

2020-01-01

## Understanding The Association Between Routine Activities, Social Bonds, Violent Victimization, And Violent Offending

Caleigh D. Lynch  
*University of Texas at El Paso*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.utep.edu/open\\_etd](https://scholarworks.utep.edu/open_etd)



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Lynch, Caleigh D., "Understanding The Association Between Routine Activities, Social Bonds, Violent Victimization, And Violent Offending" (2020). *Open Access Theses & Dissertations*. 3175.  
[https://scholarworks.utep.edu/open\\_etd/3175](https://scholarworks.utep.edu/open_etd/3175)

This is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UTEP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UTEP. For more information, please contact [lweber@utep.edu](mailto:lweber@utep.edu).

UNDERSTANDING THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN ROUTINE ACTIVITIES, SOCIAL  
BONDS, VIOLENT VICTIMIZATION, AND VIOLENT OFFENDING

CALEIGH DONOVAN LYNCH

Master's Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice

APPROVED:

---

Caitlyn Muniz, Ph.D., Chair

---

Egbert Zavala, Ph.D.

---

Michelle Jeanis, Ph.D.

---

Stephen L. Crites, Jr., Ph.D.  
Dean of the Graduate School

Copyright ©

by  
Caleigh Lynch  
2020

UNDERSTANDING THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN ROUTINE ACTIVITIES, SOCIAL  
BONDS, VICTIMIZATION, AND OFFENDING

by

Caleigh Donovan Lynch, B.S.

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Criminal Justice

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

December 2020

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	iv
List of Tables .....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Theoretical Frameworks .....	3
Current Study .....	4
Outline for Thesis.....	5
Chapter 2: Theoretical Prospective .....	6
Routine Activity Theory .....	6
Social Bonding Theory .....	12
Summary .....	15
Chapter 3: Literature Review .....	16
Victim-Offender Overlap .....	16
Routine Activity Theory .....	20
Social Bonds .....	23
Summary .....	27
Chapter 4: Methodology .....	28
Research Design and Rationale .....	28
Participants and Setting .....	28
Measures .....	34
Analytic Strategy.....	45
Chapter 5: Results.....	47
Descriptive Statistics .....	47

Understanding the Results .....	49
Chapter 6: Discussion .....	56
Discussion .....	56
Theoretical & Policy Implications .....	62
Future Research and Limitations .....	63
References .....	66
Vita .....	74

## List of Tables

Table 1 .....	48
Table 2 .....	5

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

According to the Department of Justice (DOJ), juveniles have an arrest rate of 137 per 100,000 people for violent crimes (Department of Justice, 2019). The DOJ has found that even though the arrest rate of juveniles has been steadily declining since 1980, there is still a significant number of juveniles arrested for offenses each year (Department of Justice, 2019). Juvenile crime and delinquent behavior continue to be problematic considering the high level of offenses being recorded annually. Juvenile offenses can also be serious and include violent acts including murder, sexual assault and robbery. It is critical to study juvenile violent offending to determine what causes one to commit these horrific acts. This study will add to existing research on juvenile violent offending and violent victimization by determining the association between juvenile's relationships and activities with their behavior. It is important to study juvenile violent victimization because it is often linked to violent offending, meaning that decreasing one should decrease another (Shaffer & Ruback, 2002). Doing so will allow for policy changes which would benefit our communities through determining the cause of juvenile offending and victimization. Therefore, juvenile offending can be significantly decreased, which then will lead to a decrease in juvenile victimization.

Generally, victimization theories aim to explain what causes someone to be victimized. This course of study has found a connection between victims and offenders, known as the victim-offender overlap. Previous research has established the existence of a victim-offender overlap, which is a link between victimization and perpetration of crime and delinquency (Wolfgang, 1958; Jennings & Reingle, 2012). Individuals have a higher chance of becoming a victim of a personal crime if they are personally involved in criminal behavior (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990); therefore, one could theoretically lower victimization rates by decreasing



offending. When recognizing this overlap, it is important to connect theoretical frameworks related to offending and determine if there is a connection to victimization as well.

The following study will examine the association between routine activity theory, social bond theory, and juvenile violent offending. The current study will use routine activity theory and social bond theory as the theoretical frameworks to determine the association to violent offending and then, if that relationship is mediated by violent victimization. Routine activity theory is often linked to victimization whereas social bond theory is usually linked with offending (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Hirschi, 1969). There are many criminological theories that could have been chosen to explain offending and victimization. However, these two theories were chosen based on their strong connection to relationships and activities within the community, which contribute to offending and victimization. Routine activity theory mainly explains victimization, which also indirectly explains what is necessary for crime to occur, therefore also explaining offending. Social bond theory explains offending through connections and relationships to those within one's social group. Taken together, these theories will help create a connection between victimization and offending. Then, when combining the victim-offender overlap concept, it can be understood that increasing the chances of victimization can also increase the chances to offend so it is important to view how strong the relationship between offending and victimization is in juvenile violent offenders. Based on findings from Zavala, Spohn & Alarid (2019), male victimization, gang membership, and indications of a deviant lifestyle do significantly predict victimization. Also, parental monitoring and good family characteristics did reduce victimization for males (Zavala, Spohn & Alarid, 2019). Then, by understanding how one's activities and social bonds within society, specifically in juveniles, can either aid or hinder the likelihood of involvement in deviant or criminal behavior and

victimization, policy implications can be made to decrease juvenile violent victimization and offending together.

This connection will be determined via the theoretical prospective of routine activity theory and social bond theory. Once that connection is established, the study will attempt to determine if that relationship is mediated by juvenile victimization. To better contextualize the victim-offender overlap and causes for offending, different theoretical frameworks need to be used. The study will only use wave 1 of the data set to ensure that any victimization reported did occur before the offense, which will ensure that the victim-offender overlap is relevant to this study. Theoretical frameworks provide information from existing knowledge within the criminological field to help explain current research problem being studied. Lastly, this study will aim to add to existing literature on the subject with the intention of policy changes that will cause juvenile offending as well as victimization to decrease further.

### **Theoretical Frameworks**

According to Hirschi (1969, p. 289), “delinquent acts result when an individual’s bond to society is weak or broken,” and there are four elements that make up this bond: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. When these elements are stronger, there is a lower chance of delinquency as behavior will be more controlled and paralleled to societal regulations. When these bonds are weak, an individual will be more likely to engage in criminal or delinquent behavior (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). If having weak bonds with society can cause one to engage in criminal behavior, then those bonds should also impact one’s likelihood of victimization based on the victim-offender overlap. For this study, social bond theory will be used as an avenue for explanation of juvenile offending. Involvement, beliefs, and attachment will all be used as factors to determine the juvenile’s social bonds within society.

Conversely, routine activity theory uses time and location of criminal events as a cause for increased victimization due to a motivated offender, suitable target, and absence of capable guardianship. Cohen and Felson (1979) determined that the likelihood of criminal activity will increase when there is a “convergence in space and time” of those three elements (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). If one’s routine activity can predict criminal activity, then there is possibly a relationship between routine activity and victimization rates. Demographics, delinquent lifestyle, and physical proximity to crime and social disorder have been examined as factors for increased victimization (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Finkelhor, & Asdigian, 1996; Hindelang, Gottfredson, & Garofalo, 1978; Piquero, MacDonald, Dobrin, Daigle, & Cullen, 2005). For this study, routine activity theory will be used as an explanation for juvenile violent offending, which based on the victim-offender overlap, also has a connection to victimization. Routine activity theory will be explored through employment and community involvement which will show the chances for those three factors to come into play and allow for victimization to occur.

### **Current Study**

The current study will examine the association between routine activity theory, social bond theory, and juvenile violent offending. This relationship will then be evaluated with violent victimization to determine if violent victimization mediates this effect. This study will explore these theoretical constructs and factors highly correlated with offending and victimization (e.g., demographics) to further contextualize the victim-offender overlap within criminological theory. Data from wave 1 of the Pathways to Desistance study, which was a large, longitudinal study of adolescents with felony charges in the large metropolitan areas of Maricopa County, AZ and Philadelphia, PA, will be used. The interviews covered different areas to include demographics, psychological development, personal relationships, and community involvement that this current

study aims to analyze together. The specific measures used for the current study will be routine activities (employment, community involvement, and parental monitoring), social bonds (bonds to teachers, peer attachment, parental warmth and hostility, parental employment status, family arrest history, family mental health history and importance of spirituality) exposure to violence and offense history.

### **Outline of Thesis**

The remainder of the thesis proceeds as follows: Chapter Two will discuss the theoretical frameworks used in the current study to include social bond theory, routine activity theory and the victim-offender overlap. Chapter Three will provide a review of relevant literature related to the theoretical frameworks that were discussed in chapter two. Chapter Four will then explain the methodology to be used for the current study including the research design and rationale, participants of the study and data analysis. Chapter Five will review the results of the study. Chapter Six will then discuss the findings of this study, limitations, and areas in which further research is needed.

## **Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspectives**

Juvenile offending has been explained by various theoretical perspectives in an attempt to gain insight as to why juveniles are committing crimes. This chapter will examine the theoretical frameworks that may explain causes of, reasons for, and contributions to juvenile offending. This thesis will not focus on one specific theory as explanation, rather it will examine both routine activity theory and social bond theory and determine which has a stronger impact on juvenile violent offending and then victimization. These particular theories were chosen because it is critical to understand how a juvenile's activities and bonds within society can contribute to their involvement in criminal behavior and victimization. The study intends to contribute to the existing research by answering a different question: can one particular theory explain the victim-offender overlap in juveniles better than another?

### **Routine Activity Theory**

Routine activity theory was developed during the 1970s in an effort to explain why urban violent crime rates had increased when conditions that were supposed to cause violent crime to had not worsened and had arguably improved (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Cohen and Felson (1979) wanted to explain lifestyle choices that give individuals the opportunity and ability to engage in social behavior that increases both victimization and crime. It is important to note that when the structure of one's routine activities within society influences the situations that then occur, the societal situations may also change. Also, individuals will act in response to situations that they are confronted with which causes them to engage in similar behavior. For example, if someone encounters criminal involvement as part of their daily routine, they will be contributing to their own crime involvement and the increase for society's crime rates as well. This theory aims to

combine a macro-level structural model related to patterns of routine activities in society with a micro-level situational model trying to explain crime.

Cohen and Felson (1979) argued that changes in one's routine can influence convergence in time and space of lack of capable guardianship, suitable targets, and motivated offenders as key factors for victimization to occur. The situational model represents a criminal act that occurs when motivated offender, suitable target and lack of guardianship, such as control or supervision, all happen at once. When people are in their homes, an unoccupied offender would not want to steal from an occupied home, and would try to find a target without guardianship, such as a car. However, since now more people are out of the homes, they become a suitable target without capable guardianship whenever they are outside of the home. Offenders would now have more opportunity to either find a suitable target or find targets without guardianship since more people are out of their home more frequently. On an individual level, routine activity theory attempted to explain victimization, offending, and how one's routine activities can expose them to places and situations that breed crime.

Crimes that increased between 1960 and 1975 included property crimes as well as violent crimes such as robbery, aggravated assault, homicide, and forcible rape (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Prior research studied how residents supervise neighborhoods and ways to limit access to offenders, finding the use of burglary tools, physical set up of the houses, and visibility within neighborhoods all impact the crime rates (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Reiss (1976) argued that victimization studies show that most offenders select their targets within a close proximity to their own homes (Cohen & Felson, 1979). The theoretical perspective used for this theory is based on routine activity patterns since World War II. These routine activities are any recurrent and prevalent activities which provide for basic needs, either individual or the public (Cohen &

Felson, 1979). Routine activities can occur at home, a job outside of the home, or other activities way from the home (Cohen & Felson, 1979). The United States had seen a shift from activities within the home, to activities outside the home involving members that do not live within their household.

Cohen and Felson (1979) wanted to explain lifestyle choices that give individuals the opportunity and ability to engage in behavior that increases both victimization and crime. Cohen and Felson (1979) argued that changes in one's routine can influence "convergence in time and space of lack of capable guardianship, suitable targets, and motivated offenders" as key factors for victimization to occur. Regarding suitable targets, research was done that determined about \$26.44 for every \$100 in goods was stolen related to motor vehicles in 1975 (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Whereas, it was \$6.82 worth of electronic appliances for every \$100 also in 1975 (Cohen & Felson, 1979). This data showed how people are more likely to steal when there is not a capable guardian present. Between 1960 and 1970, there was a change in trends since more women began to spend time outside of the home for work, school, and other routine activities. The female college student population increased 118% and married females in the workforce also increased 31% (Cohen & Felson, 1979). It was also discovered that the unattended homes around 8 A.M. increased by about half and there was a 72% increase in park visits during this time (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Overall, during this decade, more people, specifically women, began to leave the house for activities that they frequented, leaving their homes without guardianship.

Additionally, Sampson and Laub (1997) found it important to note that the percentage of individuals enrolled in higher education and the number of non-husband wife households was continuing to increase during this time (Cohen & Felson, 1979). These activities are, once again,

allowing offenders more opportunities to victimize those individuals, either by their homes being vacant or themselves being outside the home, which also increases chances for victimization. According to Cohen and Felson (1979), there had to be certain characteristics that will cause the motivated offenders to be chose suitable targets. They determined this characteristic to be attractiveness and that is associated with how easily they can attain or transport the target (Cohen & Felson, 1979). For example, an offender will be more likely to choose a target that is out at night walking alone, leaves their doors unlocked or windows open, uses drugs or alcohol to alter their judgement, or even lives in a disadvantaged neighborhood (Cohen & Felson, 1979). One can also decrease their chances of victimization by being a suitable target, if they have a capable guardian with them. Capable guardianship would include going to a restaurant or bar or event with someone else or even a group of people since that would limit the offender's access to the target

Routine activity theory has been studied among juveniles as well to determine how their actions are impacted by the factors of lack of capable guardianship, motivated offender and suitable targets. With juveniles, parents can have a huge impact on their routine activities mostly related to lack of capable guardianship and suitable targets. When there is no parental figure with a juvenile, that child is now without capable guardianship and therefore has a higher chance for victimization (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Additionally, a juvenile may easily be a suitable target because of their innocence and weakness which can allow for a higher chance of victimization as well (Finkelhor & Asdigian, 1996).

Bernburg and Thorlindsson (2001) attempted to explain the relationship between routine activities and deviant behavior with societal relations. They found that the relationship between routine activities and juvenile deviant behavior is mediated by societal norms and aims, which



opposes the traditional routine activity theory. Bernburg and Thorlindsson (2001) found that when there were favorable definitions to violence, the juvenile had a higher likelihood of involvement with deviant behavior. The argument from these findings would be that social relations among juveniles impacts their routine activities therefore impacting their deviant behavior. They also did not find strong evidence of unstructured peer interaction having an impact on routine activities and then deviant behavior (Bernburg & Thorlindsson, 2001). Their overall findings determined that social context does regulate the routine activities in which situations of deviance are generated (Bernburg & Thorlindsson, 2001).

There has been research done on how children spend their free time and how that impacts their delinquency. Cross, et al. (2009) performed a study on after-school programs with the intent to determine how much capable guardianship can impact one's delinquent behavior. They used a sample of children that participated in an after-school program three days a week from five middle schools within one school district (Cross et al., 2009). They used self-report surveys in which questions were asked to the children about their frequent activities including hanging out with peers unsupervised, stealing, drug use etc. (Cross et al., 2009). Their study found that participation in these programs reduce unsupervised activity by about half of a day than those without the program. There is then the question to determine if that half-day reduction is enough to prevent them from participating in juvenile delinquency. Cross et al. (2009) did support their hypothesis that unsupervised activity is linked to delinquency. However, their findings were limited due to the small study group from only one district so they were not able to determine if supervised activity, such as an after-school program, can substantially cause a decrease in problematic behaviors (Cross et al., 2009).

Kang, Tanner and Wortley (2017) found that gender differences for juveniles and their likelihood of engaging in juvenile delinquency. Their study included a sample of 2,209 students from a school in Toronto. They found that the relationship for boys is stronger than girls when engaging in unstructured and unsupervised activities and delinquency (Kang et al., 2017). However, their study found that there was no notable difference between substance abuse and gender. Also, they determined that these differences may be due to the type, or location of the leisure activities by either boys or girls. Additionally, Kang et al., (2017) determined that there was only less delinquency for boys when they were engaging in prosocial leisure activities.

A study completed by Svensson and Oberwittler (2010) hypothesized that juvenile friendships will impact offending depending on how much time they spend together, their time spent performing unsupervised or unstructured activities and their emotional relationship to their friends. They used a sample of young children from Sweden (N=1,003) and Germany (N=955) (Svensson & Oberwittler, 2010). Their findings supported their hypotheses by showing that delinquent friends have a greater impact on adolescents who frequently spend their time engaging in unstructured routine activities (Svensson & Oberwittler, 2010). These findings combine the ideas that routine activities and social bonds to society are influential of delinquency. If children who frequently engage in unsupervised and unstructured activities, then they will be more likely to be influenced by members of society due to their lack of attachment and commitment to society.

Routine activities theory explains lifestyle choices in which individuals are given opportunity to engage in social activities that can increase crime and victimization. According to Cohen and Felson (1979), one's routine will be influenced by a convergence in space and time of three aspects: (1) lack of capable guardianship, (2) suitable targets, and (3) motivated offenders.

When all three of those aspects combine at once, Cohen and Felson (1979) believe that the likelihood for victimization will greatly increase.

### **Social Bond Theory**

Hirschi (1969) developed the concept of social bonds related to offending which include the following four elements: attachment, commitment, involvement, and beliefs. Hirschi argued that those with strong social bonds are less inclined to violate norms of society. Alternatively, those with weak or no bonds to society or individuals deviate from societal norms due to a lack of concern or care.

First, attachment to one's family, school, friends or even church, can deter them from deviant or criminal behavior based on the fear, harming or distressing those attachments. However, this does not mean that anyone with a societal attachment will not commit deviant acts. Hirschi believed they will contemplate their decision because of the value they hold within those relationships.

Commitment refers to the investment and loyalty to social groups, institutions or activities (Hirschi, 1969). Hirschi stated that an individual who has invested time and/or resources into a group or activity will be less likely to deviate from societal normal. For example, if an individual is committed to furthering their education, one will contemplate committing an offense that would threaten their hard work, money and time that was spent for that education. When someone has commitments to society, they will have more to lose and would be risking more if they committed deviant or criminal acts.

Hirschi (1969) also believed that involvement within some type of group, organization or structure will decrease the likelihood of engaging in deviant activities. For example, someone who spends forty hours a week at a job is very involved in that organization and will have less

opportunity for deviant behavior. Whereas, someone who is unemployed or working part time will have free time during the day where they may be tempted to engage in negative behavior. Hirschi emphasized how discipline and regiment can encourage one to resist from the deviant or criminal behavior, even when the temptation is there.

The last element Hirschi (1969) proposed as part of social bond theory was belief which refers to belief in the moral validity of shared social values. A society will have values that are accepted by large groups or most individuals, and the likelihood of one conforming to those norms will be based on the individual's beliefs in those values. For example, if a society or a group, believes in human heterosexual marriage, yet certain individuals do not find any value in that societal norm, they will be less inclined to follow suit. These beliefs can apply to simple values and norms that have been set forth by society or a group they are involved in, such as a church, or legal rules set forth. When an individual does not have belief in the reason of a law, they do not care about breaking that law leading to a deviant and criminal lifestyle.

According to Hirschi (1969), delinquent acts occur when an individual has a weak bond to society. He found four elements that make up the one's bond to society: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. When these elements are stronger, there will be a lower chance of delinquency and the behavior will be more controlled and in line with societal controls. When these bonds are weak, the individual will be more likely to engage in criminal or delinquent behavior (Akers, Sellers & Jennings, 2017). He also believed that all four of these elements are intercorrelated and the weakening of one element will affect the others. Attachment is how one admires or identifies with others in which we will care about their expectations (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). When one has a strong attachment, they will care about their opinions and will be more likely to comply with the norms of society. Hirschi (1969) emphasized

the importance of attachment to parents and supervision by parents in order to control delinquency and that without those, there is a high chance of criminal activity. Commitment refers to how much the individual finds importance in conforming to societal rules and regulations (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). The higher the commitment, the more that they would lose if they engaged in nonconformity. Involvement means how much time one spends doing activities such as studying, sports, or family time (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). The more involved one is, the less time or want there would be for delinquent behavior since they are occupied and tied down doing something else with others. The last element is belief which means one must believe in society rules and norms in order for it to have an effect on compliance (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). If one has a strong belief in what is morally correct, there will be a smaller chance of criminal behavior.

Recent research on Hirschi's theory has determined the validity and scope of his theory (Maton, 1989; Certacci, 2003; Wallace, Moak, & Moore, 2005). Attachment has been measured by parental supervision, discipline, communication and relationships. Commitment, involvement, and belief were measured by academic achievement since good grades, test scores and scholastic ability can be strong indicators of those elements (Wallace et al., 2005). Belief is studied by looking at how one views law enforcement, laws and how the law should be obeyed (Certacci, 2003). Hirschi (1969) found that when these four elements are strong, there will be less delinquency or criminal activity and when there is a weak bond, the crime will be higher. Almost all studies found that religious belief had major impact on delinquent behavior. Overall, Hirschi's (1969) theory has received support from multiple studies but there is more support for his original control theory.

## Summary

Routine activity theory has been developed as an explanation for victimization based on the convergence of time and space of a motivated offender, suitable target and lack of capable guardianship. For example, studies have found that a juvenile who is frequently engaging unsupervised activities will be more likely to commit delinquent acts. The victim-offender overlap, which determined that those who are victimized and offend are often the same individuals, also backs that theory to show that juveniles are then more likely to be victimized when engaging in delinquent activities. Juveniles need to receive structure and guidance from an adult figure. Therefore, when that structure is lacking, they may engage in delinquent or criminal acts due to lack of supervision or appropriate decision making. Due to this, it is important to view parental involvement in juvenile's daily activities to determine what impact that had on their behavior, which ultimately led to deviant or criminal behavior.

Social bond theory explains offending via individuals' attachment, involvement, beliefs and commitment to society. For example, a juvenile who has activities, events, beliefs, or relationships within their communities will hesitate to engage in delinquency due to those connections. Most of these bonds to society are encouraged by parental figures and their decisions about their children's activities. Without those bonds, a juvenile will be more willing to engage in those delinquent activities, which then increases their likelihood of victimization based on the victim-offender overlap findings. Parental involvement is relevant to discuss when viewing one's social bonds to society due to the impact the parent has on those bonds. Most, if not all, of a juvenile's beliefs will stem from those of their parents as well as their engagement in activities and events within their communities.

### **Chapter 3: Literature Review**

It is important to understand the victim-offender overlap in juveniles by explaining how offenders and victims are connected. This literature review will allow for a better understanding of the overlap, as well as the connection of that overlap to the theories being studied, routine activity and social bonds to help explain the overlap. Then, the literature review will explain how certain measures such as social bonds to society and routine activities can impact this overlap among juveniles.

According to Hardie (2017), there are three major aspects to juvenile offending and deviant behavior, and it is not simply absence of parental monitoring. The physical absence of a parent, the psychological absence of a parent and family morals or beliefs are together what causes adolescents to commit criminal acts (Hardie, 2017). The following literature review will elaborate on those three aspects to include literature about the importance of parental monitoring, parental warmth and hostility as well as family structure. All three of these factors have been found to contribute to juvenile offending, and therefore will be included as measures in the following study.

#### **Victim-Offender Overlap**

Originally presented by Hans Von Hentig in 1948 via his book, *The Criminal and His Victim* (1948), the victim-offender overlap is the link between victimization and participation in crime and delinquent behavior. Von Hentig (1948) believed that there are victims who are passive recipients and victims that contribute to their own victimization. He believed this overlap to be true because some offenders would choose victims who are criminally involved themselves, hoping that would deter them from contacting the police. Von Hentig's idea of the victim offender overlap encouraged much more research on the topic with hopes to explore and

explain this relationship. There are many characteristics of typical crime victims: male, lower income, single, young adolescents, African American. Likewise, many characteristics of criminal offenders are male, young adolescents, African American, not married, drug use involved (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000). Due to the similarities between characteristics of offenders and victims, Von Hentig's idea of the victim offender overlap has been mostly confirmed. However, there are many areas that still need to be further researched and are being debated.

The victim-offender overlap can be defined as the link between victimization and the perpetration of crime and delinquency (Reingle, 2014). The victim-offender overlap is considered a criminological fact due to the link between behaviors exhibited by offenders as well as victims that cannot be explained with demographics (Reingle, 2014). There needs to be an understanding of what causes offending and if there are any trends that can be found prior to attempting to lower those rates of offending. Barrett and Katsiyannis (2016) performed a study using data from South Carolina's juvenile justice agents focusing on young adults ranging from 17 to 30 years old. Their study looked at those that had committed a minor offense compared to young adults with no criminal record. The study viewed certain aspects of their lives to attribute to their offending including: mental health issues, family life and learning disabilities. Barrett and Katsiyannis (2016) found that the offenders included in their study were found high risk for delinquency in all categories studied, whereas the non-offending young adults were not. Their findings show how important those factors (mental health, family, etc.) are to determine offending and additionally, show what can be an indicator for juvenile offending.

Wolfgang (1958) researched both victims and offenders, separately and combined, since research had not been looking at both groups. While studying homicide in Philadelphia, Wolfgang found that about  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the homicides studied were victim-precipitated, meaning that



homicide was provoked from a prior crime done by the victim. Dobrin (2011) performed a study in Maryland with a sample of homicide victims and citizens that were not victims. He found that a victim is four to ten times more likely to have a prior arrest record, usually for property or violent crimes than those who were not victims (Dobrin, 2011). Mustaine and Tewksbury (2000) found that lifestyle behaviors associated with exposure to offenders has influence on risk of victimization, specifically with assault among college students. Also, students who spent their free time with friends or acquaintances had lower risk of assault victimization (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000).

Sampson and Lauritsen (1990) used routine activity and lifestyle theory to find support for the victim-offender overlap based on a deviant lifestyle. Their study used two different surveys from England and Wales related to deviance, either violent or non-violent and minor offenses (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990). They were able to distinguish variables that can predict victimization and offending which were single, young age, male, low education level and being out at night (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990). Overall, they established how a deviant lifestyle can increase victimization when engaging in violent crimes. Shortly after that, Lauritsen, Sampson, and Laub (1991) used the National Youth Survey to study victimization among juveniles and the connection between victimization and offending. This survey focused on teenagers and young adults and their delinquent lifestyles and criminal victimization. They found participation in social activities reduced the risk for offending and therefore the risk for victimization as well. Also, lifestyles with greater delinquent activities were at risk of victimization, which consisted of mostly males (Lauritsen et. al., 1991).

Routine activity theory can be used to understand victimization risks, while being applied to understand offenders and criminal contexts (Felson 1998; Kennedy and Forde

1999). Due to the involvement in a criminal lifestyle, these individuals are increasing their opportunity to become victimized (Stewart & Simons, 2010). Routine activity theory relies on constant motivated offenders and focuses on situational contexts and behaviors that would place targets at risk for victimization (Cohen & Felson, 1979). However, Lauritsen, Sampson and Laub (1991) argued that structural and cultural conditions will prompt individuals, specifically adolescents, to engage in crime and therefore increase their chances of victimization.

Demographics, delinquent lifestyle, and physical proximity to crime and social disorder were examined as factors for increased victimization and their study found that those factors do have an impact (Lauritsen et. al., 1991). Demographics can be understood by the “principle of homogeneity” which states there is a higher level of victimization when one comes in contact with demographic groups that contain a disproportionate rate of offenders (Lane, 2018). When most people within a group are committing criminal activity, one will be more likely to be involved with crimes when engaging with that group.

Jensen and Brownfield (1986) found children have a higher chance of becoming a victim of a crime when involved in a delinquent lifestyle. Research has shown that youth between the ages of twelve and nineteen are twice as likely to become victimized opposed to people over the age of twenty (Lauritsen et. al., 1991). Since this age group has such a greater chance of falling victim to a personal crime, it is important to look the reason for their increased risk of victimization. According to Mustaine (2000), the student population of colleges and universities is similar to the population of typical offenders due to having similar age, employment status and social class. This can lead one to infer that students will have a higher likelihood of exposure to offenders as well as activities that can allow them to engage in dangerous behavior. College

student populations frequently engage in drinking, partying and using drugs which has been linked to predatory victimization (Lasley, 1989).

### **Routine Activity Theory**

Many childhood victimization cases are linked to either routine activity theory or lifestyle theory as an explanation for the behavior. The assumption is made based on their vulnerability since they put themselves in certain environments causing them to be exposed to potential offenders. According to Miethe and Meier (1994), these theories draw on four concepts: proximity to crime, exposure to crime, target attractiveness, and guardianship (Finkelhor & Asdigian, 1996). Proximity to crime is based on how much crime occurs in the area that the person either resides, works, passes through, or hangs out in. Exposure to crime would occur when someone is walking at night in a high crime area since they are causing themselves to be exposed. Target attractiveness, which was originally discussed by Cohen and Felson (1979), refers to reasons why they might become a target, such as having money lying around in a car. One could increase their guardianship by being with family and friends more and not going out of their homes by themselves. These concepts were studied in regard to youth victimization to determine how increased exposure and decreased guardianship can cause a youth's vulnerability to be increased. Many teenagers choose to stay out late, go to parties and other risky behaviors which are lacking the guardianship that their parents would normally provide, therefore increasing their chances to be victimized. When these children surround themselves in a lifestyle of delinquency, they are allowing themselves to come in contact with criminals which can increase their chances of becoming involved in crime themselves and their chances to fall victim to a crime.

According to Lauristen, Laub, and Sampson (1991, 1992), delinquent youths are victimized more than any other group of youths. Finkelhor and Asdigian (1996) found an issue with routine activity theory as an explanation for most or even all of young victimization since this theory was originally theorized as an explanation for street crime. Most children are not involved in random street crime and are instead victimized by their acquaintances or even their own family members. Finkelhor and Asdigian (1996) believe that the type of victimization can be impacted by the environment and parental actions. For example, parental violence inside the home will not be affected or increased when the child is engaging in activities outside of the home or increasing their “exposure to crime.” Research has found that children who have negative attachment to their caregivers can exhibit lack of trust, social isolation, and physical impairments such as weakness (Olweus, 1993, Smith, Bowers, Binney & Cowie, 1993).

There has been a lack of tests of routine activity theory related to the theory’s ability to predict victimization for specific subpopulations, offenses, or activities (Mustaine & Tewksbury (1999). Testing of routine activity theory would allow for an understanding of “how activities of crime victims viewed with specific contexts interact with individuals’ victimization risks” (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999, p. 47). It can be widely understood that the victimization of women is much different than victimization of men and, therefore, should be studied differently. Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) discussed the importance of understanding an individual’s activities including work history, leisure activities, and education history. One can have a higher likelihood of victimization if they are hanging out with people engaged in a criminal lifestyle. A study on female stalking victimization by Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) found that the most important factors contributing to victimization are what individuals do, where they are and with

whom they come in contact, and there is not much impact simply based on their demographics (race, gender etc.) which supports the original theory findings.

Lynch (1987) studied how the workplace can affect one's victimization since there has been little found related to attributes of specific occupations and how that affects work and victimization. A schedule or type of place of employment may cause one to be at greater risk for victimization since they are working late hours, or exposed to dangerous populations, such as bartenders or police officers. Prior research has shown that people are victimized more when they are on leisure time, and not at work, yet their employment does impact their routine activities. Lynch (1987) found that one's routine activities do impact their risk of victimization, further supporting Cohen and Felson (1979). He also found that sociodemographic characteristics of victims are not influential for predicting risk within the work force. Lynch (1987) also found that the influence of variables had a greater impact than the victim characteristics, which has been studied by many criminologists. Overall, activity at work was a determining factor for risk of victimization, even when dangerous work was controlled for, because of the exposure, guardianship and attractiveness (Lynch, 1987).

Cross et al. (2009) performed a study to determine the effectiveness of after-school programs (ASP) preventing adolescents from engaging in delinquency. Their study is based on prior research showing that unsupervised activities of juveniles can cause an increase in engagement in juvenile delinquency or criminal behavior (Cross et al., 2009). Their findings show that there is a reduction in delinquency of about a half-day from being placed in an ASP three days a week. Their findings do show a reduction, however, the researchers then asked if only a half day decrease in unsupervised activities was enough to consider it a reduction (Cross et al., 2009).

## **Social Bond Theory**

Most prior research has used Hirschi's social bonds, however, only studied one or two of the bonds and not all of the bonds. Chui and Chan (2012) performed a study with the goal of testing all of Hirschi's social bonds on 1,377 adolescents in Hong Kong. The adolescents were randomly selected from nine schools and ranged in age from 12 to 17 years old (Chui & Chan, 2012). They examined the chance of theft and violent crime with the effects of social bonds with and without controlling for their age (Chui and Chan, 2012). Chui and Chan (2012) found three major findings: belief in the legal system, strong parental bonds, and commitment to school all were significant factors in predicting theft and violent delinquency for adolescents. Based on their findings, they believe there should be a push for programs to build relationships between the police and there is a need for children to have a strong relationship with their parents and place priority on their education (Chui & Chan, 2012).

Children are able to relate to behavior that they are shown by adult figures in their life which allows them to portray that same behavior to others. Grossman and Grossman (1990) found that children rarely engage in antisocial behavior, fail to show emotional dysfunction, and usually show warmth toward others when they have strong attachment to their parents. Seemingly, Feeney and Noller (1990) found children with attachments, as opposed to those without, had higher self-esteem and were less anxious in their adulthood. They also found that those same individuals would be found in romantic relationships as well as strong friendships and acquaintances with those around them (Feeney and Noller, 1990). Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall (1978) established three types of attachment styles in which the sensitivity to the child is determined including secure, avoidant and anxious-ambivalent. Depending on the relationships type of attachment, the child will create a response which can then predict their behavior toward

others. A parent can create a secure parent relationship with their child when the parent is confident, responsive, warm, affectionate, empathetic, trustworthy and consistent (Feeny & Noller, 1990; Lamb, Gaeunsbauer, Malkin & Schualtz, 1985; Paterson & Moran, 1988).

Research continues to show that parental factors have a major impact on delinquent children, implying how important parental involvement is. Many factors contributing to delinquency are interrelated due to socioeconomic factors to include lack of parental supervision, one-parent households, lack of education, and criminal parents (Braga, Goncalves, Basto-Pereira, & Maia, 2017; Derzon, 2010; Farrington, 2011; Farrington & Welsh, 2007; Hoeve et al., 2009). With lack of stable income, one could resort to a criminal lifestyle for money or may be absent from the home while working long hours while working multiple jobs. A household without stable income may be putting their children at greater risk for delinquency due to lack of capable guardianship during those hours spent working. It can be very difficult to specifically determine a single cause of delinquency because many of the characteristics of family are connected to other contributing factors (Farrington, 2011). Many of the parental factors that contribute to delinquency can be found in poor neighborhoods which usually will have higher crime rates already. Minorities, specifically African Americans, have been pushed into these poor and crime-ridden neighborhoods after deindustrialization began moving the well-paying jobs out of the cities (Feld, 2017; Sampson & Wilson, 1995; Wilson, 1987, 2009). Minorities were then replaced by low-paying jobs which left the neighborhoods with poor housing options, lack of social services, and poor educational opportunities (Feld, 2017; Sampson & Wilson, 1995; Wilson, 1987, 2009). In low-income areas where people do not have assistance for opportunity to create a better life, their families will be at higher risk for victimization as well as higher likelihood of criminal involvement.

Research has shown that parental warmth and hostility toward the children can shape the child with empathy and conscience to prevent fewer behavior problems (Frick et al. 2014; Frick & Viding 2009; Muñoz & Frick, 2012). Waller et al., (2014) performed a study to determine callous-unemotional (CU) behavior among 731 mother-child dyads with children ages 2 to 3. They measured parental warmth with direct observations within the home and also coded speech samples. Their study found that parental warmth did predict CU behavior and this behavior showed during the toddler stage therefore causing adaption of parenting techniques to reflect the child behavior (Waller et al., 2014).

Hipwell et al. (2008) performed a six-year prospective analysis on girls' conduct problems, depression, and parental punishment and warmth. Prior research had shown effects on children and their behavior based on parenting factors, however, there was little research into childhood depression and other conduct issues (Hipwell et al., 2008). Their study consisted of annual interviews of girls ages 7 to 12 and their primary female caregivers, 85% of which were biological mothers, over a six-year span (Hipwell et al., 2008). Hipwell et al., (2008) determined that parenting behaviors, such as parental punishment and parental warmth, had a direct relation to girls' depression and conduct. When race and poverty were controlled for, low parental warmth was found to be an indicator of depression in the girls, even though the conduct problems were still found to be significant with both parental effects (Hipwell et al., 2008). Additionally, Hipwell et al. (2008) found that an association of conduct problems in girls and harsh punishment and did not find an association of depressed mood.

Johnson, Lang, Larson, and De Li (2001) defined religiosity as the extent to which an individual is committed to a religion where their attitudes and behavior reflects such commitment. Multiple studies have shown an association between involvement in religious



programs and reduction of juvenile delinquency or other criminal activities (Cox & Matthews, 2007; DeLei, Johnson, & McCullough, 2000; Brinker, McGarrell, & Etindi, 1999). A study completed by Cooper (2013) used data from the National Study of Youth and Religion (2005) to determine the relationship between religiosity and juvenile delinquency. The findings show that there is indeed an impact on juvenile delinquency from religiosity combined with all four aspects of Hirschi's social bonds. Additionally, it was found that religiosity has an impact on juvenile delinquency alone (Cooper, 2013).

There has been contradicting research related to the effect religion has on delinquency dating back to when Durkheim and Weber stated that religion was part of social control theory (Benda & Corwyn, 1997). Lombroso found a positive effect between deviance and religion whereas Johnson (2002) has found religion benefits health and behaviors including delinquency, substance abuse and suicide. Based on these findings, Cretacci (2003) studied how violence is impacted throughout developmental stages based on elements of a social bond, to include religion. He found that only peer commitment was significant in early adolescents and only school attachment and commitment along with belief was significant for those in the middle developmental stage (Cretacci, 2003). Overall, Cretacci (2003) did not find a strong explanation of violence based on social bonds over the course of developmental stages. According to Zavala & Muniz (2020), one's activities are impacted by their religious involvement, which influences their victimization, specifically intimate partner violence.

Wallace, Moak, and Moore (2005) took a different prospective by looking at how religiosity effects delinquency in schools. The goal of their study was to examine social bond theory in restraining students from committing school delinquency. The study included six measures: commitment to school, commitment to education, parental involvement, emotional

attachment to family, religion and belief in school rules (Wallace, Moak, & Moore, 2005).

Religion was measured with a two-item index leaving the student with a score of either high or low degree of religiosity. They found that social control theory was successful, although not completely, for explaining delinquency in schools and religion was significant in 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades, but not 10<sup>th</sup> (Wallace, Moak, & Moore, 2005).

### **Summary**

The victim-offender overlap explains how offenders and victims are often connected by certain characteristics and behaviors, and how that overlap can be applied to the youth as well. This literature review explained the overlap, as well as the connection of that overlap to the theories being studied in the current study, routine activity and social bonding, to help explain the overlap. Then, measures such as family characteristics, social bonds to society and routine activities were explored for their impact on the overlap among juveniles, specifically. There may be many factors contributing to youth who commit offenses and their victimization. This study will view impact of juvenile's social bonds and routine activities to determine if either of those associations to offending is stronger and if they are mediated by violent victimization.

## **Chapter 4: Methodology**

There are many theoretical perspectives that attempt to explain certain behavior and offer ways to prevent deviant juvenile behavior. Juvenile delinquency and crime frequently occur within communities, so it is important to determine the causes of that behavior. Once the cause of that behavior is established, communities will be able to implement certain programs or policy changes to aid those juveniles from engaging in deviant or criminal behavior. The current study aims to determine if certain factors (e.g., parental monitoring, employment, and friendship quality) predict juvenile offending and then, if that relationship is mediated by victimization. Additionally, the study will attempt to determine if a juvenile's social bonds or routine activities will give a better explanation of the relationship between violent offending and violent victimization. The following study will focus on violent victimization and offending for two major reasons. First, prior research has found more of a connection to these behaviors when discussing violent crimes. Also, the entire data set is comprised of juvenile offenders, so focusing on violent offenses will allow for distinction from general serious offenses.

### **Research Design and Rationale**

I will be using data from the Pathways to Desistance study, a large, longitudinal study of adolescents with serious charged in two large metropolitan areas. For the current study, I will be using wave 1 of the Pathways to Desistance data set. The purpose of this study is to obtain a better understanding of how routine activities and social bonds such as beliefs, involvement, commitment, and attachment, specifically with community, school, peers and parents, can impact juvenile behavior and then how that impacts victimization. The Pathways to Desistance data set includes many measures including parental involvement, friendship quality, community

involvement and exposure to violence, which are all relevant to this current study. The current study will test the following hypotheses:

### **Hypotheses**

Hypothesis 1. A juvenile's routine activities will decrease violent offending.

Hypothesis 2. A juvenile's social bonds will decrease violent offending.

Hypothesis 3. The relationship between social bonds and violent offending will be stronger than the relationship between routine activities and violent offending.

Hypothesis 4. Violent victimization will mediate the relationships between social bonds and routine activities and violent offending.

### **Design**

The present study uses data obtained from the Pathways to Desistance Study which is a longitudinal study that followed juvenile offenders in two large metropolitan cities. The study was a multi-site survey in Maricopa County, Arizona and Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania over a 10-year period. The dataset is available via the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research by the University of Michigan (ICPSR). Data collection was comprised of background characteristics (e.g., demographics, offense history, and personality), individual functioning (e.g., performance in professional settings, substance abuse, and behavior), psychosocial development and attitudes (e.g., impulse control and perceptions of opportunity), family context (e.g., quality of family relationships), personal relationships (e.g., quality of friendships, peer delinquency), and community context (e.g., neighborhood conditions and community involvement). The data collection method offers the ability to study community

context, family relationships, individual behaviors, and demographics as predictors of victimization in youth, specifically minorities (see Mulvey et al., 2004 for more detail on the study; additional information regarding measures can be found at [www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

### **Participants and Setting**

The Pathways to Desistance Study was completed with the purpose of identifying patterns of how serious adolescent offenders stop antisocial activity, describing the role of social context and developmental changes in promoting these changes, and to comparing the effects of sanctions and interventions in promoting these changes. The study included 1,354 serious juvenile offenders residing in two major cities: Phoenix, AZ and Philadelphia, PA between November 2000 and January 2003. The study followed them from adolescence to young adulthood with multiple assessments to test and record their psychological development, behavior, social relationships, mental health, and experiences in or with the criminal justice system. In order to be eligible for the study, the participants had to be between 14 and 17 years old at the time of their offense and found guilty of a serious offense to include felonies, sexual assault or weapons charges. The data was confirmed with FBI arrest records and records from each jurisdiction where the study was conducted. To control for drug use, since the population of drug users is so dense among that age group, the number of male participants with drug offenses was capped at 15%.

The study consisted of 184 girls (14%) and 1,170 boys (86%) with 30.8% (n=417) of them being 14-15 years of age, 60.9% (n=825) being 16-17 years old, and 8.3% (112) being 18-19 years old. Out of the 1354 youth, 51.7% (n=700) juveniles resided in Philadelphia and 48.3% (n=654) in Phoenix. As for ethnicity, 20.2% (n=274) of participants were White (Non-Hispanic), 41.4% (n=561) Black (Non-Hispanic), 33.5% (n=454) Hispanic, and 4.8% (n=65) Other

rates. Only 1% had their charge adjudicated with later case dismissal and 1% were required to pay fines/restitution. However, 41% were given probation, 21% were given placement at a nonincarcerated residential facility and 21% were incarcerated. It is also important to note that 15% of the total individuals used for the study were still pending their adjudication with the court system.

## **Interviews**

The participants completed their baseline interviews, after parental consent was given, between November 2000 and March 2003, and then follow-up interviews at the 6-, 12-, 18-, 24-, 39-, 36-, 48-, 60- and 72-month mark after their baseline interview. The baseline interview was conducted within 75 days of their adjudication if they are within the juvenile system or within 90 days of the decertification hearing (Philadelphia) or adult arraignment (Phoenix) for those within the adult system. An adult collateral informant, which was a parent in 80% of the cases, was also questioned during the baseline interview. In order to ensure equal measurement for all participants, the date of the interval interviews was based on their specific baseline interview date which allowed for analyses of developmental process, environmental changes and changes in behavior. The respondents could have submitted a “time release” interview which were based on time since the baseline interview or a “release” interview which were completed after a stay at a residential facility. The release interviews were completed 30 days prior to release or within 30 days after release from the facility. The interviews were completed on computers either in their homes, libraries, or within the residential facilities they were residing in at the time. The interviewers would ask questions and the respondent could either speak or type their response to address privacy concerns, if in a public setting. Interviewers had the ability to complete follow-up interviews six weeks prior to the interview target date until eight weeks after the target date.

The interviewers were given different windows (search, do, and late) in order to locate the participants and establish a time and date for each follow-up interview to take place.

These processes were in place to ensure that the interview could be completed for that follow-up period without issues location or accessing the participant. Even if one or more interviews were missed, the researchers would continue to include them in the study with future follow-up interviews unless the respondent withdrew from the study.

Interviews were conducted via computers, usually laptops with participants and interviewers both visible on the screen. With assistance from software, the interviewer was able to link prior reports from past interviews to cross-reference information which accounted for consistency from the respondents throughout the entire study. Using this software and technology also allowed for the researchers to immediately transfer and access the data from interviews to point to problems with the data, measures or trends as they are occurred. The study also used a secure Web site for respondent's information (e.g., aliases, court dates, charges, court records, etc.) which allowed for shared, easily accessible data while maintaining privacy and confidentiality for those participants.

The interviews conducted at baseline and follow-up points covered six different areas: (a) background characteristics (e.g., demographics, academic achievement, psychiatric diagnoses, offense history, neurological functioning, psychopathy, personality), (b) indicators of individual functioning (e.g., work and school status and performance, substance abuse, mental disorder, antisocial behavior), (c) psychosocial development and attitudes (e.g., impulse control, susceptibility to peer influence, perceptions of opportunity, perceptions of procedural justice, moral disengagement), (d) family context (e.g., household composition, quality of family relationships), (e) personal relationships (e.g., quality of romantic relationships and friendships,

peer delinquency, contacts with caring adults), and (f) community context (e.g., neighborhood conditions, personal capital, social ties, and community involvement). The interview conducted at release was more in-depth since it included information on the treatment and dynamics related to the program for that offender. They looked at program operations, program dynamics (e.g., contact with caring adults in the facility, perceptions of fairness and equity connected with treatment by facility staff), and the adolescents' assessments of the type and utility of services offered.

### **Participant retention**

Between November 2000 and January 2003, during the enrollment period, 10,461 individuals were processed in the two metropolitan areas that met the criteria for the study. Even though 42% of those individuals were brought through the court system more than once during the recruitment period, they only counted them once in the total number to avoid presence of skewed numbers of repeat offenders. In order to be eligible for the study, the offender had to be adjudicated for a relevant charge and some had to be excluded since they were charged with a lesser crime during their court process. At adjudication, 5,382 of the cases were reduced below felony level offences so that decreased the sample size greatly. There were about 1,799 cases that also had to be excluded since the court data was not sufficient enough to determine the charges at adjudication due to operational and design constraints. The researchers were able to use 1/3 (36%) of those adjudicated felony offenders that were brought through the court systems in both Maricopa County, AZ and Philadelphia, PA. The participation rate, or the number of participants enrolled divided by the number attempted was 67% and the refusal rate, or the number of adolescents or parents that did not want to take part in the study, was 20%.



Overall, the researchers began with 10,461 cases but excluded 1,272 because of lack of court records and complete files needed to obtain all the information for the study. There were 9,189 individuals left who were then split into three groups: (a) petitioned on an eligible charge but dropped below eligibility (n=5,392), (b) adjudicated, but not enrolled (n=2,443) and (c) enrolled group which only included those petitioned and adjudicated on an eligible charge (n=1,354). They were able to get full data at 6 and 12 months for 92% of the sample, at the 18-month point, they had received data on 89% of the starting population and at the 24-month point, they had obtained data on 81% of the sample. They had minimal percent's that did not participate in those interviews, specifically 1%, which shows a great retention rate for the study.

## **Measures**

### **Measurement selection**

Researchers in the Pathways Study wanted to examine changes (developmental and contextual) within a sample of adolescence through early adulthood. So, they had to determine which psychological and social functioning measures would best work for both age groups (adolescence and adulthood) since some do not apply to both. Also, many of those within the sample had low or minimal literacy skills, which also posed an issue with measurement selection. There were differences in age and ethnicity as well as life circumstances that impacted relevance and equivalence for the measurements. The study was critical in constructing measures that will work for the population being used which will aid future research. Due to the chaotic nature and instability of juveniles' lives, the Pathways study aimed to include information about that period of time being covered and the nature, number and timing of important changes or circumstance in one's life. The changes included residence, education, employment and interpersonal relationships and the study also viewed the relevance of criminal

offending to those changes. The current study will include use the measure of victimization as a mediating variable. The following measures will be used as independent variables: routine activities, parental involvement, and social bonds. Specifically, routine activities, community involvement, and employment as measures of one's routine activities. Then, importance of spirituality, quality of friendships and school attendance and grades will be used to measure one's social bonds. Lastly, parental warmth and hostility, parental monitoring and characteristics of the family will be used to measure parental involvement, which connect to both routine activities and social bonds.

### **Routine Activities**

#### **Capable Guardianship**

##### *Routine Activity*

In the Pathways to Desistance Study routine activities were measured using the frequency of unstructured socializing with focus on absence of an authority or adult figure based on the "Monitoring the Future Questionnaire" (Osgood, Wilson, O'Malley, Bachman, & Johnston, 1996). The interviewers included questions such as "How often did you get together with friends informally?" The participants would respond on 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Almost every day" A higher response would indicate a greater involvement in unstructured activities with lack of authority figures as this measure will be coded continuously for this current study. The current study will use the routine activities measure, community involvement, and employment as measures for routine activities, all of which will be independent variables. (Osgood, Wilson, O'Malley, Bachman, & Johnston, 1996)

##### *Parental Monitoring*

Parental monitoring will be used as a measure of routine activities, which is a variable for this study. The Pathways to Desistance study uses The Parental Monitoring inventory (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992) to assess the supervision of the study participant. They determine a primary individual who is responsible for the youth with preliminary questions and then go on to ask questions regarding their current living situation. They included five questions to assess parental knowledge to include “How much does X know about how you spend your free time” for people who either live with their caretaker or not. These questions were answered with a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “does not know at all” to “knows everything.” Individuals who live with their primary caretakers were also asked four additional questions such as “How often do you have a set time to be home on weekend nights?” to determine the level of parental monitoring of the youth’s behavior. These questions were answered with a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “always” to “never.” They must have received four of the five items listed in order to compute a mean for parental knowledge. For parental monitoring, there must have been data for at least three of the four items which was only available if the subject lives with a supervising adult. For the current study, parental monitoring will be coded continuously based on the level of monitoring and knowledge the parent provides for the respondent. The measure of parental monitoring will be used to determine how the level of presence impacts the juvenile’s decisions.

### **Suitable Target**

#### *Community Involvement*

Community involvement will be used as a measure of routine activities, which is a variable for this study. The measure of community involvement was based on the Community Involvement Scale (Elliot, 1990) yet modified to fit the specific needs of the study. The

researchers calculated scores for: involvement in community activities, count of endorsed activities, independent of recency and involvement in community activities, count of endorsed activities in which the youth has been involved in the last six months. Community involvement will be used as a measure of routine activities to determine the juvenile's frequent activities. Specifically, if a juvenile is less involved within the community, they will have more free time which allows for a higher chance of offending and victimization. For the current study, involvement in community activities will be a count of endorsed activities in which the youth has been involved during the past six months. A response higher on the 4-point scale (0-4) will show more community involvement for the respondent. If the response is a 1, the respondent would participate in 1 of the following groups (sports teams, scouts, church related groups, and volunteer work), and if the response is 2, they would be part of 2 of these groups etc. In the current study, community involvement will be measured as an independent variable to determine one's routine activities. Community involvement will be coded continuously based on if the respondent was involved in community activities regularly prior to their offenses.

(Elliott, 1990; Horney, Osgood, & Marshall, 1995).

### *Employment*

Employment was used to determine the youth's financial responsibility and any prior employment experience. This particular measure will be used for the current study as an independent variable to help establish one's routine activities. All of the responses for this measure were left individually so this measure does not include any summary scores. The study provides measures related to a current job, past job, forms of income (legal and illegal), responsibility to pay bills, and owing money based on questions that were created by the Pathways to Desistance researchers. The study looks at how long they held their prior positions for, why they are no longer in that position, leaving a position without another job in place,

number of times fired. The study includes hours worked, length of time at job, and hourly wage for their current position (if applicable). Relating to making money other ways, the study asks how the respondent made money if not from work, how much money was made elsewhere and length of illegal work. For the current study, employment will be coded dichotomously based on if the respondent had stable employment prior to their offense. Employment will be used as a measure of routine activities to measure their risk for victimization and offending based on their time spent physically in their place of employment (Monahan, Steinberg, & Cauffman, 2013).

### *Extra-curricular Activities*

Extra-curricular activities will be used as a measure of routine activities, which is a variable for this study. The measures related to education included items that were taken from the work of Cernkovich & Giordano (1992) about experiences including attendance, achievement and behavior problems. The items included were used to evaluate the participants education experience with two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers and School Orientation. The Pathways to Desistance study included number of extra-curricular activities, bonding to teacher, school orientation, satisfaction, attendance, engagement both at community schools and institution schools.

### *Attendance*

Attendance will be used as a measure of routine activities, which is a variable for this study. The Pathways to Desistance study included data on the average number of days missed per month and for what reason, enrollment in school and highest level completed, suspension/expulsion record, fights at school, record of bullying, cheating, skipping school, failing classes, homework routines and hours spent engaged in groups/events with the school. The respondents were asked questions related to their community school. For the current study,

routine activities within school will be measured via their attendance record to determine the juvenile's daily activities. For purposes of this study, attendance will be coded dichotomously, either current on attendance, meaning they did not miss more than 10 days of school, or truant, meaning they had 10 or more absences in the previous school year.

## **Social Bonds**

### **Beliefs**

#### *Importance of Spirituality*

Importance of spirituality will be used as a measure of social bonds, which is a variable for this study. The Pathways to Desistance study used the importance of spirituality measure created by Maton (1989) and is the basis of a well-known assessment of spirituality (Maton et al., 1996). This particular measure will be used for the current study as an independent variable to establish one's social bonds to society through their attachment to religion. Participants were asked to specify to what degree their decisions were impacted by God. Their responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale which include "not at all true" to "completely true." A higher response would indicate a higher level of spirituality within the individual. The scale used three items which were then combined into one final scale score to determine overall importance of spirituality that was used in compilation with two other items that were left out of the combined score (yearly service attendance and importance of religion). The study provides the following items available: how often was church attended in the past year, how important has religion been in their life, experiencing God's love and caring on a regular basis, experiencing a close personal relationship with God, and religion helping deal with problems. For the current study, importance of spirituality will be coded continuously based on how much the respondent finds

their spirituality important in the past 6 months. Importance of spirituality will be used as a measure of social bonds to determine the impact one's religious beliefs has on their offending.

## **Commitment**

### *Bonding to Teacher*

Bonding to Teachers will be used as a measure of social bonds, which is a variable for this study. The measure of bonding to teachers included items that were taken from the work of Cernkovich & Giordano (1992) about experiences including attendance, achievement and behavior problems. To determine bonding to teachers, statements were given such as "My teachers treat me fairly" and to determine school orientations, statements such as "schoolwork is very important to me" were given. They were asked to rate 13 statements using a 5 point-Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree to strongly agree." A higher score would indicate a higher level of academic commitment for the participant. They found the following values: Bonding to Teacher (alpha= .65) for the baseline set and Bonding to Teacher (alpha= .63) for youth in school in detention during baseline interview. These measures will be coded continuously to determine if a stronger relationship will cause more of an impact.

## **Attachment**

### *Friendship Quality*

Friendship quality will be used as a measure of social bonds, which is a variable for this study. The quality of friendship measure was created using Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel and Nagle's (1997) Quality of Relationships Inventory. This measure will be used for the current study as an independent variable to establish one's social bonds to society through their friendships. Originally, the scale was used to determine the support from a romantic partner, so that was adjusted to focus on the respondent's five closest friends. The scale used ten items

including “How much can you count on people for help with a problem”, “How close do you think you will be with these people in ten years?”, and “How much do you depend on these friends?”. Their responses ranged from “not at all” to “very much” on a 4-point Likert scale and were combined with prior responses related to number of friends and background of friends. A higher response on the scale would indicate a stronger quality of friendships to those around them. For the current study, friendship quality will be coded continuously based on the quality of the friendships. Friendship quality will assess the respondent's attachments to others in society as a measure of social bonds to determine if friendships impact one’s violent offending.

(Steinberg, & Monahan, 2007; Pierce, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, and Nagle, 1997).

#### *Parental Warmth*

Parental warmth will be used as a measure of social bonds, which is a variable for this study. The Pathways to Desistance study uses The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994). In order to determine the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship, they asked questions specific to mother and fathers based on warmth and hostility. They asked the respondents, “How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?” and “How often does your father tell you he loves you?” in regards to parental warmth (Mother:  $\alpha = .92$  and Father:  $\alpha = .95$ ). They used a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “Always” to “Never” containing 42 items (21 each for each parental relationship). If they discovered higher scores on the warmth scale, they can assume a more supportive and nurturing relationship. For the current study, parental warmth will be coded continuously based on the level of warmth that each parent shows toward the respondent. This measure will be used to determine the impact that parental actions have on the juvenile’s



offending actions (Blatt-Eiseng, Cauffman, Steinberg 2006; Chung, & Steinberg, 2006; Steinberg & Williams, 2011).

### *Parental Hostility*

Parental hostility will be used as a measure of social bonds, which is a variable for this study. The Pathways to Desistance study uses The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994). They asked the respondents questions such as “How often does your mother get angry at you?” and “How often does your father throw things at you?” to determine parental hostility (Mother: alpha= .85 and Father: alpha= .88). They used a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “Always” to “Never” containing 42 items (21 each for each parental relationship). Higher scores on the hostility scale will indicate a more hostile parental relationship with the respondent. For the current study, parental hostility will be coded continuously based on the level of hostility each parent shows toward the respondent. This measure will also be used to determine the impact that hostile parental actions have on the juvenile’s offending actions.

### **Involvement**

#### *Family Arrest History*

Family arrest history will be used as a measure of social bonds, which is a variable for this study. There will be a marker when one or both parents have been arrested or jailed, whether the parents that were arrested were living with the children or not and if the either of the parents had a drug or alcohol problem currently or in the past. When looking at family history of arrest, they asked if anyone in your family been arrested, number of relatives that have been arrested, and the age of those arrested. Specifically, the study will use the measures of family arrest, jail or

prison history and history of mental health care of the family to see how the family mentality can impact the juvenile's behavior.

### *Family Employment History*

In regard to parental occupation, the Pathways to Desistance study used Hollingshead's occupational index (1957) which is a seven-point scale ranging from unskilled to major professionals. This measure will look at the juvenile's mother and fathers current job status which can show the impact of how a parent working hard for income for the family will contribute to the juvenile's mentality of societal norms (Chung, & Steinberg, 2006; Hollingshead 1957; Steinberg & Williams, 2011). This measure is included as a social bond to determine how the family structure finds value in legal employment as a method for raising a stable household for a member within. A parent's ability to become involved within an organization, outside of their home, for long periods of time, will impact the child's ability to do so as well.

## **Victimization**

### *Exposure to Violence*

Exposure to violence will be used as a measure of victimization, which is a variable for this study. The Exposure to Violence Inventory (ETV; Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998) was used by The Pathways to Desistance study to access the frequency of exposure to violent events. The respondents were asked six questions based on being a victim themselves such as "Have you ever been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt?" and seven questions about being a witness to a crime such as "Have you ever seen someone else being raped?, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack?". They were then asked about their exposure to death with the following questions: "has anyone close to you tried to kill him/herself?, has anyone close to you died?, have you ever

found a dead body, have you ever tried to kill yourself?”. They then inquired about seventeen situations to determine if the respondents have ever been a victim or a witness and then inquiring about how many times it has occurred and the location. With these measures, they were able to determine the exposure to violence as a victim or a witness and overall to determine their exposure to violence. For the current study, victimization will be measured with their exposure to violence as a mediating variable and coded dichotomously. Exposure to Violence, which is the count of items where subject was a victim, will be used for the measure of victimization for this study. Respondents who experienced violent victimization will be coded as 1.

## **Offending**

### *Offense History*

Offense history will be used as a measure of offending, which is an independent variable for this study. Offense history was measured with data from their past offenses including arrest history, past stays in a secure setting, age at first secure confinement and current charges. This information is obtained from both the subject by self-report and from their official criminal record from the FBI, to validate. Also, respondents participated in Self-Reported Offending (SRO) which discussed their involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. This included twenty-four activities including damaging property, stealing, selling drugs, carrying a gun, and killing someone. If the respondent reported engaging in an antisocial or illegal activity, additional information was gathered relating to the number of times engaged and other details of the activity. For this measure, the study uses number of times been arrested in lifetime, age of first arrest, location: detention center or jail before the arrest or summons that led to study participation and number of times locked up in detention center or jail, age first time locked up in a detention center or jail, was there an influence of

drugs or alcohol when the offense was committed, and if the subject is currently in any court-ordered supervision programs. For the purpose of this study, history of violent offending will be used to differentiate between respondents. This study will code offending dichotomously by determining if the respondent committed violent offenses or not. To differentiate offending from violent offending, the following measures are used specifically to measure violent offending: beat someone up with serious injury, took by force without a weapon, took by force with weapon, shot someone with bullet hit, forced someone to have sex (Knight, Little, Losoya, & Mulvey, 2004).

### **Control Variables**

To control for the respondent's sex, age, race, and ethnicity, these demographic variables are controlled for in this study. Age will be measured dichotomously in groups of years (14-16 and 17-19). Sex is coded 1 for males and 0 for females. Ethnicity will be coded 1 for Hispanic and 0 for non-Hispanic/White. Race will be coded as 1 for non-white (i.e., Black, Asian, Native American, or other) and 0 for White.

### **Analytic Strategy**

Analyses for this thesis will proceed in a series of steps. First, descriptive statistics will be presented. Second, a series of regression models will examine the relationships between offending and victimization within the context of routine activity and social bond theories. A preliminary regression model will be used to first determine if the theoretical variables predict victimization, which will allow for determination of mediation after all models have been run. (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Then, due to the dichotomous nature of the dependent variable, a logistic regression model will examine the relationship between the theoretical variables and violent offending. The next model will add in violent victimization to see if there is a mediating

relationship. Model 1 thus contains routine activities and violent offending, plus demographic variables. Model 2 adds victimization. Model 3 contains social bonds to society and violent offending, plus demographic variables. Then, Model 4 adds victimization, plus demographic variables. This method will assess whether these variables will mediate the relationship between violent offending and violent victimization, and this strategy will allow for identification of statistical changes when new variables are introduced (Baron & Kenny, 1986). To determine whether social bonds or routine activities better explains these relationships, there will be a combination of measures examined including which has the larger effect size, higher odds ratios and more significant factors, overall. Finally, there is less than 1% of missing measurements from wave 1 of the data, which will be listwise deleted.

## Chapter 5: Results

As previously stated, there is a need to determine the causes of juvenile offending. This study aims to do so by examining the association between juvenile's relationships, activities, and behavior. The goal of this thesis is to add to existing research about juvenile's routine activities and social bonds which can allow for policy changes which would benefit our communities through determining the causes of juvenile offending and victimization. Doing so could decrease juvenile which then will lead to a decrease in juvenile victimization based on the principles of the victim-offender overlap. Additionally, decreasing juvenile offending and victimization will likely decrease adult offending and victimization as well. In order to add to existing research, the Pathways to Desistance data was used and certain measures were selected to determine the association between routine activities, social bonds and offending and then, to determine if that relationship is mediated by victimization.

In this chapter, results of this study's analyses will be presented and explored, which are comprised of a series of logistic regressions. First, a regression analysis was run between victimization and each set of variables for either routine activities or social bonds. Then, model 1 contained routine activities measures and violent offending, plus demographic variables. Model 2 added victimization. Model 3 contained social bond variables and violent offending, plus demographic variables. Then, Model 4 added victimization, plus demographic variables.

### Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 1. For the current study, the controls used included age, ethnicity, and gender. Age was split into two groups: 14-16 which contained 61.2% of the study participants (n=829), whereas the age group 17-19 was 38.7% (n=525). The study

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (n=1,354)

	Variable	n	%/M	SD	Range
<b>Victimization</b>	Violent Victimization	909	67.2%		
<b>Offending</b>	Violent Offending	786	58.2%		
<b>Social Bonds</b>	Religion	1,349	3.28	1.21	1-5
	Father Hostility	839	1.50	0.67	1-4
	Father Warmth	839	2.74	0.89	1-4
	Mother Hostility	1,306	1.61	0.45	1-4
	Mother Warmth	1,306	3.21	0.70	1-4
	Father Job	565	77.4%		
	Mother Job	938	69.2%		
	School Bonds	1,221	3.33	.832	1-5
	Quality of Friendships	1,354	3.26	.778	0-4
	Family Arrest History	892	66.4%		
	Family Mental Health History	187	13.9%		
<b>Routine Activities</b>	Routine Activities	1,350	3.82	.847	1-5
	Employment	354	26.1%		
	School Attendance	301	27.2%		
	Extra-curricular Activities	1,221	0.81	1.10	0-8
	Parental Monitoring	1,197	2.80	.861	1-4
	Parental Knowledge	1,284	2.69	.813	1-4
	Community Involvement	271	20.0%		
<b>Controls</b>	Age (14-16)	829	61.2%		
	Age (17-19)	525	38.7%		
	White	274	20.2%		
	Non-white	1,080	79.7%		
	Female	184	13.5%		
	Male	1,170	86.4%		

was also comprised of mostly male youth, with 1,170 out of 1,354 total respondents, which was 86.4% of the total sample. There were 184 female youth which was 13.5% of the total sample size. Additionally, Non-White was the predominant category for ethnicity with 1,080 respondents (79.4%) identifying as Black, Asian, Native American, or other and the remaining 20.2% identifying as White (n=274).

### **Routine Activities**

Routine activities was measured in a number of ways. The Pathways Data included a measure of routine activities that tapped into the frequency of unstructured socializing with focus on absence of an authority or adult figure. The range of the responses was 1-5 and the mean was 3.82 (SD= 0.85). The measure of employment only included those with a stable job over the last six months which was only 26.1% of respondents (n=354). To determine the juvenile's school attendance, the study used truancy measured as either not fully attending or being full time with good attendance standing with the school. Based on those requirements, only 301 (27.2%) juveniles attended school full time. Parental factors including knowledge of activities and monitoring were also used as measures of routine activities in the current study. There was a total of 1,197 respondents for the measure of parental monitoring and the responses ranged from 1-4 (SD= 0.81) and yielded a mean of 2.80. Similarly, parental knowledge contained 1,284 respondents, and the responses also ranged from 1-4 (SD= 0.813) with the mean response being 2.69. Lastly, community involvement was used a measure of routine activities, but only included those who were involved in the community, which was only 271 respondents (20.0%).

### **Social Bonds**

Most respondents from the original sample did identify as religious (n=1,349) which was measured using a range of 1-5 and showed an average response of 3.28 (SD= 1.21). Social bonds were also measured through warmth and hostility of the mother and father. There were more responses from the mothers (n=1,306) than the fathers (n=839) for measures of warmth and hostility. For father hostility, there was a mean of 1.50 (SD=0.67) whereas the mean response for mother hostility was 1.61 (SD=0.45). For father warmth, the mean response was 2.74 (SD=0.89) and mother warmth was slightly higher with a mean of 3.21 (SD=0.89). The study also looked at mother and father job status which was 938 (69.2%) and 565 (77.54%), respectively.



Additionally, school engagement was measured from a total of 1,354 respondents and resulted in an average of 3.51 from a range of 1-5 (SD= 0.81). School bonds was measured on a scale with a range of responses from 1-5 and consisted of 1,221 respondents. The measure had a mean of 3.33 (SD= 0.83) which was similar to the results of school engagement. Social bonds were also measured via the perspective of quality of friendships which contained responses from all respondents within the sample. The findings show that on a scale of 0-4, the average response was 3.26 (SD= .78). Lastly, as a measure to determine how one's family characteristics can impact their decisions, family arrest history and family mental health history was measured. Family arrest history was compromised of 892 respondents, whom all had a family member arrested, which was 66.4% of the total sample. Conversely, the minority had a family member with a mental health issue since only 187 respondents answered yes for this category.

### **Offending**

The current study used the respondent's offense history of violent offenses as a measure of violent offending. The majority of the respondents perpetrated violent offending compared to those who did not. The study only included respondents who had committed violent offenses (beat someone up with serious injury, took by force without a weapon, took by force with weapon, shot someone with bullet hit, forced someone to have sex, which was 786 juveniles (58.2%) of the total sample.

### **Victimization**

The current study used the respondent's victimization history of violent experiences of victimization as a measure of violent victimization. The majority of the respondents had experienced violent victimization compared to those who did not. The study only included

**Table 2:** Logistic Regression Predicting Violent Offending in Juvenile Offenders

	Routine Activities (n=867)				Social Bonds (n=562)			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Offending	b (SE)	Odds Ratio	b (SE)	Odds Ratio	b (SE)	Odds Ratio	b (SE)	Odds Ratio
Victimization			1.35 (0.14)***	3.84			1.32(0.18)***	3.84
Routine Activities	0.36(0.90)***	1.43	0.33(0.08)***	1.40				
Employment	0.28(0.17)	1.33	0.18(0.16)	1.20				
School Attendance	-0.26(0.17)	0.77	-0.25(0.15)*	0.78				
Extra-curricular Activities	0.04(0.70)	1.04	-0.00(0.00)	1.00				
Parental Monitoring	-0.35(0.97)	0.70	0.00(0.00)	1.00				
Parental Knowledge	-0.33(0.10)***	0.72	-0.00(0.00)	1.00				
Community Involvement	-0.22(0.18)**	0.80	-0.23(0.17)	0.80				
Religion					-0.06(0.85)	0.94	-0.08(0.07)	0.93
Father Hostility					0.92(0.25)***	2.50	0.10(0.09)	1.11
Father Warmth					-0.09(0.13)	1.10	-0.10(0.09)	0.90
Mother Hostility					0.96(0.28)**	2.60	0.21(0.10)**	1.24
Mother Warmth					0.11(0.16)	1.12	-0.21(0.10)**	0.81
Father Job					0.01(0.24)	1.01	0.07(0.21)	1.08
Mother Job					0.11(0.21)**	1.11	0.00(0.19)	1.00
School Bonds					-0.32(0.12)**	0.72	-0.00(0.00)	1.00
Quality of Friendships					0.40(0.15)**	1.50	0.25(0.11)**	1.28
Family Arrest History					0.55(0.20)	1.73	0.51(0.18)***	1.67
Family Mental Health					-0.12(0.20)**	0.88	-0.32(0.26)	0.72
Age	-0.01(0.16)**	1.00	0.03(0.16)	0.87	-0.23(0.20)	0.79	-0.09(0.18)	0.92
Non-white	-0.09(0.18)**	1.09	0.20(0.18)	1.21	0.55(0.23)*	2.30	0.47(0.20)**	1.61
Male	0.74(0.21)***	2.09	0.62(0.22)**	1.64	0.83(0.29)**	1.73	0.54(0.25)**	1.71
R <sup>2</sup>	.0856		0.1324		.1223		0.1744	
R <sup>2</sup> change			0.0468				0.0521	

Note. \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ; \*\* $p < 0.05$ .; \* $p < 0.1$

respondents who had violent victimization offenses committed against them or were witnessed which was 909 juveniles (67.2%).

## Results

A series of regression analyses was performed to determine if either routine activities or social bonds predict victimization based on the Baron and Kenny (1986) method. This determined that the measure of routine activities significantly predicts victimization at a rate of 269%. Whereas, parental monitoring decreases likelihood of victimization by 288% and parental knowledge also decreased victimization by 304%. Other variables such as employment, attendance, community involvement and extra-curricular activities were not found to be significant when regressed with victimization alone. Also, none of the measures of social bonds were found to be significant with victimization, only. Based on these findings, there will not be a mediating relationship due to lack of significant factors between victimization and the variables. However, the analysis was continued based on the importance in studying the victim-offender overlap.

### Model 1

Results of model 1, displayed in Table 2, indicate that there are six factors that significantly predict violent offending. These significant factors include routine activities (OR = 1.43,  $p < 0.001$ ), parental knowledge (OR = 0.72,  $p < 0.001$ ), community involvement (OR = 0.80,  $p < .05$ ), age (OR = 1.00,  $p < .05$ ), non-white (OR = 1.09,  $p < .05$ ) and male (OR = 2.09,  $p < .001$ ). The strongest predictor of offending was the juvenile being male, which increased the odds of violent offending by 109%. There was no significant relationship between employment, school attendance, extra-curricular activities, or parental monitoring and violent offending in model 1.

## Model 2

Model 2 indicates that four factors significantly predict violent offending. These significant factors include victimization (OR = 3.84,  $p < 0.001$ ), routine activities (OR = 1.40,  $p < 0.001$ ), school attendance (OR = 0.78,  $p < .05$ ), and male (OR = 1.64,  $p < .05$ ). When adding victimization to the model, we see a change in the significance of parental monitoring, community involvement, age and non-white, which are no longer significant, as they were in model 1. Additionally, we see school attendance become significant, while routine activities and male remain significant from model 1. The strongest predictor of offending was victimization which increased the odds of violent offending by 284% ( $p < .001$ ).

## Model 3

Results of model 3 indicate that there are eight factors that significantly predict violent offending. These significant factors include father hostility (OR = 2.50,  $p < 0.001$ ), mother hostility (OR = 2.60,  $p < 0.05$ ), mother job (OR = 1.11,  $p < 0.01$ ), school bonds (OR = 0.72,  $p < 0.05$ ), quality of friendships (OR = 1.50,  $p < 0.05$ ), family mental health (OR = 0.88,  $p < 0.05$ ), non-white (OR = 2.30,  $p < 0.05$ ), and male (OR = 1.73,  $p < 0.05$ ). The strongest predictor of offending was the juvenile having hostility from their mother, which increased the odds by 160%. There was no significant relationship between offending and religion, father warmth, mother warmth, father job, family arrest history and age.

## Model 4

Model 4 indicates that seven factors significantly predict violent offending. These significant factors include victimization (OR = 3.84,  $p < 0.001$ ), mother hostility (OR = 1.24,  $p < 0.05$ ), mother warmth (OR = 0.81,  $p < .05$ ), quality of friendships (OR = 1.28,  $p < 0.05$ ), family

arrest history (OR = 1.67,  $p < 0.001$ ), non-white (OR = 1.61,  $p < 0.05$ ), and male (OR = 1.71,  $p < 0.05$ ). When adding victimization to the model, we see a change in the significance of father hostility, family mental history, school bonds, and mother job, which are no longer significant, as they were in model 3. Additionally, we see father hostility, mother warmth, and family arrest history become significant, while mother hostility, quality of friendships, non-white and male remain significant from model 3. The strongest predictor of offending was victimization which increased the odds of offending by 284% ( $p < 0.001$ ).

#### Additional Results

Model 1 had an  $R^2$  of 0.0856 and model 2 had a  $R^2$  of 0.1324 which shows there was a  $R^2$  change of 0.047 between models 1 and 2. Model 3 had a  $R^2$  factor of 0.1223 and model 4 had a  $R^2$  change of 0.1744, meaning there was a  $R^2$  change of 0.052 between models 3 and 4.

Additionally, a chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between routine activity measures and social bonds measures. The test determined that the relation between these variables was significant, meaning social bond variables had more of an impact than routine activity variables on juvenile violent offending. This, in combination with the higher number of significant measures and higher odds ratios will determine which has a stronger relationship to offending, as predicted in hypothesis 3.

## Chapter 6: Discussion

As previously noted, the goal of the current study was to evaluate and assess the association among juvenile violent offending, social bonds, and routine activities and determine if violent victimization mediates these relationships based on the premise of the victim-offender overlap. Throughout this discussion, the analysis and implications from the results will be outlined in Chapter 5 and their relationship to juvenile offending based on theoretical explanations that cause offending and victimization. This chapter will also identify the limitations of this study, provide direction for future research, and deliver concluding remarks regarding juvenile offending.

In the analysis of the Pathways to Desistance Data, it was found that only certain aspects of a juvenile's routine activities were associated with a decrease in violent offending. One measure of routine activities was found to increase odds of violent offending based on this analysis. The measure of routine activities created within the dataset determined involvement in unstructured activities with lack of authority figures, which would be expected to increase crime. This was determined by a series of questions and a higher response would indicate a higher level of unstructured activities that were lacking adult presence. However, community involvement and parental knowledge were shown to be protective factors of violent offending as initially predicted. This is unsurprising as previous studies have found that lack of adult supervision has a severe impact on delinquency of juveniles (Braga, Goncalves, Basto-Pereira, & Maia, 2017; Derzon, 2010; Farrington, 2011; Farrington & Welsh, 2007; Hoeve et al., 2009). Surprisingly, the multivariate analysis on routine activities did not find parental monitoring, employment, or school attendance as protective factors of violent offending as those did not show significance. These findings differ from recent studies that reported the impact that parental

monitoring decreases juvenile offending (Braga, et al., 2017; Derzon, 2010; Farrington & Welsh, 2007; Hoeve et al., 2009).

When victimization was added to the model, the results demonstrated that violent victimization greatly influenced violent offending, which supported Von Hentig's (1948) victim-offender overlap. Prior research has found that individuals who commit or associate with others who commit deviant acts often either provoke or contribute to these occurrences (Von Hentig, 1948; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000; Wolfgang, 1958). Victimization, routine activities, and being male were still shown to be significant risk factors of violent offending. Based on data from the Bureau of Justice, it was expected that males would have a higher likelihood of violent offending in contrast to their female counterpart since males statistically commit more crimes (NCVS, 2020). Additionally, juveniles who hold great attendance records at school were less likely to commit violent offending. This finding was in accordance with studies such as Chui and Chan's (2012) which determined involvement to school was a significant factor in predicting theft and violent delinquency for adolescents.

When analyzing the impact of social bonds on violent offending, most factors associated with social bonds are considered risk factors and contribute to violent offending as opposed to decreasing violent offending in juveniles. Hostility from one's mother and father, strong friendship quality, and their mother's employment were found to increase violent offending. It was expected that all strong, positive, social bonds to society would have decreased violent offending based on Hirschi's (1969) theory of social bonds. It was predicted that parental hostility would increase offending and warmth from one's parents would decrease offending. However, there may be further explanations for some of the findings. It may be possible that a mother's employment would have increased a youth's time without parental supervision, which

can allow for an increase in juvenile delinquency (Cohen & Felson, 1979). It is also likely that employment of the juvenile's mother was not a strong measure for social bonds to society, which caused these conflicting results. It is understood that hostility originating from a subject's parents would negatively impact juveniles and increase their violent offending (Waller et al., 2014; Frick et al. 2014; Frick & Viding 2009; Muñoz & Frick, 2012). Even though a juvenile has high quality friendships, those friends may be engaging in delinquent activities, which justifies why this measure was found to increase violent offending (Svensson & Oberwittler, 2010; Battin-Pearson et al., 1998). The study found that measures of knowing of one's family mental health history and bonding to teachers within schools were the only measures that did decrease violent offending. Moreover, religion was not found to be significant during this analysis of social bonds in contrast to prior studies that determined a decrease in violent offending and identified an association between involvement in religious programs and reduction of juvenile delinquencies and criminal activities (McGarrell, et al., 1999; Johnson, et al., 2000; Cox & Matthews, 2007; Cooper, 2013).

Once victimization was introduced to the model, the analysis indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between victimization and offending, thus indicating that previous violent victimization increases violent offending. There was a significant impact of violent victimization on violent offending related to both social bond and routine activity measures, which should be noted. Again, this finding was expected based on the victim-offender overlap and how often offenders have been previously victims of crimes (Von Hentig, 1948). Based on these findings, our current society needs to change how we view juvenile offenders and delinquents. Most, if not all, juvenile offenders have received some type of victimization in their past, then their delinquency is likely related to that trauma. Since there is such a strong



connection between victimization and offending, there should be policies created to help those who are victimized to prevent them needing to work out their anger, frustration, and pain through criminal activity. As a society, if we expect to see a decrease in criminal activity among juvenile offenders, we first need to acknowledge this overlap and work toward helping these individuals at the root of their issues, instead of just punishing them for expressing their feelings.

Additionally, many of the factors associated with social bonds remained statistically significant even when adding victimization to the model. Mother hostility, quality of friendships, and knowledge of family arrest history all impacted violent offending positively. Grossman and Grossman (1990) found that children rarely engage in antisocial behavior, fail to show emotional dysfunction, and usually show warmth towards others when they have strong attachment to their parents. Children can emulate similar behaviors that adult figures project which can positively or negatively influence future actions and decisions. Multiple studies have found that parental warmth and hostility toward children can shape the child by contributing to behavior problems later in their life (Frick et al., 2014; Frick & Viding 2009; Muñoz & Frick, 2012), so results that demonstrated an increase in violent offending due to hostility from a child's parents were not unexpected. After victimization was added to the model, the only factor that was found to still decrease violent offending was warmth from one's mother. This finding was expected based on studies such as Hipwell et al.'s (2008) study which determined that parenting factors such as warmth and punishment had a direct relationship to juvenile's conduct.

Out of three of the four models of the analysis, it was found that non-white respondents had significantly increased chances of violent offending compared to white respondents. Low-income communities are more often composed of minorities and have higher crime rates which lead to the struggle for stability and well-paying jobs in comparison to communities with higher

populations of white individuals (Feld, 2017; Sampson & Wilson, 1995; Wilson, 1987, 2009; Farrington, 2011). Therefore, it is expected that non-white juveniles who reside in urban cities are engaging in more violent crime than white juveniles. Male respondents were found to have significantly increased occurrences of crime in all of the models that were regressed.

Overall, the hypotheses were partially supported by this analysis of wave 1 of the Pathways to Desistance Data. Hypothesis 1 was supported with the variables of community involvement and parental knowledge, but not with the routine activity measure. Hypothesis 2 was also partially supported by the juvenile's school attendance, but the measure of routine activities was not in support of decreasing violent offending, yet again. Lastly, hypothesis 3 was found to be true based on a slightly larger effect size, more variables with higher odds ratios, and a higher percentage of significant variables within models 3 and 4 than models 1 and 2, which represented social bonds and routine activities, respectively. Regarding hypothesis 4, it can be determined that adding victimization to model increased the variance explained in both models. In following the Barron and Kenny (1986) method, the theoretical variables were regressed with only victimization first. This analysis yielded that there was no significance with the variables simply with victimization, so no mediating effect was able to be determined. When analyzing routine activities, there were several measures that appeared to be mediated by victimization including parental knowledge, parental involvement. The other variables such as employment, attendance, community involvement and extra-curricular activities were not found to be significant for mediation. Then, certain measures of social bonds were appeared to be mediated by victimization including hostility from one's father, employment of one's mother, bonds to one's teacher and knowledge family members' mental health history. However, it cannot be determined that there was full mediation due to lack of significance found when the theoretical

variables were regressed with victimization only. These findings of mediation show that once victimization was added, meaning the respondent had been violently victimized prior to their offense, those variables no longer significantly impacted juvenile violent offending. Routine activity theory is one of the well now theories associated with victimization and what factors need to be present to increase likelihood of victimization. Yet, it may be possible that there was not significance found between the specific theoretical variables chosen and victimization because those variables were not strong predictors of victimization within the given data set. Therefore, their victimization may have been caused by other factors that were not analyzed in this study which other studies could examine.

Inclusively, this study added to existing research in support of the victim-offender overlap while determining an association between juvenile violent offending with their routine activities and social bonds to society including their relationship with family members. These particular theories were chosen based on their strong connection to how who the individuals spend time with and frequents establishments can impact their likelihood of victimization and offending. Specifically, routine activity theory focuses on how a combination of lack of capable guardianship, suitable target and motivated offender can create the perfect opportunity for victimization to occur. Additionally, social bond theory looks deeply at how one's attachment, involvement, and beliefs can contribute to their likelihood to offend based on how much they value those relationships. Then, when combining the victim-offender overlap concept, it can be understood that increasing the chances of victimization can also increase the chances to offend so it is important to view how strong the relationship between offending and victimization is in juvenile violent offenders. The results yielded support for victimization mediating offending when using certain measures of social bonds and routine activities based on a decrease in

significance. The results also determined that measures of social bonds did not significantly impact victimization alone, however, some did significantly impact offending as well as offending once victimization was added into that model. Even though victimization does not necessarily mediate the relationship with the theoretical variables in the study, victimization is an extremely important variable that should be included when studying violence because there is such a large effect on violent offending. It is very important to view the relationship between offending and victimization due to the victim-offender overlap and the strong connection that has been previously established. Studies that do not include victimization as a variable are severely lacking and need to include that factor as a major limitation when viewing their results. To avoid including that limitation in the current study, victimization was still included in the regression models, even though there would not be a mediating effect.

### **Theoretical & Policy Implications**

It can be suggested that social bonds to society rarely decrease violent juvenile offending, which does not align with social bond theory. Theoretical implications that can be made from these findings do indeed support that lack of capable guardianship does in fact cause juvenile offending and weak social bonds to society can increase violent offending. Whereas, other factors of social bonds to society did not necessarily show a strong connection which implies that social bonds do not decrease offending, specifically in juvenile offenders.

Due to the measures that were found to increase violent juvenile offending, there should be an increase in required programs within the community for juveniles to participate in. This would allow for a higher level of community involvement while allowing parental knowledge of the juvenile's whereabouts, which were both significant factors in juvenile violent offending. These programs will decrease a juvenile's free time while limiting their activities which would

greatly benefit society as a whole. Additionally, programs for parents at different stages of parenthood can teach coping mechanisms and strategies to work through tough situations with their child may be beneficial in reducing hostility rates toward the child from both the mother and father, which were found to significantly increase rates of offending. These programs should follow the ideals of “Staying Connected with your Teen” created by Richard F. Catalano and J. David Hawkins in the UW School of Social Work, the “Incredible Years” which was created by Carolyn Webster-Stratton, or “Positive Parenting Program” (UW News, 2020).

It may be helpful to offer some type of counseling at schools for the juveniles to partake in when they receive hostility from their parent. These services will provide them with coping mechanisms and alternative ways to relieve their stress, instead of resorting to delinquency or crime. If these individuals are able to manage their anger and frustration from the actions of their parents, it is likely that they may not offend. There can also be a benefit to society, specifically those who have already committed offenses such as the individuals involved in this study, in juvenile reentry programs. They consist of reintegrative services designed to prepare juvenile offenders, who have been either incarcerated or held in detention centers, to enter back into the community (National Institute of Justice, 2020). These programs aim to reduce the recidivism rates of juvenile offenders.

Based on the victim-offender overlap, it is understood that victims and offenders are often the same individuals. Thus, it is important to create policies and practices that reflect that information to represent both victims and offenders within the criminal justice system. The findings of this study do indeed show that victimization is a significant factor in offense history for both routine activity and social bond measures, therefore strengthening the argument of the victim-offender overlap. There are many challenges for policy administrators and criminologists

to completely understand the victim-offender overlap, which is why studies such as this one, can greatly benefit the field by showing the connection of victimization with offending, especially with juveniles and their actions. In doing so, policies can address these areas comprehensively to decrease crime rates across the country by strengthening the individual as well as their family and relationships within the community.

### **Future Research and Study Limitations**

While the current study provides important information related to juvenile offending and victimization, there are still multiple limitations within the study that should be addressed in further research. The study has a few limitations that should be taken into consideration when viewing the results.

First, the study uses a pre-existing data set which consists of juveniles from only two cities within the United States. These cities were carefully selected by those who conducted the study; however, it is possible that a study conducted in different cities, may yield different results. Additionally, with this data set being pre-existing, this study will be limited with what measures can be used. When selecting measures for the current study, there were only certain measures available which were already scaled and combined, from the original data set. The data set included the measure of offense history which was based on self-report. There are some limitations there due to the chance of over-reporting or under-reporting of their offense history. Second, the data set only includes individuals who are offenders which does not allow for a control of non-offenders. In order to combat this limitation, offenders were distinguished based on violent victimization or violent offending. In doing so, the study used a sample of all offenders and determined the impact of violent offending as well as violent victimization. This may have also impacted the association between the theoretical variables and victimization,

which then disabled the ability to find a mediating factor. The lack of significance may have been due to measurement issues with interview questions, therefore, creating insufficient findings with the variables. Other variables, such as delinquent peers, may have impacted some behaviors, but were not included in the study which would also impact the findings significantly. It may be possible that the strong friendships that the study found may have been with others who are also engaged in crime, which would cause an increase in offending, opposed to causing a decrease, which was originally expected. Additionally, other theoretical frameworks may allow for a better understanding of why this study did not yield the results that were expected. For example, Gottfredson and Hirschi's 1990 self-control theory discusses how important self-control is for individuals, specifically juveniles, and how much of an impact it has on criminal behavior. If one does not have the ability to regulate self-control, then all other theoretical frameworks are not relevant. Since this study did not include self-control theory as a framework, that is a large limitation of the results. Third, this study does remove data when the respondents did not answer 1 or more questions from the interviews. Due to this factor, the measures used in the current study are not compromised of the entire sample, and some have significantly less respondents. Fourth, the effect size of the study is relatively small, compared to average effect sizes of other studies. A small effect size does limit the generalizability of the study, since it cannot be determined that these results are applicable to larger groups or entire populations. Lastly, this study only used one wave of the data set. This was done for simplicity of the results and to determine that the temporal order of victimization did occur before offending. In doing so, the study is able to strengthen the argument of the victim-offender overlap since any victimization did occur before their offense.

Further research should attempt to use data which includes juvenile offenders and non-offender juveniles to determine a better association. While this issue was combatted in the current study, a future study could be stronger with a new sample size of juveniles who had offended and some who did not. Additionally, further research should use a larger sample of juveniles which would allow for a larger generalization for most juvenile offenders. While the sample size was a decent size (n=1,347), the sample size for some of the measures used was not as large, as some respondents did not answer, or were excluded from the analysis for various reasons. For example, when discussing the respondent's routine activities and social bonds, the sample size was minimized to 867 and 562, respectively. A larger sample size overall would allow for individual measures to have larger sample sizes as well, which makes for a stronger study. Also, a future study should look at later waves of the Pathways to Desistance data set to determine if those who didn't indicate victimization at wave 1, but had committed an offense, indicated victimization in a later wave of data. Using other waves of data would likely conclude that offenders were also victimized, but not prior to their offense, which is important to note since victimization can still impact offending even after an offense.



## References

- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, 30, 47-88.
- Akers, R. L. (1985). *Deviant behavior: A social learning approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Akers, R. L., Sellers, C. S., and Jennings, W. (2017). *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation and Application*. 7th Edition. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, E. (1990). *Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Battin-Pearson, S. R., Thornberry, T. P., Hawkins, J. D., & Krohn, M. D. (1998). Gang membership, delinquent peers, and delinquent behavior. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*, 1-11.
- Barrett, D. E., & Katsiyannis, A. (2016). Juvenile offending and crime in early adulthood: a large sample analysis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25, 1086-1097.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Bernburg, J. G., and Thorlindsson, T. (2001). Routine activities in social context: a closer look at the role of opportunity in deviant behavior. *Justice Quarterly*, 18(3), 543-567.

- Certacci, M. A. (2003). Religion and social control: an application of a modified social bond on violence, *Criminal Justice Review*, 28(2), 254-277.
- Chui, W. H., & Chung, H. O. (2012). An empirical investigation of social bonds and juvenile delinquency in Hong Kong. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 41, 371-386.
- Cohen, L. E., and Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 505-524.
- Cooper, M. N. (2013). From theory to application: is religiosity a factor in criminal behavior and juvenile delinquency, 1-61.
- Criminal Victimization in the United States - Definitions. (2020). Retrieved June 4, 2020, from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/html/cvus/definitions.cfm>
- Cross, A. B., Gottfredson, D. C., Wilson, D. M., Rorie, M., & Connell, N. (2009). The impact of after-school programs on the routine activities of middle-school students: results from a randomized, controlled trial. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 8(2), 391-412.
- Department of Justice. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). (2019). Retrieved July 30, 2020. [http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/crime/JAR\\_Display.asp?ID=qa05218&selOffenses=35](http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/crime/JAR_Display.asp?ID=qa05218&selOffenses=35).
- Finkelhor, D. and Asdigian, N. L. (1996). Risk factors for youth victimization beyond a lifestyles/routine activities theory approach. *Violence and Victims*, 11(1), 3-19.
- Gottfredson, M. R., and Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hardie, B. N. (2017). Why monitoring doesn't always matter: The situational role of parental monitoring in adolescent crime (Doctoral Thesis).

Hindelang, M., Gottfredson, M. R. and Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Hipwell, A., Keenan, K., Kasza, K., Lober, R., Lober, M. S., and Bean, T. (2008). Reciprocal influences between girls' conduct problems and depression, and parental punishment and warmth: a six-year analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36(5), 663-677.

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

Holland, T., Clare, C. H., & Mukhopadhyay, T. (2002). Prevalence of 'criminal offending' by men and women with intellectual disability and the characteristics of 'offenders': implications for research and service development. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 46(1), 6-20.

Kang, T., Tanner J., & Wortley, S. (2017). Same routines, different effects: gender differences in leisure, and young offending. *Justice Quarterly*, 35(6). 1030-1072.

Lauritsen, J. L., Sampson, R. J. and Laub, J. H. (1991). The link between offending and victimization among adolescents. *Criminology*, 29, 265-291.

Lauritsen, J. L., Laub, J. H., and Sampson, R. J. (1992). Conventional and delinquent activities: Implications for the prevention of violent victimization among adolescents. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 91-108

- Lynch, J. (1987). Routine activity and victimization at work. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 3(4), 283-300.
- Marshall, W. L., Hudson, S. M., Hodkinson, S. (n.d.) The importance of attachment bonds in the development of juvenile sex offending. *The Juvenile Sex Offender*, 165-177.
- Maton, K.I. (1989). The stress-buffering role of spiritual support: Cross-sectional and prospective investigations. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28(3), 310-323
- Maton, K.I., Teti, D., Corns, K., Vieira-Baker, K., Lavine, J., Gouze, K.R., and Keating, D. (1996). Cultural specificity of social support sources, correlates and contexts: Three studies of African American and Caucasian youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 24, 551-587.
- Meier, R. F., & Miethe, T. D. (1993). Understanding Theories of Criminal Victimization. *Crime and Justice*, 17, 459-499.
- Miethe, T. D., and Meier, R. F. (1994). *Crime and its social context: Toward an integrated theory of offenders, victims, and situations*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mulvey, E. P., Steinberg, L., Fagan, J., Cauffman, E., Piquero, A. R., Chassin, L., et al. (2004). Theory and research on desistance from antisocial activity among serious adolescent offenders. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 2, 213–236.
- Mustaine, E. M., & Tewksbury, R. (2000). Comparing the lifestyles of victims, offenders and victim-offenders: a routine activity assessment of similarities and differences of criminal

- incident participants. *Sociological Focus*, 33(3), 339-362.
- Pierce, G.P. (1994) the quality of relationships inventory: Assessing the interpersonal context of social support. In B.R. Burleson, T.L Albrecht & I.G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of social support: Message, interactions, relationship and community* (pp 247-266). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pierce, G., Sarason, I.G., Sarason, B.R., Solky-Butzel, J.A., and Nagle, L.C. (1997). Assessing the quality of personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14, 339-356.
- Practice Details. (2020). Retrieved November 12, 2020, from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/practicedetails?id=54>
- Pratt, T. C., and Cullen, F. T. (2000). The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: A meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 38, 931-964.
- Piquero, A. R., MacDonald, J., Dobrin, A., Daigle, L. E., and Cullen, F. T. (2005). Self-control, violent offending, and homicide victimization. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 21, 55-72.
- Regoeczi, W. (2000). Adolescent violent victimization and offending: Assessing the extent of the link. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42, 493-505.
- Reingle, J. M. (2014). The victim-offender overlap. *The Encyclopedia of Theoretical Criminology*.
- Sampson, R. J. (1985). Neighborhood and crime: The structural determinants of personal

- victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 22, 7-40.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). A life-course theory of cumulative disadvantage and the stability of delinquency. *Developmental Theories of Crime and Delinquency*, 133-141.
- Sampson, R. J., and Lauritsen, J. L. (1990). Deviant lifestyles, proximity to crime and the victim-offender link in personal violence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 27, 110-139.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., and Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing “neighborhood effects”: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28, 443–78.
- Schreck, C. J., Fisher, B. S., and Miller, J. M. (2004). The social context of violent victimization: A study of the delinquent peer effect. *Justice Quarterly*, 21, 23-48.
- Schreck, C. J., Stewart, E. A., and Fisher, B. S. (2006). Self-control, victimization, and their influence on risky lifestyles: A longitudinal analysis using panel data. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 22, 319-340.
- Silver, E., Piquero, A. R., Jennings, W. G., Piquero, N., and Lieber, M. (2011). Assessing the violent offending and violent victimization overlap among discharged psychiatric patients. *Law and Human Behavior*, 35, 49-59.
- Stewart, E. A., & Simons, R. L. (2010). Race, code of the street, and violent delinquency: A

- multilevel investigation of neighborhood street culture and individual norms of violence. *Criminology*, 48(2), 569-605.
- Svensson, R., & Oberwittler, D. (2010). It's not the time they spend, it's what they do: the interaction between delinquent friends and unstructured routine activities on delinquency: findings from two countries. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(5), 1006-1014.
- Thornberry, T. P., Giordano, P. C., Uggen, C., Matsuda, M., Masten, A. S., Donker, A. S., & Petechuk, D. (2014). Explanations for Offending. National Institute of Justice, 1-2.
- Tijerino, R. (1998). Civil spaces: A critical perspective of defensible space. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 15(4), 321-337.
- Von Hentig, H. (1948). *The Criminal and His Victim: Studies in the Sociobiology of Crime*. New York: Schocken Books
- Wallace, L. H., Moak, S. C., & Moore, N. T. (2005). Religion as an insulator of delinquency in schools. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(2), 217-233.
- Waller, R., Fardner, F., Shaw, D. S., Sishlon, T. J., Wilson, M. N., & Hyde, L. W. (2014). Bidirectional associations between parental warmth, callous unemotional behavior, and behavior problems in high risk preschoolers. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 42(8), 1275-1285.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wolfgang, M. E. (1958). *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Wolfgang, M. E., and Ferracuti, F. (1967). *Subculture of violence - towards an integrated theory in criminology*. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.

Wright, K. A., Kim, B., Chassin, L., Losoya, S. H., & Piquero, A. R. (2014). Ecological context, concentrated disadvantage, and youth offending: identifying the social mechanisms in a sample of serious adolescent offenders. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 43, 1781-1799.

Zavala, E., & Muniz, C. N. (2020). The influence of religious involvement on intimate partner violence victimization via routine activity theory. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0(0), 1-25.

Zavala, E., Spohn, R., & Alarid, L. F. (2019). Gender and serious Youth Victimization: assessing the generality of self-control, differential association, and social bonding theories. *Sociological Spectrum*, 1-17.

5 effective parenting programs to reduce problem behaviors in children. (n.d.). Retrieved November 12, 2020, from <https://www.washington.edu/news/2013/12/16/5-effective-parenting-programs-to-reduce-problem-behaviors-in-children/>.



## **Vita**

### **Caleigh D. Lynch**

Caleigh Lynch was born in Rockland County, NY and lived there until moving to El Paso, TX a few years ago. She attended Nanuet Senior High School in May of 2015 and received a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice at Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA in May of 2019. She has been working as a graduate teaching assistant for the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Texas at El Paso from September 2019. The responsibilities include advising undergraduate students on degree evaluation for the program, basic office functions in an academic department, grading tasks on Blackboard. Previously, she has worked as an intern at the District Attorney's Office, Rockland County, NY from February 2017-June 2017. The responsibilities included assisting the ADA in court settings, preparing documents for court, handling confidential information while assisting on cases, basic office functions in a law office.