where they or their parents were born were excluded from the current study (n=182; 1.6% of the total sample). In line with prior literature (Jiang & Peguero, 2017), we created three categories for generational status: first generation, second generation, and native born. When the nation of origin did not match the residence nation, we coded the respondent as first generation. If the respondent was born inside their current nation and at least one parent (specified as mother or father) was born outside their current country, we coded the respondent as second generation. Respondents were labeled native born when they and their parents were born in the nation of residence.

Theoretical control measures. We include six control variables aligned with social control, self-control, and peer association theories: parental attachment, parental supervision, school commitment, impulsivity, risk-seeking, and peer pressure. The measures are averaged responses to items contained in scales (available upon request). Across all measures, higher values indicate higher parental attachment, parental supervision, school commitment, impulsivity, risk-seeking, and peer pressure. Prior analyses using the same data find these scales reliable and valid in the Caribbean context (Cheon et al., 2023). Table 1 presents the scale scores and ranges.

Demographic control measures. Finally, we include demographic control measures. Self-reported gender, ethnicity, and age at the time of the survey were asked of each respondent. Gender response options included male and female. Ethnicity responses were re-coded into four groups: African descent, East Indian descent, Indigenous, and mixed/other race. As displayed in Table 1, about 43% of the sample was male, and the average age was 16.29. Almost half (49%) of respondents were of African descent, 20% were of East Indian descent, 3% were Indigenous, and 27% identified as mixed or another race. In the final sample, 6.3% of respondents resided in Antigua and Barbuda, 6.6% in Dominica, 9.2% in Grenada, 4% in St.

Kitts and Nevis, 16.6% in St. Lucia, 9.2% in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and 48.2% in Trinidad and Tobago.

Analytic Strategy

First, we present residents' generational statuses by nation. Second, we compare bivariate differences across generational statuses and delinquency using *t*- and Pearson's chi-square tests. Third, we run a series of regressions (i.e., Poisson, negative binomial, and logistic) by nation with each delinquency outcome measure to examine generational statuses' unique variances net of demographic characteristics and theoretical control factors using listwise deletion for missing data.[4] Variance inflation factors (VIF=1.27-1.42) and correlation checks did not indicate multicollinearity concerns. We examine nations individually to account for differing migrant prevalence and patterns and unique national contexts within the region that may influence needs and opportunities.

Results

Generational Status among Youth in the English-speaking Caribbean

As shown in Table 2, 8.6% of the sample are first-generation migrants, 9% are second-generation migrants, and 82.4% are native born. There is variation by nation. Over 25% of youth in Antigua and Barbuda reported being foreign born, followed by 19.8% in St. Kitts and Nevis, 11.6% in Grenada, 10.9% in Dominica, 7.7% in St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and 5% in Trinidad and Tobago. Respondents from Antigua and Barbuda also reported the highest proportion of second-generation migrants (32%), followed by St. Kitts and Nevis (11.7%), Grenada (10.2%), St. Vincent and the Grenadines (10%), St. Lucia (8.6%), Dominica (6.8%), and Trinidad and Tobago (5.9%). Generational statuses were significantly different

between all nations except for between St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines (at a 95% confidence level).

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Bivariate Results by Foreign-born and Generational Status

Table 3 presents the differences in delinquency for first-generation, second-generation, and native-born youth within each nation. Only statistically significant differences are reported in the significance column. The results indicate that in St. Kitts and Nevis, second-generation ($\bar{x}$=1.83) and native-born youth ($\bar{x}$=1.83) engage in more violence than first-generation youth ($\bar{x}$=1.33). In Trinidad and Tobago, first ($\bar{x}$=1.59) and second-generation youth ($\bar{x}$=1.75) reported significantly more violence in the prior year compared to native-born youth ($\bar{x}$=1.37). Similarly, for property offending, second-generation youth ($\bar{x}$=1.93) reported higher levels of property offending than first-generation youth ($\bar{x}$=1.33). Both first ($\bar{x}$=1.21) and second-generation youth ($\bar{x}$=1.15) in Trinidad and Tobago participated in more property offending than native-born youth ($\bar{x}$=0.90).

In Grenada, significantly more native-born youth (79.7%) reported alcohol use than second-generation youth (70.1%). Similarly, in St. Kitts and Nevis, second-generation (79.3%) and native-born youth (73.1%) were significantly more likely to self-report alcohol use than first-generation youth (60.0%). Native-born youth (84.9%) in St. Lucia reported more alcohol use than first-generation youth (77.6%). Conversely, significantly more first-generation youth (44.8%) in St. Lucia reported marijuana use. First (30.6%) and second-generation youth (27.0%) in Trinidad and Tobago were significantly more likely to self-report marijuana use than native-born youth (21.1%). Youth in Trinidad and Tobago were the only respondents to report significant differences in generational status and drug sales. Native-born youth in Trinidad and

Tobago were less likely to report drug sales in the past year compared second-generation youth (7.8% vs. 12.3%).

Youth in four of the seven nations reported significant differences in gang membership by generation status. First (31.8%) and second-generation youth (32.6%) in Dominica were significantly more likely to self-report gang membership than native-born youth (19.5%). Second-generation youth (23.8%) in St. Lucia reported higher gang involvement than native-born youth (17.0%). First-generation youth (23.6%) similarly reported higher gang membership than native-born youth (13.5%) in St. Vincent and the Grenadines. In Trinidad and Tobago, first-generation (17.1%) youth were more likely to self-report gang membership than second-generation youth (10.5%) and native-born youth (8.4%).

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Multivariate Results by Foreign-born and Generational Status

After controlling for demographic and theoretical factors, we then examine whether the associations between delinquency and generational status persisted. Table 4 presents unstandardized coefficients and standard errors for the key variables, with first-generation youth as the reference group, compared to second and native-born youth; full results including control measures are available in Supplemental Table 1. In St. Vincent and the Grenadines, second-generation youth compared to first-generation youth were significantly less likely to use marijuana (b=-0.916, p<0.01). In Trinidad and Tobago, native-born youth were significantly less likely to self-report property offending (b=-0.187, p<0.05), marijuana use (b=-0.387, p<0.05), and gang membership (b=-0.757, p<0.01) than first-generation youth. Conversely, in St. Kitts and Nevis, native-born youth were more likely to self-report violence (b=0.248, p<0.05) and alcohol use (b=0.611, p<0.05). Second-generation youth in St. Kitts and Nevis were more likely

to report property offending than first-generation youth (b=0.246, p<0.05). Finally, native-born youth in St. Lucia self-reported being more likely to use alcohol (b=0.723, p<0.01) compared to first-generation youth.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Broadly, the relationship between immigration status and delinquency is unique by country and delinquency type. On the one hand, in 75 of the 84 (89.3%) possible outcomes examined (i.e., seven nations by six outcomes by two generational comparisons), we observed no significant difference between generation status and delinquency. On the other hand, in 5 of the 84 (6.0%) possible outcomes examined, we observed that foreign-born youth were significantly less likely to self-report delinquency. In 4 of the 84 (4.8%) possible outcomes examined, we observed that foreign-born youth were significantly more likely to self-report delinquency.

Discussion

We hypothesized in the current study that first-generation youth in the English-speaking Caribbean engage in less delinquency than second-generation or native-born youth. While native-born youth in some nations participated in more problem behavior, our findings, when taken together, offer mixed findings on the importance of immigration status when examining delinquency in the region. In only two countries, generational status was significantly related to violent and property offending. Specifically, foreign-born youth in Trinidad and Tobago self-reported more property offending, but in St. Kitts and Nevis, foreign-born youth self-reported less violent and property offending. In both nations, these differences emerged between first and native-born youth (also first and second generation for property offenses in St. Kitts and Nevis). However, it should also be noted that foreign-born youth in Trinidad and Tobago had lower property offending than native-born youth in all the other study nations.

Differences in delinquency between first and later-generation youth were more pronounced for substance use. First-generation youth in St. Kitts and Nevis and St. Lucia were significantly less likely to self-report alcohol use than native-born youth. However, in Antigua and Barbuda, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago, first-generation youth were significantly more likely to self-report marijuana use than second or native-born youth. In all seven nations, first-generation youth were no more likely to sell drugs than second or native-born youth, and gang membership was not associated with generational status except in Trinidad and Tobago, where foreign-born youth were significantly more likely to self-report gang membership than native-born youth.

Overall, our findings align with prior literature on the relationship between immigration status and delinquency in other regions, which generally report either a negative or unrelated association (Ousey & Kubrin, 2018; Kubrin & Ousey, 2023). This suggests that whether a youth is a first or second-generation immigrant, they are not significantly more likely to engage in delinquency compared to someone who is native born (Tilley et al., 2021; Sirin et al., 2022; Juárez et al., 2022; Svensson et al., 2012). While our data do not allow us to examine the causal mechanisms behind the lack of association between immigration status and delinquency, prior literature indicates several possible explanations. First, the status of individuals who migrate to these nations may shed light on the relationship; it could be that many migrants entering these nations are skilled, educated, and possess social and financial capital—factors negatively associated with delinquency and offending, which might buffer migrant youth from engaging in such behavior (Reid et al., 2005). Second, migrants and their children may place a higher value on the social and/or economic opportunities provided to them compared to native-born residents and may experience fewer stressors or strains in their circumstances after migrating. This

ultimately might reduce the likelihood of their offending or encourage a rule-abiding attitude (Sander, 1999). Third, the lack of relationship with delinquency may be explained by fear. Some argue that migrants are reluctant to draw attention to themselves through illegal behavior due to concerns that they and their families could face deportation for delinquent or criminal acts—particularly relevant if a youth or one of their family members is undocumented (Lee et al., 2001; Guerra & Curry, 2024).

Acculturation (i.e., when someone modifies or adapts their culture while living near members of another culture) may also influence the relationship – and has often been used to explore the immigration-delinquency link outside the region (Kaplan & Marks, 1990). A large body of scholarship shows that increasing levels of acculturation are positively associated with various delinquent outcomes among youth in the United States (Bersani et al., 2014). This research suggests that adopting American culture may directly encourage and reward delinquent behaviors (Mendez et al., 2012) or indirectly promote individualism (Messner & Rosenfeld, 2012). However, it remains unclear how the acculturation process influences immigrant youth in Caribbean nations. Future research in the region should examine these and other possible explanations for the lack of a positive association between immigration and delinquency.

We did find, however, that migrant youth contribute disproportionately to property crime in Trinidad and Tobago and are more likely to report marijuana use in Antigua and Barbuda, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago. Youth, in general, encounter social, familial, and educational strains and stressors that can influence delinquency. Migrant youth face these and additional stressors related to assimilation that might result in the increased property offending and drug use presented here. Higher levels of property offending among first-generation youth in Trinidad and Tobago might be attributable to economic strain. Prior research

has shown that poorer youth in wealthier communities are more likely to steal (Hannon, 2002). Trinidad and Tobago is one of the wealthiest nations in the Caribbean. Migrant youth might have greater opportunities for property crime in the nation compared to the other study nations due to the greater volume of goods available to steal. Further, high levels of income inequality in Trinidad and Tobago may contribute to property offenses by migrant youth.[5] Youth exposed to wealthier peers may engage in property offenses to maintain status among their peers.

Similarly, marijuana use might be greater among foreign-born youth in Antigua and Barbuda, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago due to economic strain and varying beliefs about marijuana use among migrants. Svensson and Hagquist (2010) examined the relationship between substance use and generational status in Sweden. They found that foreign-born youth were significantly more likely to self-report drug use than native-born youth. They suggested that the differences in drug use might be related to socioeconomic disadvantage, with foreign-born youth facing greater economic stress resulting in substance use or different attitudes and beliefs held by immigrants, who might migrate from nations that possess more permissive beliefs about substance use.

It is unclear why migrant youth are more likely to be affiliated with gangs in Trinidad and Tobago but not in the other study nations. Prior research on gangs has shown that multiple risk and protective factors are associated with gang joining in Trinidad and Tobago (Katz & Fox, 2010), and these risk factors might uniquely manifest themselves in the nation. Among the study nations, Trinidad and Tobago is the most urban, densely populated, and ethnically heterogeneous – factors that are associated with gang joining in developed countries (Katz & Schnebly, 2011). As initially proposed by Park and Burgess (1925) and further discussed by Bursik and Garsmick (1993), immigration status might be associated with greater personal strains, as noted above, and

when combined with such social-structural factors might result in a greater proportion of youth associating with gangs. Additional research is needed to understand the interaction between immigration status and gang joining in Trinidad and Tobago and why this interaction might be unique when compared to other Caribbean nations.

Like Marshall and Marshall's (2018) work in Europe, we found substantial between-country differences in the immigration-delinquency link in the English-speaking Caribbean, which should not necessarily be surprising given prior research in the English-speaking Caribbean. Past cross-national research recognizes that differences in culture and opportunity between regions and nations can be strong predictors of crime and offending (Nivette, 2011). While the study nations share cultural, social, and political histories and face many of the same challenges in crime, violence, and poverty, our results emphasize that immigration and delinquency experiences are not uniform across the region. While still a region with similarities, characteristics of small island developing states (SIDS) and "islandness" may help explain nation-specific variation in immigration and delinquency (Conkling, 2007). Geographically isolated island youth grow up with relatively limited and stable groups of adult and peer influencers. Distinct social structures develop in these locations, perpetuating and influencing offending levels over time. Our findings indicate the need for further pathway, causal, and qualitative research on youth integration processes following relocation in the Caribbean.

With few exceptions, youth migrants were not significantly more likely to be involved in delinquency than their native-born counterparts. However, regarding property offenses and alcohol and marijuana use, immigration status acted as a risk factor in some countries and a protective factor in others. Thus, contrary to some public opinion, the present study generally does not support the notion that youth immigration is a significant risk factor in the region—an

important consideration as government and non-governmental organizations allocate limited resources to crime prevention. Investments in crime prevention may be better directed toward strengthening protective factors and focusing more on other criminological risk factors that are more strongly associated with delinquency, as supported by research both in and outside the Caribbean, such as focused deterrence (Maguire et al., 2018) and family-based programming (Stahlberg et al., 2022).

However, the conflicting results of the study across nations highlight the limitations for a regional approach to addressing delinquency among migrants and underscore the importance of considering local contexts, along with nation-specific policies and responses tailored to relocated youth. Further research is necessary to identify the underlying mechanisms driving delinquency involvement, both formal and informal—particularly crucial for immigrant communities where trust in local law enforcement may be limited. It is also essential to examine how authorities respond in nations where immigration status itself acts as a risk factor. This research should subsequently inform revisions and the development of policies and procedures aimed at improving the experiences of migrant youth and reducing delinquency. While this study focused on the individual-level relationship between immigration status and delinquency, future work should extend this line of inquiry to adult populations and explore the broader macro-level factors impacting immigration and crime across the region.

Limitations to the present study exist. The present study only included school-attending youth. Migrant and delinquent youth are both likely underrepresented in school and the sample. There is wide variation in the percentage of foreign-born youth across nations in our sample. These differences could result from differences in immigration to countries. However, they might also result from other influences such as immigration laws, school requirements, or

restrictions on school attendance for migrants. Future work should further examine between-nation differences. Examining migrants' nation of origin and legal status adds additional nuance to understanding immigration and offending (Caraballo, 2024). In the current study, few respondents provided their birth nation if outside of the region, and the survey did not ask about legal status or when someone migrated, hindering our ability to explore these potential relationships. Finally, as noted above, recent socio-political developments have impacted migration in the region, for example, the mass exodus of Haitians and Venezuelans, which are not captured in this data (IOM, 2025). While the current study makes a significant contribution as one of the first to examine individual-level responses to this relationship in large national samples of youth outside the Global North, future research and data collection efforts should continue to explore the relationship between immigration and delinquency in the region.

The Caribbean region experiences a high level of immigration, which is expected to continue in future years (UN-DESA, 2020). The current study sheds light on the association between generational status and delinquency. Immigration does not significantly contribute to the region’s delinquency, with limited exceptions in Antigua and Barbuda, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago. Our findings highlight the importance of considering local contexts and extending research on immigration and delinquency beyond traditional destinations.

Notes

[1] This figure represents the percent of the population, both adults and children, "of people born in a country other than that in which they live, including refugees" (World Bank, n.d.). 2015 is the latest data estimate available for the region.

[2] The Ministry of Education in each nation approved the study and notified schools with Form 5 students of their approval of the project. School administrators could choose whether their school participated or not. At the individual level, participation was based on passive consent; information about the survey was distributed, and individuals and their guardians had the option to withdraw or not participate. They were informed that if they did not wish to participate, they could skip the questions and return an incomplete survey. Likewise, they were informed that if they did not want to answer a specific question, they did not have to provide an answer to that question. The project was approved by Arizona State University's Human Subjects Review Board (#1301008686).

[3] The options included Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago.

[4] Poisson and negative binominal regressions were used for the models employing variety score outcomes, given that these are skewed count measures. Poisson regression was used as the standard; however, when overdispersion was present in the data, identified through Likelihood ratio tests, negative binominal regression was used, which is more flexible and accounts for the dispersion. Logistic regression was used for the models that employ the alcohol and substance use, drug selling, and gang membership outcomes, given that these outcomes are binary (occurred or not).

[5] The World Bank (n.d.) last reported Trinidad and Tobago had a Gini index score of 40.3 in 1992. This commonly used indicator of income inequality ranges from 0-100, with scores over 40 indicating high inequality.

References

Anatol, M. & Kangalee, Q. M. (2021). Crime in Trinidad and Tobago: The possible impacts of increased crime due to migration from Venezuela. *Migration and Development, 10*(2), 260-272. https://doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2020.18092

Bahar, D., Dooley, M., & Selee, A. (2020). Venezuelan migration, crime, and misperceptions: A review of data from Colombia, Peru, and Chile. *Migration Policy Institute* and *Brookings*. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/migration-crime-latam-eng-final.pdf

Borkowska, K., Ketuly, K. A., Mohammad, S. A., Azizi, N., & Mwaikokesya, M. (2018). *Migration and its impact on developing countries* (Thematic Paper Series No. TPS103/18). Strengthening Urban Engagement of Universities in Africa and Asia (SUEUAA). http://sueuaa.org/blog/sueuaa-thematic-paper-series-migration-paper-three

Beaton, K., Cerovic, S., Gaaldamez, M., Hadzi-Vaskov, M., Loyola, F., Koczan, Z., Lissovolik, B., Martijin, J. K., Ustyugova, Y., & Wong, J. (2017). *Migration and remittances in Latin America and the Caribbean: Engines of growth and macroeconomic stabilizers?* (Working Paper No. 2017/144). International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2017/06/29/Migration-and-Remittances-in-Latin-America-and-the-Caribbean-Engines-of-Growth-and-44956

Bersani, B. E. (2014). A game of catch-up? The offending experience of second-generation immigrants. *Crime & Delinquency*, *60*(1), 60-84. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128713502406

Braithwaite, J., & Fisse, B. (1983). Asbestos and health: A case of informal social control. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *16*(2), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.1177/00048658830160020

Bursik, R., & Grasmick, H. (1993). *Neighborhoods and crime: The dimensions of effective community control*. Lexington Press.

Caraballo, K. (2024). Beyond the dichotomy: Understanding the masking effect of binary measures of "status" on foreign nationals' lifetime victimization outcomes. *Justice Quarterly, 41*(7), 1058-1086. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2024.2430280

Conkling, P. (2007). On islanders and islandness. *Geographical Review, 97*(2), 191–201. https://www.jstor.org/stable/30034161

Crawley, H., & Teye, J. K. (2023). South–South migration and inequality: An introduction. In Crawley, H. & Teye, J. K. (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of South–South Migration and Inequality* (pp. 1-22). Palgrave Macmillan.

Dipietro, S. M., & McGloin, J. M. (2012). Differential susceptibility? Immigrant youth and peer influence. *Criminology*, *50*(3), 711-742. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00273.x

Foss, A., Laurent, B., de Garcia, D., Charles, H., Puucilowski, M., Hazel, N., Sahai, R., & McKenzie, S. (2013). *Eastern and Southern Caribbean Youth Assessment (ESCYA)*. United States Agency for International Development.

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

Guerra, C., & Curry, T. R. (2023). Immigrant status and the desire for a low profile from police. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 47*(10), 2085–2108. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2023.2265996

Hannon, L. (2002). Criminal opportunity theory and the relationship between poverty and property crime. *Sociological Spectrum, 22*(3), 363-381. https://doi.org/10.1080/02732170290062676

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

Hoeve, M., Stams, G. J. J. M, van der Put, C. E., Dubas, J. S., van der Laan, P. H., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2012). A meta-analysis of attachment to parent and delinquency. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 40*, 771-785. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-011-9608-1

International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2019). *World migrant report 2020*. https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr_2020.pdf

International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2025, March). *Data mapping for the English and Dutch speaking Caribbean: Migration trends and movement of vulnerable populations in the English and Dutch speaking Caribbean*. https://easterncaribbean.un.org/sites/default/files/2025-04/migration-data-report-dutch-and-english-speaking-caribbean-countries-n2_2024.pdf

Jaupart, P. (2023). *International Migration in the Caribbean*. Background paper for the World Development Report. https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/3c5cf49b10dd0607472f4a2fb8a063ce-0050062023/original/WDR2023-Caribbean-Background-Paper-FORMATTED.pdf

Jiang, X., & Peguero, A. A. (2017). Immigrant generations and delinquency: Assessing the relative effects of family, school, and delinquent friends. *Race and Justice*, *7*(3), 199-225. https://doi.org/10.1177/2153368716640324

Juárez, S. P., Honkaniemi, H., Gustafsson, N. K., Rostila, M., & Berg, L. (2022). Health risk behaviours by immigrants' duration of residence: A systematic review and meta-

analysis. *International Journal of Public Health*, *67*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2022.1604437

Katz, C. M. (2015). An introduction to the gang problem in the Caribbean, In Harriott, A., & Katz, C. M. (Eds.), *Gangs in the Caribbean: Responses of state and society* (pp. 1-27). University of the West Indies Press.

Katz, C. M., Cheon, H., Freemon, K., & Nuño, L. E. (2023). Delinquency, drug use, and gang membership in the English-speaking Caribbean. *Children and Youth Services Review, 144*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2022.106758

Katz, C. M., & Fox, A. (2010). Risk and protective factors associated with gang involved youth in a Caribbean nation: Analysis of the Trinidad and Tobago Youth Survey. *Rev Panam Salud Publica, 27*(3), 187-202. http://doi.org/10.1590/s1020-49892010000300006

Katz, C. M., & Schnebly, S. (2011). Neighborhood variation in gang member concentrations. *Crime & Delinquency, 57*(3), 377-407. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128708317065

Kroneberg, C. (2018). Reconsidering the immigration-crime nexus in Europe: Ethnic differences in juvenile delinquency. In Kalter, F., Jonsson, J. O., van Tubergen, F., & Heath, A. (Eds.), *Growing up in diverse societies: The integration of the children of immigrants in England, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden* (pp. 335-268). British Academy. https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197266373.003.0013

Kubrin, C. E., & Ousey, G. C. (2023). *Immigration and crime: Taking stock*. Springer Nature.

Lee, M., Martinez, R., & Rosenfeld, R. (2001). Does immigration increase homicide? Negative evidence from three border cities. *Sociological Quarterly, 42*(4), 559–580. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2001.tb01780.x

MacDonald, J. M., & Saunders, J. (2012). Are immigrant youth less violent? Specifying the reasons and mechanisms. *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 641*(1), 125–147. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716211432279

Maguire, E. R., Oakley, M. T., & Corsaro, N. (2018). *Evaluating Cure Violence in Trinidad and Tobago*. Inter-American Development Bank.

Marshall, I. H., & Marshall, C. E. (2018). Norms, values, and education: How different are immigrant youth from native youth? Insights from the third International Self-Report Delinquency Study (ISRD3). In Kury, H., & Redo, S. (Eds.), *Refugees and Migrants in Law and Policy* (pp. 165-190). Springer International Publishing.

Mazza, J., & Villarreal, N. F. (2024). Perú and migration from Venezuela: From early adjustment to policy misalignment. In Crawley, H., & Teye, J. K. (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of South–South Migration and Inequality* (pp. 653-678). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-39814-8_30

Mendez, J. J., Bauman, S., & Guillory, R. M. (2012). Bullying of Mexican immigrant students by Mexican American students: An examination of intracultural bullying. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *34*(2), 279-304. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986311435970

Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (2012). *Crime and the American dream* (5th ed.). Wadsworth.

Nivette, A. E. (2011). Cross-national predictors of crime: A meta-analysis. *Homicide Studies, 15*(2), 103-131. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767911406397

Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2009). Exploring the connection between immigration and violent crime rates in U.S. cities, 1980–2000. *Social Problems, 56*(3), 447-473. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2009.56.3.447

Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2018). Immigration and crime: Assessing a contentious issue. *Annual Review of Criminology, 1*, 63-84. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-032317-092026

Park, R., & Burgess, E. (1925). *The city*. University of Chicago.

Reid, L. W., Weiss, H., Adelman, R., & Jaret, C. (2005). The immigration–crime relationship: Evidence across US metropolitan areas. *Social Science Research, 34*(4), 757–780. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2005.01.001

Scott, J., & Staines, Z. (2021). Charting the place of islands in criminology: On isolation, integration and insularity. *Theoretical Criminology, 25*(4), 578-600. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480620910250

Sirin, S. R., Choi, E., & Sin, E. J. (2022). Meta-analysis on the relation between acculturation and alcohol use among immigrant youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *70*(3), 361-377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.09.021

Sommers, I., Fagan, J., & Baskins, D. (1994). The influence of acculturation and familism on Puerto Rican delinquency. *Justice Quarterly, 11*(2), 207-228. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829400092231

Stahlberg, S. G., Díaz-Cayeros, A., & Pizatella-Haswell, R. (2022). Supporting youth and families to prevent risky youth behavior and delinquency: An impact evaluation of a family counseling program in the Caribbean. *Children and Youth Services Review, 142*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2022.106645

St. Bernard, G. (2003). *Major trends affecting families in Central America and the Caribbean*. United Nations. https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/family/Publications/mtstbernard.pdf

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Harvard University Press.

Svensson, Y., Burk, W. J., Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2012). Peer selection and influence of delinquent behavior of immigrant and non-immigrant youths: Does context matter? *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 36*(3), 178-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025411434652

Svensson, M., & Hagquist, C. (2010). Adolescent alcohol and illicit drug use among first-and second-generation immigrants in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, *38*(2), 184-191. http://doi/10.1177/1403494809353822

Sweeten, G. (2012). Scaling criminal offending. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 28*(3), 533–557. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-011-9160-8

Tilley, J. L., Huey Jr, S. J., Farver, J. M., Lai, M. H., & Wang, C. X. (2021). The immigrant paradox in the problem behaviors of youth in the United States: A meta-analysis. *Child Development*, *92*(2), 502-516. https://doi/10.1111/cdev.13542

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. (UN-DESA). (2020). *International Migration 2020 Highlights* (ST/ESA/SER.A/452). https://www.un.org/en/desa/international-migration-2020-highlights

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2015). *Combating violence against migrants.* https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/UNODC_Combating_Violence_against_Migrants.pdf

Vazsonyi, A. T., Mikuška, J., & Kelley, E. L. (2017). It's time: A meta-analysis on the self-control-deviance link. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *48*, 48-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.10.001

World Bank. (n.d.). Metadata Glossary: S.M.POP.TOTL.ZS. https://databank.worldbank.org/metadataglossary/jobs/series/SM.POP.TOTL.ZS

Yahaya, J. U. (2019). International migration and the phenomenon of insecurity in Nigeria. *Journal of International Politics, 1*(3), 42-68. http://doi.org/10.22259/2642-8245.0103005

Table 1. Descriptive statistics (n=11,485)

	Mean (S.D.) or %	Range	Missing
Country			
Antigua & Barbuda	6.3%		-
Dominica	6.6%		-
Grenada	9.2%		-
St. Kitts & Nevis	4.0%		-
St. Lucia	16.6%		-
St. Vincent & the Grenadines	9.2%		-
Trinidad & Tobago	48.2%		-
Dependent variable			
Violent variety score	1.52 (1.41)	0-5	0.8%
Property variety score	1.18 (1.45)	0-6	0.8%
Alcohol use	72.9%		1.3%
Marijuana use	27.1%		1.4%
Drug selling	9.7%		1.5%
Gang membership	11.8%		16.7%
Control variables			
Gender			0.3%
Male	43.2%		
Female	56.8%		
Age	16.29 (0.78)	15-18	-
Race			2.2%
African-descent	49.6%		
East Indian-descent	20.4%		
Indigenous	3.3%		
Mixed/Other	26.8%		
Parental attachment	2.61 (0.67)	1-4	0.2%
Parental supervision	3.16 (0.63)	1-4	0.1%
School commitment	3.04 (0.44)	1-4	0.3%
Impulsivity	2.30 (0.58)	1-4	0.6%
Risk-seeking	2.52 (0.69)	1-4	0.8%
Peer pressure	1.75 (0.92)	1-5	1.3%

Table 2. Generational status by nation of residence

	Antigua & Barbuda (n=718)	Dominica (n=753)	Grenada (n=1,054)	St. Kitts & Nevis (n=455)	St. Lucia (n=1,909)	St. Vincent & the Grenadines (n=1,061)	Trinidad & Tobago (n=5,535)	Total (n=11,485)
First generation	25.6%	10.9%	11.6%	19.8%	7.7%	7.7%	5.0%	8.6%
Second generation	32.0%	6.8%	10.2%	11.7%	8.6%	10.0%	5.9%	9.0%
Native	42.3%	82.3%	78.1%	68.6%	83.7%	82.3%	89.1%	82.4%

Note: Significant differences using chi-square tests between all nations except for St. Lucia and St. Vincent & the Grenadines

Table 3. Delinquency measures by generational status and nation of residence

	1. First generation	2. Second generation	3. Native	Significance
Violent variety				
Antigua & Barbuda	1.39 (1.31)	1.46 (1.34)	1.52 (1.42)	-
Dominica	1.99 (1.52)	2.08 (1.64)	1.78 (1.46)	-
Grenada	1.56 (1.54)	1.28 (1.20)	1.42 (1.31)	-
St Kitts & Nevis	1.33 (1.29)	1.83 (1.53)	1.83 (1.44)	2, 3 > 1
St. Lucia	1.90 (1.56)	1.67 (1.52)	1.70 (1.41)	-
St Vincent & the Grenadines	1.71 (1.37)	1.50 (1.40)	1.61 (1.39)	-
Trinidad & Tobago	1.59 (1.54)	1.75 (1.56)	1.37 (1.37)	1, 2 > 3
Property variety				
Antigua & Barbuda	1.17 (1.43)	1.16 (1.39)	1.23 (1.44)	-
Dominica	1.60 (1.67)	1.77 (1.81)	1.49 (1.63)	-
Grenada	1.37 (1.40)	1.22 (1.32)	1.39 (1.37)	-
St Kitts & Nevis	1.33 (1.68)	1.93 (1.60)	1.59 (1.50)	2 > 1
St. Lucia	1.71 (1.65)	1.43 (1.65)	1.54 (1.53)	-
St Vincent & the Grenadines	1.31 (1.45)	1.11 (1.37)	1.23 (1.41)	-
Trinidad & Tobago	1.21 (1.62)	1.15 (1.54)	0.90 (1.31)	1, 2 > 3
Alcohol use				
Antigua & Barbuda	72.0%	76.0%	73.6%	-
Dominica	75.0%	78.4%	80.6%	-
Grenada	78.7%	70.1%	79.7%	3 > 2
St Kitts & Nevis	60.0%	79.3%	73.1%	2, 3 > 1
St. Lucia	77.6%	82.9%	84.9%	3 > 1
St Vincent & the Grenadines	73.2%	66.7%	72.3%	-
Trinidad & Tobago	65.8%	70.5%	67.0%	-
Marijuana use				
Antigua & Barbuda	40.1%	32.8%	34.3%	-
Dominica	42.5%	39.2%	33.9%	-
Grenada	21.3%	25.2%	21.3%	-
St Kitts & Nevis	34.4%	43.4%	34.5%	-
St. Lucia	44.8%	37.0%	35.8%	1 > 3
St Vincent & the Grenadines	32.1%	21.0%	27.4%	-
Trinidad & Tobago	30.6%	27.0%	21.1%	1, 2 > 3
Drug selling				
Antigua & Barbuda	9.9%	9.6%	7.4%	-
Dominica	23.8%	23.5%	17.9%	-
Grenada	6.6%	6.5%	6.5%	-
St Kitts & Nevis	8.9%	9.4%	10.5%	-
St. Lucia	14.8%	15.9%	11.2%	-
St Vincent & the Grenadines	9.9%	7.6%	11.2%	-
Trinidad & Tobago	10.4%	12.3%	7.8%	2 > 3
Gang membership				
Antigua & Barbuda	8.5%	6.3%	5.4%	-
Dominica	31.8%	32.6%	19.5%	1, 2 > 3
Grenada	12.1%	7.1%	10.0%	-
St Kitts & Nevis	7.9%	11.1%	7.9%	-
St. Lucia	21.8%	23.8%	17.0%	2 > 3
St Vincent & the Grenadines	23.6%	15.1%	13.5%	1 > 3
Trinidad & Tobago	17.1%	10.5%	8.4%	1 > 2, 3

Notes: Means and standard errors reported for violent and property variety; Significance reports *t*- and Pearson's chi-square test results comparing averages between generational statuses, significance level $p<0.05$; only statistically significant differences reported; 1 = First generation; 2 = Second generation; 3 = Native

Table 4. Second generation and native vs. first generation regression coefficients for delinquency measures by nation of residence

	Antigua & Barbuda (n=718)	Dominica (n=753)	Grenada (n=1,054)	St. Kitts & Nevis (n=455)	St. Lucia (n=1,909)	St. Vincent & Grenadines (n=1,061)	Trinidad & Tobago (n=5,535)
Violent variety							
Second generation	0.010	0.105	-0.091	0.253	0.042	-0.150	0.080
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.07)
Native	0.030	-0.028	-0.025	**0.248***	0.040	-0.036	-0.068
	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.08)	**(0.11)**	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.05)
Property variety							
Second generation	-0.038	0.256	-0.043	**0.246***	0.021	-0.255	-0.100
	(0.11)	(0.16)	(0.12)	**(0.14)**	(0.10)	(0.16)	(0.10)
Native	0.013	0.009	0.037	0.109	0.071	-0.057	**-0.187***
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.08)	(0.12)	**(0.08)**
Alcohol use							
Second generation	0.189	0.289	-0.444	0.809	0.568	-0.343	0.122
	(0.25)	(0.50)	(0.33)	(0.43)	(0.31)	(0.36)	(0.19)
Native	-0.003	0.215	0.176	**0.611***	**0.723****	0.046	0.169
	(0.24)	(0.33)	(0.26)	**(0.28)**	**(0.23)**	(0.28)	(0.15)
Marijuana use							
Second generation	-0.452	0.128	0.401	0.309	-0.099	**-0.916****	-0.201
	(0.24)	(0.42)	(0.36)	(0.41)	(0.26)	**(0.39)**	(0.21)
Native	-0.385	-0.283	0.162	-0.220	-0.132	-0.299	**-0.387***
	(0.23)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.29)	(0.20)	(0.28)	**(0.16)**
Drug selling							
Second generation	0.025	0.459	0.179	0.001	**0.739***	-0.497	0.342
	(0.37)	(0.52)	(0.61)	(0.65)	**(0.36)**	(0.62)	(0.30)
Native	-0.232	-0.156	0.089	0.080	0.203	0.304	-0.080
	(0.38)	(0.34)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.29)	(0.47)	(0.24)
Gang membership							
Second generation	-0.516	0.503	-0.443	0.436	0.423	-0.423	-0.487
	(0.45)	(0.49)	(0.55)	(0.70)	(0.31)	(0.45)	(0.30)
Native	-0.678	-0.483	-0.118	-0.076	-0.100	-0.390	**-0.757****
	(0.44)	(0.34)	(0.36)	(0.53)	(0.24)	(0.34)	**(0.21)**

Notes: Reference category for all models first-generation youth; unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors reported for the variables of interest; control variables not shown include gender, race, age, parental attachment, parental supervision, school attachment, impulsivity, risk-seeking, and peer pressure; $p < 0.05$ *; $p < 0.01$ **

Supplemental Table 1. Full regression results for delinquency measures by nation of residence (second generation and native vs. first generation)

	Antigua & Barbuda (n=718)	Dominica (n=753)	Grenada (n=1,054)	St. Kitts & Nevis (n=455)	St. Lucia (n=1,909)	St. Vincent & the Grenadines (n=1,061)	Trinidad & Tobago (n=5,535)
Violent variety							
Second generation	0.00949	0.105	-0.0909	0.253	0.0420	-0.150	0.0801
	(0.0868)	(0.130)	(0.117)	(0.141)	(0.0863)	(0.122)	(0.0679)
Native	0.0295	-0.0275	-0.0245	0.248*	0.0404	-0.0360	-0.0683
	(0.0835)	(0.0865)	(0.0832)	(0.105)	(0.0648)	(0.0931)	(0.0532)
Male	0.184**	0.327**	0.259**	0.203*	0.409**	0.201**	0.327**
	(0.0712)	(0.0641)	(0.0581)	(0.0818)	(0.0384)	(0.0550)	(0.0258)
East Indian-descent (vs African-descent)	-0.544	-0.0735	-0.253*	-0.246	0.0648	0.0149	-0.214**
	(0.292)	(0.0978)	(0.115)	(0.283)	(0.0916)	(0.247)	(0.0300)
Mixed (vs African-descent)	0.138	0.0600	-0.204	-0.122	0.0697	0.00145	-0.0503
	(0.152)	(0.228)	(0.139)	(0.160)	(0.145)	(0.110)	(0.0643)
Other (vs African-descent)	-0.0859	0.00191	-0.369**	-0.232	-0.00313	0.0137	-0.0835**
	(0.0878)	(0.0619)	(0.0955)	(0.134)	(0.0383)	(0.0541)	(0.0307)
Age	0.0538	0.0675	-0.00618	0.0861	0.0424	0.0771**	0.0479**
	(0.0349)	(0.0361)	(0.0313)	(0.0547)	(0.0302)	(0.0288)	(0.0161)
Parental attachment	0.0844	0.0529	-0.0199	-0.0188	-0.00144	-0.0208	-0.0910**
	(0.0600)	(0.0468)	(0.0501)	(0.0644)	(0.0320)	(0.0448)	(0.0205)
Parental supervision	-0.301**	-0.220**	-0.271**	-0.270**	-0.224**	-0.173**	-0.178**
	(0.0664)	(0.0556)	(0.0555)	(0.0740)	(0.0367)	(0.0485)	(0.0230)
School commitment	-0.114	-0.137*	-0.310**	-0.125	-0.220**	-0.133*	-0.203**
	(0.0816)	(0.0664)	(0.0707)	(0.0887)	(0.0430)	(0.0618)	(0.0280)
Impulsivity	0.0254	0.117*	0.105*	0.178*	0.171**	0.0797	0.0403
	(0.0600)	(0.0505)	(0.0490)	(0.0698)	(0.0336)	(0.0457)	(0.0225)
Risk-seeking	0.353**	0.158**	0.296**	0.193**	0.222**	0.290**	0.285**
	(0.0522)	(0.0450)	(0.0455)	(0.0630)	(0.0290)	(0.0405)	(0.0203)
Peer pressure	0.118**	0.127**	0.0836**	0.132**	0.0422*	0.0811**	0.130**

	(0.0312)	(0.0279)	(0.0312)	(0.0378)	(0.0202)	(0.0289)	(0.0119)
Constant	-0.763	-0.665	1.040	-1.137	-0.158	-0.956	-0.150
	(0.685)	(0.671)	(0.578)	(0.967)	(0.539)	(0.550)	(0.299)
Obs.	669	718	991	436	1,859	993	5,328
Property variety							
Second generation	-0.0384	0.256	-0.0425	0.246	0.0213	-0.255	-0.0997
	(0.113)	(0.163)	(0.121)	(0.140)	(0.102)	(0.160)	(0.102)
Native	0.0134	0.00880	0.0374	0.109	0.0706	-0.0566	-0.187*
	(0.108)	(0.109)	(0.0865)	(0.107)	(0.0763)	(0.122)	(0.0779)
Male	0.288**	0.507**	0.262**	0.447**	0.439**	0.240**	0.389**
	(0.0922)	(0.0788)	(0.0592)	(0.0874)	(0.0445)	(0.0716)	(0.0382)
East Indian-descent (vs African-descent)	-0.230	-0.0130	-0.244*	-0.104	-0.0418	0.130	-0.295**
	(0.306)	(0.115)	(0.118)	(0.274)	(0.113)	(0.315)	(0.0444)
Mixed (vs African-descent)	0.211	-0.453	-0.225	-0.0599	0.00216	0.0555	0.0359
	(0.192)	(0.330)	(0.145)	(0.159)	(0.175)	(0.145)	(0.0932)
Other (vs African-descent)	-0.151	-0.165*	-0.294**	-0.335*	-0.00926	0.0934	-0.179**
	(0.116)	(0.0782)	(0.0940)	(0.147)	(0.0446)	(0.0706)	(0.0459)
Age	0.0825	0.115**	0.0246	0.112*	-0.0148	0.103**	0.0790**
	(0.0450)	(0.0435)	(0.0316)	(0.0569)	(0.0359)	(0.0376)	(0.0240)
Parental attachment	0.0125	-0.0725	-0.0153	-0.0187	0.00655	-0.0448	-0.0911**
	(0.0785)	(0.0580)	(0.0509)	(0.0673)	(0.0375)	(0.0590)	(0.0308)
Parental supervision	-0.433**	-0.234**	-0.312**	-0.255**	-0.358**	-0.368**	-0.348**
	(0.0873)	(0.0686)	(0.0562)	(0.0775)	(0.0430)	(0.0638)	(0.0342)
School commitment	-0.262*	-0.294**	-0.336**	-0.142	-0.291**	-0.338**	-0.373**
	(0.106)	(0.0806)	(0.0718)	(0.0925)	(0.0503)	(0.0811)	(0.0420)
Impulsivity	0.139	0.170**	0.0981*	0.195**	0.167**	0.139*	0.130**
	(0.0780)	(0.0625)	(0.0498)	(0.0738)	(0.0393)	(0.0605)	(0.0341)
Risk-seeking	0.314**	0.215**	0.218**	0.253**	0.214**	0.250**	0.300**
	(0.0674)	(0.0555)	(0.0460)	(0.0669)	(0.0338)	(0.0527)	(0.0301)
Peer pressure	0.146**	0.123**	0.153**	0.151**	0.0765**	0.143**	0.181**
	(0.0420)	(0.0343)	(0.0304)	(0.0389)	(0.0235)	(0.0377)	(0.0180)
Constant	-0.686	-1.216	0.731	-1.931*	1.176	-0.609	-0.298
	(0.888)	(0.810)	(0.585)	(1.001)	(0.638)	(0.719)	(0.447)

Obs.	669	718	991	436	1,859	994	5,326
Alcohol use							
Second generation	0.189	0.289	-0.444	0.809	0.568*	-0.343	0.122
	(0.252)	(0.495)	(0.332)	(0.427)	(0.308)	(0.355)	(0.193)
Native	-0.00248	0.215	0.176	0.611*	0.723**	0.0460	0.169
	(0.238)	(0.325)	(0.258)	(0.276)	(0.231)	(0.284)	(0.145)
Male	-0.156	-0.240	0.222	0.344	0.207	0.226	-0.166*
	(0.211)	(0.240)	(0.177)	(0.248)	(0.150)	(0.166)	(0.0672)
East Indian-descent (vs African-descent)	-1.583**	0.279	0.334	-0.866	-0.114	0.341	-0.504**
	(0.614)	(0.373)	(0.359)	(0.657)	(0.382)	(0.652)	(0.0772)
Mixed (vs African-descent)	-0.423	-0.417	-0.812*	-0.334	0.433	-0.0815	-0.0780
	(0.442)	(1.018)	(0.395)	(0.504)	(0.651)	(0.313)	(0.188)
Other (vs African-descent)	0.314	0.266	-0.324	0.000420	0.0338	0.231	-0.0322
	(0.263)	(0.230)	(0.246)	(0.361)	(0.144)	(0.162)	(0.0845)
Age	0.253*	0.428**	0.0564	0.137	0.0513	0.220*	0.221**
	(0.103)	(0.144)	(0.0986)	(0.170)	(0.115)	(0.0874)	(0.0434)
Parental attachment	0.212	-0.449*	-0.234	-0.353	-0.200	-0.218	-0.132*
	(0.172)	(0.182)	(0.147)	(0.201)	(0.119)	(0.133)	(0.0526)
Parental supervision	-0.486*	-0.728**	-0.320	-0.0699	-0.626**	-0.486**	-0.332**
	(0.200)	(0.220)	(0.173)	(0.226)	(0.146)	(0.148)	(0.0679)
School commitment	-0.0419	-0.483	-0.0189	-0.0260	-0.0223	-0.600**	-0.435**
	(0.263)	(0.279)	(0.241)	(0.283)	(0.177)	(0.217)	(0.0817)
Impulsivity	0.172	0.0530	0.218	0.0110	0.0350	-0.0462	-0.0253
	(0.178)	(0.184)	(0.154)	(0.212)	(0.123)	(0.136)	(0.0591)
Risk-seeking	0.886**	0.540**	0.586**	0.615**	0.765**	0.506**	0.618**
	(0.155)	(0.160)	(0.139)	(0.189)	(0.108)	(0.120)	(0.0520)
Peer pressure	0.150	-0.00598	0.288*	0.0737	0.0966	0.0435	0.182**
	(0.120)	(0.139)	(0.129)	(0.134)	(0.0985)	(0.103)	(0.0379)
Constant	-4.666*	-2.228	-0.386	-2.398	0.584	-0.0632	-1.743*
	(2.069)	(2.685)	(1.880)	(3.048)	(2.044)	(1.654)	(0.809)
Obs.	667	713	985	434	1,856	986	5,301
Marijuana use							
Second generation	-0.452	0.128	0.401	0.309	-0.0987	-0.916*	-0.201
	(0.239)	(0.419)	(0.361)	(0.407)	(0.260)	(0.385)	(0.207)

Native	-0.385	-0.283	0.162	-0.220	-0.132	-0.299	-0.387*
	(0.230)	(0.277)	(0.275)	(0.290)	(0.199)	(0.283)	(0.157)
Male	0.456*	0.297	0.228	0.346	0.428**	0.582**	0.465**
	(0.191)	(0.192)	(0.179)	(0.241)	(0.112)	(0.167)	(0.0764)
East Indian-descent (vs African-descent)	-1.627*	0.401	0.0328	0.176	-0.112	1.585*	-0.174
	(0.813)	(0.299)	(0.328)	(0.707)	(0.296)	(0.672)	(0.0915)
Mixed (vs African-descent)	0.111	0.219	-0.647	-0.0987	0.402	0.684*	0.182
	(0.450)	(0.838)	(0.482)	(0.491)	(0.434)	(0.319)	(0.195)
Other (vs African-descent)	-0.0656	0.154	-0.273	-0.592	0.0509	0.432*	0.146
	(0.238)	(0.194)	(0.278)	(0.407)	(0.113)	(0.168)	(0.0926)
Age	0.144	0.503**	0.342**	0.213	0.190*	0.496**	0.287**
	(0.0957)	(0.114)	(0.0972)	(0.170)	(0.0902)	(0.0906)	(0.0486)
Parental attachment	0.247	-0.196	-0.154	0.155	-0.119	-0.244	-0.105
	(0.164)	(0.149)	(0.155)	(0.199)	(0.0950)	(0.138)	(0.0620)
Parental supervision	-0.651**	-0.245	-0.289	-0.732**	-0.401**	-0.516**	-0.509**
	(0.185)	(0.174)	(0.173)	(0.228)	(0.110)	(0.149)	(0.0696)
School commitment	-0.329	-0.792**	-0.869**	-0.310	-0.534**	-0.205	-0.553**
	(0.236)	(0.215)	(0.227)	(0.271)	(0.134)	(0.200)	(0.0868)
Impulsivity	0.323	0.108	0.107	0.591**	0.142	0.311*	0.000714
	(0.169)	(0.156)	(0.155)	(0.218)	(0.101)	(0.144)	(0.0687)
Risk-seeking	0.674**	0.440**	0.690**	0.661**	0.731**	0.265*	0.572**
	(0.145)	(0.139)	(0.147)	(0.196)	(0.0882)	(0.126)	(0.0622)
Peer pressure	0.269**	0.138	0.276**	0.313*	0.206**	0.162	0.300**
	(0.0975)	(0.0974)	(0.1000)	(0.123)	(0.0647)	(0.0935)	(0.0365)
Constant	-3.372	-6.924**	-5.657**	-5.203	-3.236*	-8.307**	-4.379**
	(1.902)	(2.129)	(1.821)	(3.021)	(1.606)	(1.720)	(0.903)
Obs.	667	712	990	435	1,844	988	5,304
Drug selling							
Second generation	0.0253	0.459	0.179	0.00120	0.739*	-0.497	0.342
	(0.373)	(0.516)	(0.605)	(0.651)	(0.363)	(0.622)	(0.302)
Native	-0.232	-0.156	0.0886	0.0799	0.203	0.304	-0.0804
	(0.376)	(0.343)	(0.458)	(0.461)	(0.290)	(0.468)	(0.242)
Male	1.056**	1.208**	0.859**	1.318**	1.326**	0.672**	1.050**
	(0.338)	(0.253)	(0.320)	(0.449)	(0.177)	(0.250)	(0.126)
East Indian-descent (vs African-descent)	-0.447	0.223	-0.803	1.071	0.399	2.321**	0.137
	(1.086)	(0.360)	(0.654)	(0.886)	(0.363)	(0.770)	(0.137)

Mixed (vs African-descent)	0.770	-0.594	-1.057	0.382	-0.0951	0.507	0.109
	(0.571)	(1.033)	(0.841)	(0.653)	(0.676)	(0.488)	(0.284)
Other (vs African-descent)	0.100	-0.0152	0.00570	-0.794	-0.136	0.707**	0.148
	(0.376)	(0.251)	(0.431)	(0.773)	(0.170)	(0.245)	(0.143)
Age	0.157	0.527**	0.419**	0.387	-0.0386	0.566**	0.235**
	(0.158)	(0.139)	(0.157)	(0.253)	(0.134)	(0.136)	(0.0718)
Parental attachment	0.157	-0.141	0.201	0.709*	0.0829	-0.133	-0.0757
	(0.278)	(0.187)	(0.266)	(0.309)	(0.141)	(0.204)	(0.0947)
Parental supervision	-0.824**	-0.442*	-0.393	-0.527	-0.662**	-0.619**	-0.586**
	(0.301)	(0.218)	(0.290)	(0.358)	(0.163)	(0.223)	(0.0991)
School commitment	-0.467	-0.511*	-1.591**	-0.100	-0.678**	-0.529	-0.617**
	(0.354)	(0.261)	(0.348)	(0.437)	(0.185)	(0.275)	(0.122)
Impulsivity	0.427	0.194	0.226	-0.160	0.0875	0.227	0.340**
	(0.273)	(0.202)	(0.250)	(0.350)	(0.148)	(0.214)	(0.103)
Risk-seeking	0.493*	0.396*	0.792**	0.396	0.592**	0.591**	0.383**
	(0.237)	(0.186)	(0.246)	(0.312)	(0.132)	(0.188)	(0.0932)
Peer pressure	0.181	0.386**	0.144	0.512**	0.171*	0.246*	0.425**
	(0.139)	(0.110)	(0.150)	(0.164)	(0.0825)	(0.122)	(0.0494)
Constant	-4.754	-9.942**	-7.493**	-11.22*	-0.806	-11.38**	-5.885**
	(3.077)	(2.637)	(2.880)	(4.602)	(2.394)	(2.592)	(1.339)
Obs.	666	710	986	431	1,849	986	5,292
Gang membership							
Second generation	-0.516	0.503	-0.443	0.436	0.423	-0.423	-0.487
	(0.452)	(0.490)	(0.549)	(0.701)	(0.310)	(0.447)	(0.295)
Native	-0.678	-0.483	-0.118	-0.0757	-0.0999	-0.390	-0.757**
	(0.440)	(0.343)	(0.364)	(0.532)	(0.244)	(0.337)	(0.208)
Male	0.385	0.345	0.405	0.206	0.540**	0.260	0.488**
	(0.387)	(0.247)	(0.267)	(0.458)	(0.143)	(0.218)	(0.120)
East Indian-descent (vs African-descent)	-	-0.625	-0.414	0.0779	0.133	1.081	0.757**
		(0.397)	(0.547)	(1.172)	(0.343)	(0.714)	(0.147)
Mixed (vs African-descent)	-0.543	0.114	0.316	0.0494	0.331	0.421	0.722**
	(1.083)	(1.122)	(0.522)	(0.746)	(0.511)	(0.397)	(0.276)
Other (vs African-descent)	-0.992	-0.333	0.129	-0.617	-0.158	0.202	0.545**
	(0.570)	(0.258)	(0.375)	(0.796)	(0.147)	(0.216)	(0.156)
Age	0.121	0.385**	0.00931	0.433	0.156	0.0227	0.160*

	(0.191)	(0.143)	(0.143)	(0.282)	(0.114)	(0.114)	(0.0749)
Parental attachment	-0.0941	-0.0347	0.173	0.535	-0.00460	-0.184	0.116
	(0.334)	(0.189)	(0.226)	(0.344)	(0.121)	(0.179)	(0.0959)
Parental supervision	0.0328	-0.777**	-0.616*	-1.422**	-0.642**	-0.305	-0.536**
	(0.369)	(0.222)	(0.247)	(0.431)	(0.141)	(0.191)	(0.105)
School commitment	-0.140	-0.0776	-0.0818	-0.464	-0.369*	0.0765	-0.517**
	(0.447)	(0.275)	(0.323)	(0.493)	(0.163)	(0.254)	(0.127)
Impulsivity	0.459	0.411*	0.517*	0.337	0.585**	0.338	0.354**
	(0.349)	(0.201)	(0.230)	(0.396)	(0.128)	(0.183)	(0.104)
Risk-seeking	0.525	0.379*	0.125	-0.166	0.155	0.567**	0.376**
	(0.285)	(0.179)	(0.206)	(0.319)	(0.109)	(0.164)	(0.0944)
Peer pressure	0.257	0.201	0.200	0.178	0.199**	0.0613	0.313**
	(0.157)	(0.119)	(0.141)	(0.201)	(0.0750)	(0.121)	(0.0523)
Constant	-6.556	-7.010**	-2.790	-6.287	-3.468	-3.283	-4.552**
	(3.731)	(2.667)	(2.613)	(4.929)	(2.025)	(2.179)	(1.398)
Obs.	551	574	797	371	1,697	854	4,412

Notes: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors reported.