



**Missouri State**  
UNIVERSITY

**BearWorks**

---

MSU Graduate Theses

---

Fall 2015

## Understanding the Victim-Offender Overlap: An Exploratory Study

Christine Kay Hannis

As with any intellectual project, the content and views expressed in this thesis may be considered objectionable by some readers. However, this student-scholar's work has been judged to have academic value by the student's thesis committee members trained in the discipline. The content and views expressed in this thesis are those of the student-scholar and are not endorsed by Missouri State University, its Graduate College, or its employees.

---

Follow this and additional works at: <https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses>



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

### Recommended Citation

Hannis, Christine Kay, "Understanding the Victim-Offender Overlap: An Exploratory Study" (2015). *MSU Graduate Theses*. 2840.

<https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses/2840>

This article or document was made available through BearWorks, the institutional repository of Missouri State University. The work contained in it may be protected by copyright and require permission of the copyright holder for reuse or redistribution.

For more information, please contact [BearWorks@library.missouristate.edu](mailto:BearWorks@library.missouristate.edu).

**UNDERSTANDING THE VICTIM-OFFENDER OVERLAP:  
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY**

A Masters Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate College of  
Missouri State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science, Criminology and Criminal Justice

By

Christine Kay Hannis

December 2015

Copyright 2015 by Christine Kay Hannis

# **UNDERSTANDING THE VICTIM-OFFENDER OVERLAP: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY**

Criminology and Criminal Justice

Missouri State University, December 2015

Master of Science

Christine Kay Hannis

## **ABSTRACT**

The strong and consistent relationship between criminal involvement and victimization is one of the most persistent documented findings within criminological research. The current problem associated with this relationship involves the lack of studies on the nature and extent of why this overlap exists, with even less research focusing on the perspectives of the offenders who identify themselves as victims. The current study attempts to better understand the victim-offender overlap by analyzing the experiences of criminal offenders who also identify as victims of crime, within the context of various theoretical perspectives. Various themes emerge to elaborate on the nature of the victim-offender overlap with implications for guidance in the development of research and policy. Such implications include creating and implementing programs and policies that address aspects of victimization and offending simultaneously, which will help individuals who have characteristics of both. These individuals can then receive the appropriate assistance and services they need in order to help prevent other offending and victimization situations from occurring. This will in turn create a safer environment for family members and the community, in addition to redirecting resources elsewhere, such as away from filing police reports and apprehending offenders, to being redirected towards increasing and enhancing these programs and policies being offered.

**KEYWORDS:** victimization, offending, victim-offender overlap, routine activities and lifestyle theories, socialization theories, and individual trait theory/population heterogeneity argument.

This abstract is approved as to form and content

---

Aida Y. Hass, PhD  
Chairperson, Advisory Committee  
Missouri State University

**UNDERSTANDING THE VICTIM-OFFENDER OVERLAP: AN  
EXPLORATORY STUDY**

By

Christine Kay Hannis

A Masters Thesis  
Submitted to the Graduate College  
Of Missouri State University  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of Master of Science, Criminology and Criminal Justice

December 2015

Approved:

---

Aida Y. Hass, PhD

---

Bernard J. McCarthy, PhD

---

Patti Ross Salinas, JD, PhD

---

Julie Masterson, PhD: Dean, Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Reflecting back on the various stages of not only this research process, but on my college career as a whole, has shown me that the number of individuals that I need to thank well exceeds the length of just this one page. To those of you who I do not get a chance to mention, your constant support and encouragement have not gone unnoticed or have been forgotten.

First, I want to thank my teachers, past and present. Specifically, to my thesis committee, thank you for your guidance, mentorship, and reinforcement throughout this research process. Dr. Hass, thank you for all that you have done for me. Thank you for all of the chances you've given me to use my talents and knowledge to help others. If I did not have you as my mentor these past couple of years, I might not have made it through graduate school in one piece. Dr. McCarthy, thank you for your guidance, openness, and kindness. You have been supportive of me since my first semester of graduate school and that is something that I will never forget. Dr. Salinas, thank you for all the ways you've empowered me to practice my learning and for constantly pushing me to go beyond what I think I am capable of accomplishing. There are no words to describe how much I appreciate everything you have done for me over the past two years.

Secondly, I want to thank those individuals volunteered to participate in my research study as well as the staff at the Greene County Jail. This study could not have been accomplished without your help and because of that I thank you.

Third, I want to thank my family for their love, support, and for standing beside me during my academic career. I would not be where I am in life if I did not have my family to constantly motivate me to go for my dreams and reach for the stars. I want to especially thank my mom-Kay, dad-Craig, Brother-Jesse, Aunt Kathy, and Uncle Mike. You five are individuals I hold very dear to my heart. I would also like to thank Eli, Marie + kids and Sue, Aiden, Ian, Shane, and Sherri for always being there for me. I have to thank my uncle, Shaun, as well because he not only provided me with encouragement while here on Earth, but he continues to watch out for me while Heaven.

Fourth, I would like to personally thank my high school teachers, especially Sabra Paulsmeyer, Amy Backes, and Lori Hagenhoff. You were always there for me growing up and for that, I am forever grateful. I would also like to thank my college professors Dr. Garland, Caryn Saxon, Ivy Yarckow-Brown, and Diane Leamy for all that you have done for me these past few years.

Finally, I would like to thank all of my friends. Anyone who knows me knows that I hold my friends close to me. Thank you to all my band, Chamois, Springfield, high school, college, work, and travel friends, as well as sorority sisters for always being there for me. Special thanks to Molly, Alyssa, Kristen, the Walker Family Alex, Matt Jones, my 'Home Girls', 'Band Boys' 'Band Girls', Mandi, Scott, Kendall, Montana, Amanda, Logan, Daniel, Jake, Justin, Jamie, Tiffany, Candice, Collette, Lauren, Katie, and Nicole.

As I stated above, I could go on well past the length of this page thanking everyone. But, it looks like I have ran out of space to talk. So, once again thank you all for everything.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction .....	1
Understanding the Problem and the Need for Further Research .....	6
Current Study .....	7
Defining Victimization .....	8
Defining Offending .....	9
Chapter Two: Theoretical Perspectives .....	11
Routine Activities and Lifestyle Theory .....	11
Socialization Theories .....	15
Subcultural Theory .....	16
Neighborhood Context Theory .....	18
Social Control Theory .....	19
Social Learning Theory and Differential Association Theory .....	20
Individual Trait Theory and Population Heterogeneity Argument .....	21
Strain Theory .....	22
Self-Control Theory .....	23
Theoretical Implications .....	26
Chapter Three: Literature Review .....	28
The Birth of the Victim-Offender Overlap .....	28
Victim-Offender Overlap Characteristics .....	29
Wolfgang's Research .....	31
Homicide Studies .....	32
Additional Supporting Studies .....	35
Existence of Overlap in Criminal Behaviors: Dating Violence .....	45
Existence of Overlap among Specific Groups: Hispanics .....	47
Methodologies .....	48
Literature Review Conclusion .....	51
Chapter Four: Methodology .....	54
Research Design and Rationale .....	54
Participants and Setting .....	55
Questionnaire .....	57
Interviews .....	60
Data Analysis .....	61
Chapter Five: Results .....	64
Questionnaire: Demographic/Background Data .....	64
Interviews and Responses Questions .....	74
Questionnaire: Interview Data .....	82
Understanding the Results .....	85

Chapter Six: Discussion.....	94
Role of Victim-Offender Overlap in Criminal Justice.....	94
Future Research and Study Limitations.....	101
Concluding Remarks.....	104
References.....	108
Appendices.....	119
Appendix A. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval .....	119
Appendix B. Research Approval from Director of Mental Health Services .....	121
Appendix C. Research Study Flier.....	122
Appendix D. Informed Consent Form .....	123
Appendix E. Demographic/Background Questionnaire .....	125
Appendix F. Guided Interview Questionnaire .....	126
Appendix G. Overall Questionnaire Participants Received.....	128
Appendix H. Criminal Victimization Responses.....	132
Appendix I. Criminal Offending Responses.....	133
Appendix J. Specific Participants' Responses (Full Version) .....	134
Appendix K. Specific Participants' Responses (Condensed Version).....	169



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Age of Questionnaire Respondents .....	66
Table 2: Race/Ethnicity of Questionnaire Respondents .....	67
Table 3: Marital Status of Questionnaire Respondents.....	68
Table 4: Education Level of Questionnaire Respondents.....	69
Table 5: Characteristics of Adult Women on Probation and in Local Jails.....	71
Table 6: Offending Experiences of Questionnaire Respondents .....	75
Table 7: Victimization Experiences of Questionnaire Respondents.....	76

## **CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION**

Theoretical criminology has traditionally been developed around the notions of criminal behavior, its various causes, understanding its nature and extent, and developing crime control interventions that are grounded in evidence based research. Over the years, the field of victimology emerged to enhance our understanding within criminology by exploring the concepts and theories related to crime victimization and the relationship between victims and offenders, as well as the interactions that take place between victims and the criminal justice system. Emerging from this field of study is the notion that there is very often a connection between victims of crime and criminal offenders that transcends the mere incidence of crime or the criminal event itself. While the relationship between crime victimization and criminal offending can be somewhat illusive, the research literature presents clear and compelling findings that offenders are 1.5 to 7 times more likely than non-offenders to be victims of crime, while victims are 2 to 7 times more likely than non-victims to be criminal offenders. (Daigle, 2012) Until the 1980s, these dynamics were relatively unrecognized.

People tend to categorize victims and offenders into distinct, separate groups from one another. The same goes for how criminologists and the criminal justice system categorize the two groups. As a result, criminal justice policies and practices have been built upon the ideological separation of crime victims and criminal offenders into two distinct groups. Indeed, there is a substantial body of evidence suggesting that offenders and victims are quite distinct from one another (Broidy et al., 2006; Klevens et al., 2002; Loeber et al., 2005; Schreck et al., 2008). However, an equally impressive body of

literature and evidence has emerged to suggest that victims and offenders share many similarities with regard to demographics, experiences, and behavior patterns (Cohen et al., 1981; Gottfredson, 1986; Hindelang, 1976, 1981; Hindelang et al., 1978; Jensen and Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen et al., 1991). The similarities associated with both victims and offenders has led to the study of a concept known as the *victim-offender overlap* (Broidy et al., 2006; Klevens et al., 2002; Loeber et al., 2005; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 2000; Piquero et al., 2005; Pizarro et al., 2011; Sampson and Lauritsen, 1990; Schreck et al., 2008).

The victim-offender overlap comes from the idea that an individual can be both a victim and offender (Sampson and Lauritsen, 1990). This idea stems from the fact that criminal involvement, whether the individual is a victim or an offender, increases both offending and victimization risk (Lauritsen et al., 1991; Lauritsen et al., 1992). By acknowledging that an overlap exists in the behaviors associated with victims and offenders, researchers are better able to understand the intricate relationship between victimization and offending.

The correlation between victimization and offending is one of the most documented empirical findings in delinquency research to date (Jennings et al., 2012). Out of all the criminological facts examined within the research literature, including strong, patterned relationships between crime, age, sex, race, socioeconomic status, neighborhood disadvantage, and individual differences, there does not exist a relationship as consistent as that of the relationship between offenders and victims (Gottfredson, 1981; Maxfield, 1987). However, these findings are among the least understood within

the criminological literature (Broidy et al., 2006; Lauritsen and Laub, 2007; Lauritsen et al., 1991).

Various studies examining this relationship reveal that offending predicts consequent victimization and that victims at a later point in time will often become offenders themselves (Lauritsen et al., 1991; Reingle et al., 2011). Out of the empirical research conducted over the relationship between the two groups, a rather large body of this research indicates that criminal offenders have a much higher chance of being victimized when compared to those individuals who are law-abiding citizens (Barnes and Beaver, 2012). Likewise, victims are at a greater risk of being offenders compared to those individuals who identify as being non-victims. For example, Dobrin (2001) found that victims were between four and ten times more likely to have a previous arrest for property and violent crimes along with drug-related arrests compared to non-victims. Dobrin (2001) also reported the risk of homicide increased from 1.4 to 5.6 times for each arrest.

Research findings suggest that the victim-offender overlap relationship exists for both violent and non-violent offenses and expands across a wide variety of data sources (Berg and Loeber, 2011; Posick, 2013). Studies conducted on the relationship between crime victimization and criminal offending have also found the connection to exist across a wide variety of crime categories including nondomestic assault cases, homicide, abuse of alcohol, gang involvement, and sexual/violent crimes, such as intimate partner violence (IPV) (Muftic et al., 2012).

Moreover, an examination of the characteristics associated with both victims and offenders reveals that the two groups share common demographic traits including gender

(overwhelmingly male), age (between 17 and 24 years old), and race (predominantly African American). Also, a number of victims of crime as well as criminal offenders reported having used alcohol and/or drugs prior to the incident. In addition, studies show that both victims and offenders exhibit the presence of cognitive distortions such as low self-esteem, insecurity, anxiety, and fatalism (Daigle, 2012). These studies that have emerged to suggest there is a victim-offender overlap, or a strong positive relationship between victimization and offending, indicates that crime victims and offenders share similar characteristics and common experiences that increases their likelihood of becoming a crime victims as well as a criminal offender.

In addition to documenting the strong, positive relationship between victimization and offending, studies of the victim-offender support that the relationship between victimization and offending is widely generalizable. Tillyer and Wright note that “the victim-offender relationship is robust, having been found in the United States as well as other countries, over time, across various contexts, and within various demographic subgroups,” (Tillyer and Wright, 2014, p. 34). Researchers demonstrating the positive association between victimization and offending using data from general population samples of adults and from specialized samples of adult offenders and deviant youth have found that the incidence and prevalence of victimization and offending substantially increase the incidence and prevalence of the other, even after controlling for other important factors related to criminal involvement (Daigle, 2012).

Many different studies have emerged using a wide range of factors, variables, methodologies, and trajectories to explain the existence of this connection. Much of the literature examining the victim-offender overlap stems from Wolfgang’s formative study

on homicide victims (Wolfgang, 1958). In his sociological analysis of criminal homicide, Wolfgang proposed that individuals who end up as victims often engage in some type of behavior that provokes or precipitates crime. Using a Philadelphia urban community as a case study, Wolfgang analyzed criminal homicides listed in the Philadelphia Police Department between January 1, 1948, and December 31, 1952. Focusing on elements of the crime such as presence of alcohol, motivation, temporal and spatial patterns, Wolfgang found that 26% of homicides were victim-precipitated, occurring as a result of provocation (Wolfgang, 1958).

More recently, studies have emerged to suggest that an individual's demographic variables or delinquent lifestyle can be used to predict both victimization and offending (Daday et al., 2005). In 2008, Schreck et al. conducted a study to examine the predictors of an overlap between offending and victimization using data from Add Health, a nationally representative sample of adolescents, between grades 7 through 12, who attended school in the United States between 1994 through 1996 (Schreck et al., 2008). The study examined several measures of risky lifestyle activities, including time spent with delinquent friends, unsupervised time, skipping school, sneaking out at night without parents' permission, and driving a car, as well as measures of social control such as attachment to parents and commitment to school. In addition to demographic and lifestyle variables, a significant body of research currently exists which reveals individual-level factors, such as impulsivity, low levels of self-control, and neuroticism, as having a connection to the development of antisocial behaviors that can lead to both victimization and criminal involvement (Ousey et al., 2011).

## **Understanding the Problem and the Need for Further Research**

The current problem associated with the victim-offender overlap involves the lack of studies over the nature and extent of why this overlap exists. Additionally, there is even less research focusing on the perspective of the offenders who identify themselves as victims, while the documentation within the theoretical literature indicates there is indeed a victim-offender overlap. The current problem has yet to be researched more in-depth by researchers, criminologists, and academics to find the explanation of the nature and extent of why this overlap exists. Thus, it is important to study the victim-offender overlap to better understand why this overlap exists as well as finding out how this overlap impacts policy development and program implementation within the criminal justice system.

Applying theories of victimization to offending, and vice versa, has significant policy implications. Research studies draw attention to the possibility that existing theoretical frameworks for explaining the underlying causes of offending might be equally useful for explaining the underlying causes of victimization. Therefore, these studies and theoretical frameworks may offer useful policy suggestions, programs, and initiatives for preventing crime victimization, which can help to reduce an individual's risk for both. These same theoretical frameworks as well as various programs and services can help to target the causal factors and/or variables that increase the likelihood for both victimization and offending. This information can assist policy makers, program coordinators, and field officers in their decisions about allocating scarce prevention and treatment resources, interventions, and services, along with how to utilize these items

more efficiently. This would not only save money for departments of corrections, but would also ensure that there is not a gap in the services provided as well.

Support exists for a new approach in the study of the etiology of crime victimization. By recognizing the parallels in the onset of criminality and victimization, researchers and program administrators can address the needs of crime victims and offenders in a more focused, wrap-around, overlapping approach. Addressing victimization and offending as unique problems rather than symptoms of similar issues is counterproductive. Thus, an understanding of the victim-offender overlap is imperative to the continued progression of the criminology and criminal justice field.

### **Current Study**

The current research study is aimed at gaining a first hand, in-depth understanding of the connection that exists between criminal offending and crime victimization by providing a unique and informative perspective on the nature of this overlap. This perspective will provide a better understanding of this concept as well as demonstrate the need to create better policies, programs, resources, and education that addresses the problem in a more comprehensive way, which will result in helping those individuals who identify as both victims and offenders.

In light of a significant deficit in the research literature with regard to the study of victimization and offending (especially among women), the current study aimed to elaborate on personal backgrounds, common experiences, and shared sentiments expressed by the sample population of offenders, in order to gain a better understanding



of the theoretical grounding of the victim-offender overlap. The following goals were thus set forth for the current research study:

- To identify and describe the different theories explaining the victim-offender overlap (such as routine activities and lifestyle theory; socialization theories; and individual trait theory/population heterogeneity argument)
- To identify and describe the key components of individual traits along with alcohol/drug use among victims and offenders to determine whether these components encompass characteristics related to this concept
- To evaluate whether the various characteristics previously studied indeed demonstrate an overlap between victims and offenders
- To provide a voice to those victims/offenders to allow their experiences to contribute to the knowledge and better understanding of this concept within the criminology and criminal justice field
- To evaluate and assess the background, social characteristics, shared experiences, and common sentiments among study participants who identify as both an offender and victim within the current study

Before proceeding further into the discussion over the victim-offender overlap, it is important to address the definition of key terms relevant to this research, such as victimization (victims) and offending (offenders). After recognizing what these key terms mean, a better understanding of the theories associated with the victim-offender overlap, previous studies on this overlap, methodology and results of the current study, and how this overlap impacts the criminal justice system, can occur.

### **Defining Victimization**

Victimization can have a variety of meanings depending on the context of its use. The concept of a 'victim' extends back to ancient societies. In this sense, it was connected to the notion of sacrifice (Karmen, 2013). The original meaning of a 'victim'

was a person or an anima put to death during a religious ceremony in order to appease some supernatural power or deity. Over time, the word picked up additional meanings. It is more commonly referred now to individuals who suffer injuries, losses, or hardships for any reason (Karmen, 2013). Crime victims are those who are harmed by illegal acts. Karmen (2013) describes victimization as ‘an asymmetrical interpersonal relationship that is abusive, painful, destructive, parasitical, and unfair’ (p. 2). Victimization is a complex phenomenon, which results from a multitude of broad social and micro-situational influences. In turn, criminologists, sociologists, and other researchers have developed theories to help provide a more comprehensive understanding of victimization. Victimization theories are generally a set of testable propositions designed to help explain why a particular individual experiences victimization (Daigle, 2012). These theories vary, but such theories include those that focus on victimization as a function of opportunity, social interactional dynamics between victim and offender, and as a deep social division in terms of power and control (Wilcox, 2010). Examples of more specific theories of victimization include victim precipitation theory, the lifestyle theory, deviant place theory, and the routine activities theory.

### **Defining Offending**

For the purpose of this study, the definition of offending, more specifically “criminal offending/offender” will be “any individual who is charged with, or convicted of, any criminal offense, including a youth offender or a juvenile offender” (Criminal Offender [Education] Law and Legal Definition, 2015). The assumption that rewards and punishments influence an individual’s life choices between different courses of action

underlies much economic, sociological, psychological, and legal thinking about committing a particular act or action (Cornish and Clarke, 2014). Different reasons exist as to why an individual is an offender or commits an offending criminal action. Causal attributions for offending include internal, external, unstable and uncontrollable causes and events (Cornish and Clarke, 2014). Whatever the case may be for why an individual commits an offending act or action, many theories aim to explain an offender's thought process, behavior, motives, emotions, and activities. Such theories include the social conflict theory, self-control theory, and strain theory. These theories are not only useful in explaining why offenders commit criminal acts, but help explain the victim-offender overlap as well.

## **CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES**

While no single or unified theory exists to fully explain the victim-offender overlap, researchers can trace its evolution and rationale through several modern theoretical works. This chapter examines the theoretical perspectives relevant to better understanding the victim-offender overlap concept. In particular, an emphasis on works and concepts that focuses on both victims and offenders and not just on one particular group will take place. While this overview is important to better understanding the victim-offender overlap, it is necessary to clarify that this research is not grounded in a particular theory, but is an inductive study intended to contribute to the theoretical understanding of the victim-offender overlap and its role within the criminal justice field.

### **Routine Activities and Lifestyle Theory**

During the 1970s, routine activities theory emerged to explain the context of lifestyle choices that place individuals in positions of opportunity for, exposure to and engagement in activities that increase both victimization and offending. Routine activities and lifestyles theories propose that a person's victimization risk can be better understood by the extent to which the victim's routine activities or lifestyle creates opportunities for a motivated offender to commit a crime (Daigle, 2012). Variables such as drug and alcohol use, unsupervised out of home recreation, risk taking leisurely activities, residential disadvantage, and contact with known offenders not only facilitate criminal events, but also expose individuals to becoming the victim of a crime. This

theoretical framework offers a view of the interactive dynamics of a given situation that may increase the likelihood of victimization and offending to occur.

Cohen and Felson (1979) argued that a person's routine activities, or daily routine patterns, impact the risk for an individual to become a crime victim. As a person's routine activities or patterns places him or her in a position of being in contact with motivated offenders, crime victimization risk abounds. Additionally, individuals whose lifestyles include criminal involvement are more likely to come into contact with diverse offending populations, which increases their risk of becoming a crime victim themselves (Schreck et al., 2008). Cohen and Felson (1979) also noted that there must be some type of specific characteristic associated with particular individuals, items, and places, which encourages motivated offenders to select them as suitable targets. This specific characteristic Cohen and Felson noted is attractiveness, which refers to the quality of a particular target. A target's attractiveness relates to how easy it is to transport the target and/or the value of the target. Offenders therefore choose suitable targets based upon the amount of attractiveness associated with the target. Specific examples of suitable targets for offenders involving individuals include:

- Going out/working at night (alone)
- Walking, not driving
- Leaving doors unlocked and homes unsecured
- Hanging out with delinquent peers
- Residing in a disadvantaged neighborhood
- Use of drugs/alcohol

Offenders also choose suitable targets based upon whether or not they have a capable guardian with them. Capable guardianship refers to the protection of a target in the effort to prevent victimization from occurring by an offender. For example, capable guardianship involves one person accompanying another person to a bar, restaurant, concert, or a sporting event so the individual is not attending these events or places by themselves. When a target does not have capable guardianship, then chances of becoming a suitable target for an offender increases. These types of factors, such as a target's routine activity, being a suitable target, and having capable guardianship, can help explain the overlap connection between victimization and offending (Averdijk, 2011; Berg and Loeber, 2012; Chen, 2009; Lauritsen et al., 1991; Lauritsen and Laub, 2007; Schreck and Fisher, 2004; Schreck et al., 2004).

Guardianship refers to both social and physical prevention tactics a target takes in order to seek protection from an offender. When all three elements- motivated offenders, suitable targets, and lack of capable guardianship- merge together, victimization is more than likely to occur. Osgood et al. (1996) developed a theoretical framework referred to as "unstructured socializing" that has direct relevance for explaining the victim-offender overlap. Osgood et al. focused on the relationship of youth, delinquency, and time. They argued that it is not necessarily the time, in general, that a youth spends with delinquent peers that results in these individuals offending and experiencing victimization, but instead it is the amount of time that a youth spends with delinquent peers in the absence of adult supervision. From this argument, they noted that the absence of adult supervision produces a situation ideal for these individuals to offend and be victimized (Osgood et al., 1996). In short, the routine activities framework offers a view of the

interactive dynamics of a given situation that may increase the likelihood of victimization and offending to occur.

Hindelang et al.'s (1978) lifestyles theory relates closely to the routine activities theory. Hindelang and colleagues suggested that certain lifestyles or behaviors place people in situations in which victimization is likely to occur. As a result, an individual's lifestyle can increase the chances for that individual to become a crime victim. As a person comes into contact (through lifestyles and behaviors) with potential offenders, that person is more than likely creating opportunities for crime victimization to occur.

Hindelang and his colleagues identified lifestyle factors that create opportunities for individuals to become victimized, such as the type of people an individual associates with, whether or not an individual works outside the home, and the type of leisure activities in which an individual engages (Hindelang et al., 1978). Thus, a person who associates with criminals, works outside the home, and participates in activities (i.e. going out at night, being away from one's home, and hanging out with nonfamily members) is at more of a risk for being a target for personal victimization compared to others. Researchers treat the routine activities and lifestyles theories interchangeably, which is why the routine activities and lifestyles theories often refer to both perspectives at the same time (Daigle, 2012).

In 1978, Hindelang et al. conducted a landmark study of victimization patterns in the National Crime Survey (NSC). This particular study helped to set in motion the adoption of a novel theoretical orientation with the aim to explain victimization risks (Hindelang et al., 1978). Hindelang et al. (1978) suggested the *principle of homogamy*, which helps explain why victimization risk is higher for some people compared to others.

This principle explains that the more frequently a person comes into contact with demographic groups of likely offenders, the greater the risk of experiencing victimization. This frequency may relate to the function of demographics or lifestyle of a particular individual or group. For example, males have a higher chance of being criminal offenders compared to females. Additionally, males are at a greater risk for victimization due to the amount of time they spend with other males.

The work done by these researchers discussed above proved to be important in assessing the theoretical implications for knowledge of the victim-offender overlap concept, especially through the use of the routine activity/ lifestyles theories. Various socialization theories are also useful in explaining the victim-offender overlap relationship and are discussed below.

### **Socialization Theories**

Structural and social process theories have also been used to explain why the risk of criminal offending is linked to an increased risk of victimization. Sampson and Lauritsen (1990) suggested that the perpetration of criminal behavior increases the risk of victimization through association with others who may also engage in crime. The perpetration of criminal behavior increases the risk of victimization as people are likely to engage in crime against individuals within the same social circle or close geographic area, which in turn creates a circle of victimization and offending at both the peer and neighborhood level (Fagan et al., 1987; Wilson, 1987). The development of socialization theories, such as subcultural and neighborhood context theories, help explain this circle



of victimization and offending. These two theories are some of the more popular socialization theories used to explain the victim-offender overlap.

### **Subcultural Theory**

Subcultural theories of violence help to provide an explanation for violence among subgroups within a particular population. Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) provide a good example of this explanation. Wolfgang and Ferracuti propose that violence is a characteristic of particular cultural groups since there does not exist another alternative. Specifically, this applies to those within the lower classes of a population. These individuals tend to have limited access to obtain goals, such as respect and money, through the use of nonviolent, legitimate avenues are denied or not available (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967). For example, if parents of young children portray violence, aggression and breaking the law as legitimate means to support the family, children in turn will learn that these are acceptable and reasonable alternatives to achieve desired goals.

Singer (1981) used a subcultural approach to help better explain the link that exists between offenders and victims. He argued that the extent to which particular perceptions and misperceptions concerning the use of force are common among both victims and offenders. These perceptions regarding the use of force within these populations may not necessarily be clear-cut, but rather serve as an alternative method for survival within a network of subcultural relationships. Additionally, subcultural norms embedded within a subculture of violence may place offenders in a role of victimization since these norms validate retaliation (Singer, 1986). Within subcultures of violence,

individuals who attack and victimize others risk retaliation from former victims (Schreck et al., 2008).

Retaliatory violence is a key principle of subcultural theories of crime. In some particular situations, victims tend to think that a response to victimization should be through the use of violent retaliation. Anderson (1999) coined the phrase “code of the street,” which indicated that the structural conditions of neighborhoods make violence a routine of street life. The prevailing norms of this particular environment demonstrate that victims often will retaliate against others in order to maintain respectability among peers within a given situation or context. This retaliation then may leave both the individual and neighborhood vulnerable to experiencing victimization by someone else either within or outside the neighborhood who also aspires to be recognized as someone with high social status or “street credit” (Jennings et al., 2012).

Anderson (1999) suggested that an individual’s response to victimization with violence is not only expected, but it has an association to an individual’s self-respect, honor, and identity. Within subcultures of violence, the use of force becomes a mechanism of survival, and individuals who attack and victimize place themselves at risk of retaliation from their victims, as norms embedded within a subculture of violence also validate retaliation as a means of gaining respect and honor (Anderson, 1999). Anderson goes on to further suggest that victimization is a risk factor for offending and that subsequent victimization goes along with retaliatory offending in a cycle of violence. Thus, subcultural theories of crime often suggest that retaliatory violence, as a result of strengthened antisocial values, is a mediating mechanism where victimization will not only lead to offending, but to subsequent victimization as well (Brezina et al., 2004).

## **Neighborhood Context Theory**

Neighborhood-level mechanisms significantly influence the overlap in victimization and offending. These mechanisms cause the relationship between victimization and offending to vary according to neighborhood context, family, friends, and personal interaction (Daigle, 2012). Not only does an individual's lifestyle play an important factor involving the amount of risk for an individual, but other factors such as where the person lives and spends time puts that person at a risk of victimization as well. "Hot spots" or areas known as being crime-prone create opportunities for victimization to occur and enhance the chances of an individual experiencing victimization (Daigle, 2012).

Many neighborhood factors have been associated to the victim-offender overlap. One such factor involving the relationship between victimization and offending is family structure. Sampson (1985) found that neighborhoods with a large percentage of female-headed households, greater structural density (the measurement of units in structures of five or more units), and higher rates of residential mobility (the percentage of individuals who are 5 years and older living within a different house from five years before) have higher rates of theft and violent victimization. Adding to the neighborhood context idea is collective efficacy, which is the social cohesion among neighbors combined with the neighbor's willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good (Sampson et al., 1997). Using collective efficacy, researchers begin to understand why disadvantaged neighborhoods are likely to have very little collective efficacy and are less able to mobilize effective sources of informal social control, which helps to maintain order,

stability, and safety within a neighborhood. Therefore, crime and violence are more likely to occur when communities do not have these strong informal mechanisms well established because these mechanisms would help reduce the likelihood of criminal offending and the risk of victimization within communities (Daigle, 2012).

### **Social Control Theory**

Social control theories suggest that the involvement of individuals in conventional activities and their association with conventional peers and groups decrease their risk for both offending and victimization. Hirschi (1969) postulated that the natural tendency towards crime is reduced by the development of pro-social bonds that not only act as barriers towards committing delinquent acts, but naturally protect individuals from potential situations that increase their chances of coming into contact with criminal offenders and the potential for victimization. For example, if an individual has a weak social bond and attachment to parents, friends, school, and/or community then the individual has a higher likelihood to “give in” to this natural tendency individuals have towards crime (Schreck et al., 2008). If the individual decides to give in to this natural tendency, then they risk experiencing victimization more compared to those who do not give in to crime. The social control theory helps researchers better understand the victim-offender overlap by understanding how an individual’s natural tendency to lean towards crime and the social bonds that an individual has with those around them play an important part in how an individual experiences criminal offending and criminal victimization.

## **Social Learning Theory and Differential Association Theory**

Criminologists have also relied on social learning theories to help explain variables mediating the victim-offender overlap. Social learning theories help explain the victim-offender overlap by explaining the intergenerational patterns, such as when a victim experiences violence, which could then lead to the victim learning violent and aggressive behavior (Megargee, 1982). In examining the behaviors of individuals, the differential association theory was created. This theory suggested that offenders learn deviant behaviors from others, especially those individuals who have closer relationships with the offenders (Sutherland, 1947). This includes learning deviant norms, values and behaviors that are communicated through the interaction. By the same token, behaviors that value lawless, risky, and defiant actions not only place individuals in crime prone interactions, but also increase their chances of coming into contact with individuals who can potentially victimize them.

Akers (1985) suggests that a system of rewards and reinforcements are additional factors that influence offending behavior. These rewards and reinforcements provided by friends and family members reinforce offending behavior by an individual and increase the likelihood of deviance for an offender. This type of learned behavior can also apply to victims as well. Victims learn violent and aggressive behaviors from those individuals who are closest to them. In turn, these learned behaviors are rewarded and reinforced as an acceptable way to act and behave by the individuals whom the victims learned the behaviors from originally. As a result, victims continue to learn and develop these types of behaviors. Thus, individuals who have deviant peers and family members in their life

have a higher chance at becoming both a victim and an offender as these deviant individuals exhibit deviant behaviors for others to learn from (Akers, 1985).

### **Individual Trait Theory and Population Heterogeneity Argument**

Researchers attempting to understand the victim-offender overlap have also examined the role of individual traits, such as low self-control, in mediating the relationship between offending and victimization (Finkelhor and Asdigian, 1996; Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Hindelang et al., 1978; Jensen and Brownfield, 1986; Schreck, 1999; Wilson and Hernstein, 1985). Other contributing factors to explain the overlap include individual and community factors, such as gender and race, physical appearance (i.e. individual size, physical vulnerability), and antisocial behaviors (i.e. violence and criminal involvement) (Finkelhor and Asdigian, 1996; Gottfredson, 1984; Hindelang et al., 1978; Jensen and Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen and Quinet, 1995; Miethe and Meier, 1994; Sampson et al., 1997).

A significant body of research currently exists which reveals individual-level factors, such as impulsivity, low levels of self-control, and neuroticism, have a connection to the development of antisocial behaviors and criminal involvement. One example of this research involves Ousey's 2011 research study. Using longitudinal data on middle- and high-school students, the researchers examined competing arguments regarding the relationship between victimization and offending embedded within the 'dynamic causal' and 'population heterogeneity' perspectives (Ousey et al., 2011). Their analysis began with models that estimated the longitudinal relationship between victimization and offending without accounting for the influence of time-stable individual

heterogeneity. They then reconsidered the victimization-offending relationship after the effects of the time-stable sources of heterogeneity, and time-varying covariates that were controlled (Ousey et al., 2011). The initial results without controls for population heterogeneity are in line with much prior research and indicated a positive link between victimization and offending. These results are most consistent with the notion that the oft-reported victimization-offending relationship link is driven by a combination of dynamic causal and population heterogeneity factors (Ousey et al., 2011). They found that the impact of victimization on offending (and vice versa) became weak when the observed measures of impulsivity, social bonds, and differential association with peers included the researcher's fixed effects regression models. Their findings heavily suggested that victimization and offending may share common etiological factors tied to individual level traits (Ousey et al., 2011). Other studies have also emerged to reveal that some of these same individual level factors may also relate to an individual's chance for experiencing victimization (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Schreck et al., 2002)

### **Strain Theory**

Studies examining the role of experienced, vicarious, and anticipated strains mediating the causes of offending and victimization have found that these associations are useful in explaining the cycle of violence (Agnew, 1992, 2002). Strain, in the form of victimization or trauma, has led to offending by way of negative emotionality (Hay and Evans, 2006; Manasse and Ganem, 2009; Maschi et al., 2008). Negative emotions, such as depression and anger, help provide a link for traumatic events and the abuse that leads to offending and victimization. Further, negative emotionality can lead to the

relationship between victimization and offending. For example, victimization stimulates emotions, such as anger, frustration, fear, and depression. These types of emotions can also be stimulations behind why an individual becomes an offender. Research suggests that anger is perhaps the most closely linked emotional mediator of the victim-offender overlap (Hay and Evans, 2006; Maschi et al., 2008). However, studies indicate that the role of emotions being stimulators may vary across demographic characteristics, such as sex (Posick et al., 2013).

### **Self-Control Theory**

Other sociological and criminological theories exist to further explain the victim-offender overlap. One such theory involves Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime. This theory focuses on the individual characteristic of self-control along with more general subcultural theories used to explain the victim-offender overlap, which also ties into the individual trait theory and population heterogeneity argument discussed earlier (Anderson, 1999; Stewart et al., 2006). Hirschi (1969) argued that people within a society will conform to a specific type of behavior best suited for that particular society when an adequate amount of bond and involvement with prosocial individuals and institutions occurs. Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime also suggests that both victimization and offending emerge through similar processes and experiences that stem from an individual's socialization within the family environment (Baron et al., 2007; Forde and Kennedy, 1997; Holtfreter et al., 2008; Piquero et al., 2005; Schreck, 1999; Schreck et al., 2002; Schreck et al., 2006). Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) also suggested that an absence of socialization can also result in delinquent and/or



criminal activity as a result of not being properly socialized over the matter. These researchers further argued that crime is a by-product of an individual's decision to habitually ignore the long-term consequences of their actions.

In terms of the self-control theory proposed by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), criminal acts are "short-lived, immediately gratifying, easy, simple, and exciting." A person with low self-control exhibits six elements, which include:

- Inability to delay gratification- higher levels of impulsiveness along with being unable or unwilling to delay gratification
- Risk taking- eagerness to engage in thrill-seeking behavior without thought of consequence
- Shortsighted- does not obtain any clear long-term goals
- Preference for physical activity instead of mental activity
- Low frustration tolerance- quick to anger
- Insensitivity and self-centeredness- inability to exhibit empathy towards others

Ironically, these same traits very often characterize individuals who experience recurrent patterns of victimization.

An example of how low self-control theory elaborates on the victim-offender overlap involves parents monitoring the behavior and activities of their children. If parents do not monitor children's behavior effectively by identifying and correcting potentially defiant behaviors and attitudes within the child, in addition to intervening in a positive way to correct the behavior, then this failed socialization process will yield an inadequately socialized youth. Low self-control may then manifest early on within an individual's life, such as the youth stage, where it then can remain stable throughout the individual's life course. As a result, this can increase the chances of both personal and

violent victimization, in addition to increasing the individual's chances of offending (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Schreck, 1999). Even when control over family, peer, and other situational risk factors exist, self-control still contributes to the experiences that lead to violent victimization (Schreck et al., 2002).

Thus, self-control theory suggests that individuals who lack self-control are not concerned about long-term consequences of certain behaviors, and therefore, these individuals will more likely engage in activities and interact in risky social settings that provide immediate gratification with little effort, often putting themselves at greater risk of victimization (Holtfreter et al., 2010). Moreover, low self-control contributes to the escalation of a violent situation as the failure to recognize long-term consequences of behavior may illicit a violent reaction in a conflict ridden situation. This theory is useful to explain a wide variety of traditional offending outcomes located within diverse samples, such as low self-control's association to force and fraud within the general population (Grasmick et al., 1993; Pratt and Cullen, 2000).

Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory implies that individuals who lack self-control will have higher chances of self-selecting into risky social settings. From an offending perspective, individuals with low self-control are unable to accurately measure the potential negative consequences, such as likelihood of apprehension and engagement in criminal activities (Holtfreter et al., 2010). Upon exposure to risky settings, self-control theory suggests that individuals with low self-control will also be at a higher risk for victimization. This relationship between low self-control and victimization finds support in studies using a wide range of samples, such as low self-control's association with self-reported victimization regarding the general population and among college students,

homicide victimization, and violent victimization using adult and juvenile samples (Ford and Kennedy, 1997; Piquero et al., 2005; Schreck, 1999; Schreck et al., 2008; Schreck et al., 2002).

Schreck (1999) noted that individuals who experience low self-control are more vulnerable to victimization due to individual's being irritable, disagreeable, and failing to recognize the long-term consequences of an act or behavior that may then cause a violent reaction. Other "crime-analogous" outcomes or negative events associated with low self-control include an individual's history of broken relationships, poor educational achievement, accidents, disease, and failures at an individual's work (Schreck et al., 2008).

### **Theoretical Implications**

By reviewing the theoretical foundations of the victim-offender overlap through the contributions of scholars like Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), Schreck (1999), and Sampson and Lauritsen (1990), the existence of an overlap between offenders and victims becomes apparent. However, without further research on the nature and extent of this overlap, victims and offenders will continue to experience treatment as two distinct, separate groups. Challenges exist for researchers and policy administrators to not only better understand this overlap between victims and offenders, but to also find better ways to address crime using information gained from studying this concept. The importance of the victim-offender overlap's role within the criminal justice system makes it all the more essential that there is a better understanding as to why this overlap exists within the contemporary culture and how representation for both victims and offenders occurs

within the system. Researchers and policy administrators can view this overlap as a vehicle by which to strengthen not only an individual, but family and community connections as well.

In the following chapter, more information will aim to fully explore what the victim-offender overlap is, as well as review existing literature in regards to the victim-offender overlap. Additionally, the following chapter will examine studies used to understand why the victim-offender overlap exists among specific groups and its connection to the general population.

## **CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW**

It is important to first understand the origin of the victim-offender overlap concept in order to better understand the existing literature used to explain the existence of this overlap. This literature review not only offers the opportunity to better understand the existing literature used to explain this overlap, but it also provides the opportunity to examine studies used to explain the existence of this overlap among specific groups and its connection to the general population.

### **The Birth of the Victim-Offender Overlap**

Hans Von Hentig first presented the victim-offender overlap concept in 1948, where it became a critical component within the criminology and criminal justice fields. Von Hentig's textbook, *The Criminal and His Victim* (1948), was the first major criminological publication to explicitly recognize and attempt to theorize the victim-offender overlap phenomenon. Von Hentig argued that there are two categories of crime victims- those who are passive recipients of violence and those who contribute dynamically to their own misfortunes and circumstances (Von Hentig, 1948). It was this latter class of victims that many criminologists, along with legal professionals, overlooked within their research studies. In his own words, Von Hentig's idea of the victim-offender overlap by the law's criterion encompasses "Perpetrators and victims as being distinguished... (But) it may happen that the two distinct categories merge...and in the course of causative forces the victim assumes the role of a determinant" (Von Hentig, 1948, p. 450). Von Hentig also speculated that the influence for this overlap among both

victims and offenders stemmed from would-be perpetrators pursuing victims who have some type of involvement in crime as a result of their reluctance to contact the police. Additionally, he recognized what a variety of research has since revealed over the subject, which is victimization and offending closely connect to one another (Von Hentig, 1948).

Von Hentig never offered a specific, formal theory to explain the victim-offender overlap, but he did set up the beginning steps to identifying the significance of victimization research for criminological knowledge. Through his efforts and contributions, Von Hentig drew attention to the relationship between crime victimization and criminal offending, setting the stage for the development of research studies designed to explain the nature, cause and extent of this relationship.

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

Characteristics of crime victims include:

- Overwhelmingly male
- Under 24 years of age
- Highest incidence of violent victimization amongst African American males
- Over 70% of victims report to be victimized by a friend or acquaintance
- Most common crime victimization is theft
- Being single increases risk of victimization
- Crime victims are not selected at random
- Victims of crime are more likely to be lower income
- Crime victims are overwhelmingly urban dwellers

- Alcohol/drug use prevalent prior to violent crime victimization
- Presence of cognitive distortions (low self-esteem, insecure, anxious, submissive, fatalistic, dependent, and unrealistic) (Daigle, 2012).

While characteristics of criminal offenders include:

- Overwhelmingly male
- Highest rate of criminal offending between ages of 17 and 26
- Violent offending at a higher rate for African American males
- Less than 1.3 of criminal offenses are perpetrated by strangers
- Largest category of criminal offending is property crime
- Being married reduces the likelihood of criminal offending
- Criminal offenders target specific victims
- Criminal offenders are more likely to be disadvantaged and have a lower socioeconomic status
- Alcohol/drug use prevalent prior to violent crime offending
- Highest criminal offending in inner cities
- Presence of cognitive distortions (low self-esteem, insecure, anxious, controlling, fatalistic, unrealistic, deceptive, and blaming) (Daigle, 2012).

By looking at the characteristics associated with each group, an overlap of characteristics begins to surface between the two groups and the victim-offender overlap concept forms. Some characteristics that overlap include:

- The gender of an individual (usually males)
- Age (between 17-24 years old)
- Race (African American)
- Alcohol/drug use prevalent prior to an accident

- Presence of cognitive distortions (low self-esteem, insecure, anxious, fatalistic, and unrealistic).

This overlap in characteristics of both victims and offenders helps researchers gain a better understanding as to how and why Von Hentig came to his conclusion that victims and offenders fall under the same group, as well as how he came up with the idea and notion for the victim-offender overlap.

The theoretical foundation underlying the overlap in victimization and offending continues to be a subject of debate, however, through the use of a wide range of factors, variables, methodologies, and trajectories, many different theories and studies have contributed to the explanation of why this overlap exists. Expanding upon these theories used to describe the victim-offender overlap, studies have emerged using different methodological and analytical techniques to examine the presence and magnitude of the overlap (Jennings et al., 2012). These different studies, methodologies, and trajectories, are discussed below.

### **Wolfgang's Research**

Much of the victim-offender research stems from a study of homicide victims by Wolfgang (Wolfgang, 1958). Previous statistical studies on the subject of homicide were concerned either with victims or offenders, never with both. Wolfgang decided to study each of these groups, both as distinct and as interacting units (Wolfgang, 1958). He proposed that individuals who end up as victims often engage in some type of behavior that provokes or precipitates crime. In his sociological analysis of criminal homicide, Wolfgang used Philadelphia as a community case study. Wolfgang studied the files of the Homicide Squad of the Philadelphia Police Department to analyze criminal homicides



listed by the police between January 1, 1948, and December 31, 1952. He then made comparisons of the criminal homicides in Philadelphia to other research over homicides elsewhere. He focused on such problems as alcohol, motivation, temporal and spatial patterns.

His most significant contributions from this research involved victim-precipitated homicides. Wolfgang (1958) found that 150 (26%) of the 588 homicides studied were victim-precipitated (VP), which indicated that homicide occurred as a result of provocation by another crime perpetrated by the victim of the homicide. Other early studies examining the relationship between victims and offenders reported homicide victims as being more likely to have a record of criminal offending as well (Fagan et al., 1987; Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen and Brownfield, 1986; Wolfgang, 1958).

### **Homicide Studies**

A number of studies indicate a direct association between victimization and offending for assault, larceny, robbery, vandalism (Lauritsen and Quinet, 1995), violence, theft, drug use (Sampson and Lauritsen, 1990), and offender status in general (Mawby, 1979; Singer, 1981; Sparks et al., 1977). However, the majority of the contemporary literature on the victim-offender overlap indicates widespread support for the existence of this overlap in the most severe of criminal behaviors, homicide, where it appears to be the most pronounced (Brodiy et al., 2006; Chang et al., 2003; Dobrin, 2001; Fiegelman et al., 2000; Heyman and Smith, 2002; Jennings et al., 2010; Jennings et al., 2011; Maldonado-Molina et al., 2009; Maldonado-Molina et al., 2010; Reingle et al., 2011; Reingle et al., 2012; Silver, 2002; Silver et al., 2011; Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta, 1999).

In 2006, Broidy et al. conducted a study over homicide victims in New Mexico. The results indicated that 57% of offenders had prior arrests and 50% of homicide victims had a prior arrest. The researchers determined that homicide offenders and victims are more likely to have prior violent histories compared to individuals who do not have prior violent histories. This finding adds to the research literature that suggests previous violence more strongly predicts offending compared to victimization (Kuhlhom, 1990; Schreck et al., 2008).

Another study examining victim-offender overlap within homicide cases involves Dobrin's 2011 research study. Dobrin (2011) used a sample of homicide victims and matched these individuals with a general population sample of non-victims within the same county in Maryland. The victims and non-victims were matched in accordance to an individual's age, sex, and race factors. Data for this analysis came from different sources of information concerning residents of Prince George's (PG) County, Maryland (a suburban county bordering Washington, D.C.) from 1993. Dobrin (2011) used a case-control methodology to analyze the results and found support for the hypotheses that homicide victims are more criminal than non-victims and offending increases the risk of homicide victimization (Dobrin, 2011). Additionally, the results indicate that victims are between four and ten times more likely to have a previous arrest record for property and violent crimes, in addition to drug-related arrests, compared to non-victims. Dobrin (2001) reported that the risk for homicide offending increased from 1.4 to 5.6 times with each arrest.

This empirical relationship is found in two different case-control studies involved within the study. One involved a randomly selected control sample, while the other one

involved individuals being matched according to age, race, and gender of the cases assessed. These results remained after controlling for individual and neighborhood characteristics (Dobrin, 2011). Dobrin's analysis suggests that if an individual has previous offending experience then this same individual is at a higher risk of homicide victimization. Dobrin (2011) further noted that integrated theories, such as the lifestyle theory, can better explore the interrelated nature of offending and victimization.

Piquero et al. (2005) used data from a larger study on recidivism involving youths among a group of four cohorts of male California Youth Authority parolees during the 1980s to examine the victim-offender overlap in violent offending and homicide victimization. Data was gathered from 3,995 randomly sampled paroles between July 1, 1981 and June 30, 1982 and those parole between July 1, 1986 and June 30, 1987. Piquero et al. (2005) used a rare events logistic regression strategy to examine predictors of violent offending and homicide victimization. They found that low self-control was related to both violent offending and homicide victimization, which is consistent with Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory. Additionally, these researchers found that violent offending and homicide victimization might not only be produced by a confluence of decisions prompted by individual differences, but also by the social circumstances in which those with low self-control are embedded (Lynam et al., 2000). Such conditions might include, for example, disorganized neighborhoods marked by a "street code" or culture conducive to the use of physical force (Anderson, 1999; Piquero et al., 2005).

## **Additional Supporting Studies**

Consistent with historical work, some researchers suggest that an individual's demographic variables or delinquent lifestyle can be a predictor for the victim-offender overlap (Daday et al., 2005). In a study conducted by Jennings et al. (2010), researchers identified a considerable degree of overlap between victimization and offending trajectories. The researchers used data gained from the longitudinal portion of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) project for their study. The use of this data permitted an investigation of the covariation between offending and victimization that goes beyond cross-sectional data. This particular study used longitudinal data from Waves 2 through 6 where the researchers examined a specific cohort of individuals that were 12 years old in Wave 2 and 16 years old in Wave 6. By examining the same group of individuals, the researchers were able to obtain data from five different waves. Additionally, data collection took place within the following six sites: Philadelphia (PA), Portland (OR), Phoenix (AZ), Omaha (NE), Lincoln (NE), and Las Cruces (NM), which helped to capture large and mid-sized cities throughout the United States (Jennings et al., 2010). The total sample size for the study was 407 youths.

The analysis for this research study took place in five stages, which included:

- First stage- presentation of sample descriptive and bivariate correlations
- Second stage- identification of the trajectory solutions
- Third stage- two one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) models that were used to identify the various risk/protective factors to discriminate between trajectory groups
- Fourth stage- use of the risk/protective factors that were significantly associated with group membership derived from the ANOVA and post hoc test results. Additionally, two multinomial logistic regression models were used to determine which risk/protective factors significantly

distinguish the trajectory groups of offending and victimization in a multivariate context

- Fifth stage- a cross-tabulation of the results that helped to demonstrate the degree of overlap among trajectories of offending and trajectories of victimization (Jennings et al., 2010).

Several key findings emerged from this study. The trajectory analyses identified four distinct trajectory groups for delinquency and three trajectory groups for physical violence victimization. The multivariate results indicated that school commitment, parental monitoring, low self-control, and sex significantly distinguished trajectory group membership for both delinquency and victimization. Jennings et al. (2010) found that individuals who have greater school commitment have reduced chances of being assigned to a moderate- or high-rate delinquency trajectory and reduced chances of being assigned to a low- or high-rate victimization trajectory. Additionally, individuals with more parental monitoring were significantly less likely to be assigned to a high-rate delinquency or victimization trajectory (Jennings et al., 2010). Being female reduced the likelihood of being assigned to a low or moderate delinquency trajectory and an individual's gender also significantly distinguished victimization trajectories. Finally, low self-control was the most robust covariate for distinguishing all trajectory groups (Jennings et al., 2010).

The results from this study indicate that group assignment for one outcome was associated with group assignment for the other. For example, there was a greater concentration of individuals in the non-delinquent or low-rate delinquent trajectory compared to those in the non-victim trajectory. An assignment to a moderate- and high-rate delinquency trajectory was associated with assignment to either a low-rate victimization trajectory or a high-rate victimization trajectory, but specifically a high-rate

victimization trajectory (Jennings et al., 2010). Finally, the results from this study also bear relevance for several theories used to examine the victim-offender overlap, including social control theory and Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory. These results help to demonstrate that an overlap exists and similar risk factors, specifically low self-control, are associated with both outcomes. Jennings et al.'s findings are also consistent with Schreck et al.'s (2008) longitudinal study examining the role differentiation among victims and offenders (Jennings et al., 2010).

In 2008, Schreck et al. conducted a study to examine the predictors of the victim-offender overlap. These researchers employed two waves of the public-use version of the Add Health, which provides data on a variety of health and social issues. The data used for this study came from a nationally representative sample of adolescents, between grades 7 through 12, who attended school in the United States between 1994 through 1996 (Schreck et al., 2008). Each wave of data contained eight items concerning violent offending and violent victimization, which categorized the involvement of a respondent in violence as either a victim or an offender. Six items addressed violent offending, while three items addressed violent victimization. Additionally, Add Health applied several theories that were relevant to the examination of crime in health and social issues (Schreck et al., 2008). This particular study highlighted many measures that pertain to theories used to examine the victim-offender overlap. For example, several measures of risky lifestyle activities, such as time spent with friends, skipping school, sneaking out at night without parents' permission, and driving a car, were used within this study. Additionally, two measures derived from Hirschi's (1969) social control theory

(attachment to parents and commitment to school) were used as well within this study to examine the victim-offender overlap.

Schreck et al.'s study (2008) uses a new model of offense specialization developed by Osgood and Schreck (2007) as part of their statistical strategy. This particular method implements an item response theory (IRT) conception of measurement (Osgood et al., 2002) in a multilevel regression framework (Raudenbush et al., 2003). The multilevel regression model specifies a measurement model that defined two indices. The first of the two indices reflected combined risks to both offend and to be victimized, while the second reflected differential tendency toward either offender or victim roles. They found that meaningful variation is observed among members of the sample in a tendency towards either offending or victimization (Schreck et al., 2008). The researchers found that both victimization and offending characterize the experiences of most respondents who had encountered multiple incidents of violence, with a significant consistency in the roles individuals play in violent encounters. Additionally, the researchers found a significant consistency in the roles individuals play in violent encounters. Essentially, individuals who differentiate into violent offending, violent victimization, or both, are likely to continue to do so later (Schreck et al., 2008). They also found that as teenagers grow older (and are at the peak of their physical capabilities), they shift away from offending and tend to experience more victimization. These findings indicate that as older teens begin to age out of offending they remain exposed to motivated offenders as a function of their environment. From their research findings, Schreck et al. (2008) found support for the routine activities and lifestyle theories, as well as for the social control theory, to explain the victim-offender overlap.

Sampson and Lauritsen (1990) also found support for the victim-offender overlap using the routine activities and lifestyle theories. They suggested that a deviant lifestyle is responsible for the overlap between victims and offenders. These researchers used data from two national surveys of victimization in England and Wales that suggested offense activity (whether violent or minor deviance, such as drinking or drug use) directly increased the risk for personal victimization. Using this information, they identified situational and contextual variables that better predict both victimization and offending among individuals. These variables include:

- Being single,
- Spending nights out on the town,
- Lower levels of education,
- Younger age, and
- Being male (Sampson and Lauritsen, 1990).

Sampson and Lauritsen (1990) found support for their hypothesis that general deviance and violent offense activities may be considered a type of lifestyle that increases victimization risk. Additionally, these researchers found that the structural constraint of residential proximity to crime does indeed have an effect on victimization that is unmediated by lifestyle and individual-level demographic factors.

In 1991, Lauritsen et al. expanded upon the deviant lifestyle hypothesis using data from the National Youth Survey. These researchers used data from the first five waves of the National Youth Survey (1976-1980). The waves consisted of youths within the United States being interviewed about events and behaviors occurring within each



calendar year associated with each wave. Data was obtained over a wide range of variables and factors, which included:

- Demographic and socioeconomic status of respondents,
- Disruptive events in the home,
- Neighborhood problems,
- Youth aspirations and current successes,
- Normlessness,
- Labeling by parents, friends, and co-workers,
- Perceived disapproval,
- Attitudes towards deviance,
- Exposure and commitment to delinquent peers,
- Sex roles,
- Interpersonal violence,
- Attitudes toward sexual violence,
- Pressure for substance abuse by peers,
- Drug and alcohol use, and
- Victimization (Elliott, 1980).

Lauritsen et al.'s (1991) research fuses two key areas (victimization among juveniles and young adults and the connection between offending and victimization) together through the examination of the effects of delinquent lifestyles on the criminal victimization of teenagers and young adults. They found that adolescent involvement in delinquent lifestyles strongly increases the risk for both personal and property victimization. Additionally, the analysis revealed that a significant proportion of the risk

of victimization incurred by different demographic subgroups, especially males, results from greater involvement in lifestyles characterized by delinquency (Lauritsen et al., 1991). The researchers also found that participation in pro-social activities reduced the risk of criminal victimization and offending, while participation in a delinquent lifestyle increased the risk of victimization and offending for robbery, larceny, vandalism, and assault (Lauritsen et al., 1991).

Reingle et al. (2011) examined gender differences in order to further explore violence, specifically victimization of violence (Jennings et al., 2012). Their research was based on the idea that risk factors experienced early in the life course of an individual may affect exposure to violence initially, yet, over time, the cumulative exposure to violence and the shared commonalities in the risk factors between delinquency and exposure to violence may begin to take prominence. Reingle et al. (2011) used data derived from 1, 138 Puerto Rican youth who participated in the Boricua Youth Study (BYS) (Bird, Canino, et al., 2006a; Bird, Davies, et al., 2006b). The BYS is an epidemiological and longitudinal study of Puerto Rican children between the ages of 5 and 12 living in the Bronx, New York. Information was collected from three annual waves of data from the youth between summer 2000 and fall 2004 (Bird, Canino, et al., 2006a; Bird, Davies, et al., 2006b).

The findings showed that the predictors of violence exposure differed between the genders, and these disparities increased as youth age. When these adolescents were younger (such as in their early adolescence stage of life), higher sensation seeking, peer delinquency, cultural stress, negative school environment, and higher delinquency increased the exposure to violence among both males and females. As time went on and

the adolescents aged, the predictors of violence exposure increasingly diverged between gender groups. Sensation seeking, peer delinquency, and delinquency in general were baseline predictors for exposure to violence among both genders and, upon further examination, only delinquency was a baseline predictor for exposure to violence for both gender groups (Reingle et al., 2011). Thus, the researchers concluded that delinquency was a strong predictor of exposure to violence for both males and females. The association for delinquency was robust and observed over a course of time, which suggested that there was a link between the exposure to violence for both males and females. This also included personal victimization and involvement in offending.

Reingle et al. (2011) further suggested that the relationship observed between delinquency and exposure to violence observed over time (while the effect of a number of risk factors are not) is reflective of state dependence and population heterogeneity arguments (Nagin and Paternoster, 1991, 2001) as well as the victim-offender overlap (Broidy et al., 2006; Chen, 2009; Klevens et al., 2002; Loeber et al., 2005; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 2000; Schreck et al., 2008). Reingle et al. used a negative binomial regression methodology and found that factors such as familial, peer and contextual factors could not explain away the type of observation that took place within this particular study (Reingle et al., 2011).

Silver et al. (2011) also conducted a study to further examine the victim-offender overlap. The data for this particular study came from the MacArthur Foundation's *Violence Risk Assessment Study* (Monahan et al., 2001; Steadman et al., 1998). Between 1992 and 1995, the MacArthur Study sampled roughly 826 patients from three psychiatric hospitals. These three hospitals included: Worcester State Hospital (a state

psychiatric hospital) and the university of Massachusetts Medical Center (a university-based general hospital, both located in Worcester, MA); Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic; and Western Missouri Mental Health Center (a public mental health center located in Kansas City, MO) (Silver et al., 2011). Silver et al. (2011) used a bivariate probit model for their analysis and found that 13% ( $n = 107$ ) of the sample had committed a violent offense, 19% ( $n = 160$ ) had been a victim of a violent offense, and 5.6% ( $N = 47$ ) were involved in both a violent offense *and* a violent victimization. These findings indicate a significant association between the two outcomes (Chi-square = 47.454,  $p < .05$ , Phi = .239), as well as between the disturbances of the two outcomes. The researchers then did a series of bivariate probit estimations in their analysis where they included in a block fashion the domain-specific risk factors (Silver et al., 2011).

Silver et al. (2011) found that: (1) violent offending and violent victimization show substantial covariation; (2) several risk factors were similarly predictive of the covariation between violent offending and victimization; and (3) even after adjusting for demographic, clinical, and social risk factors, the correlation between violent offending and victimization remained robust. The results help to demonstrate that the relationship between violent offending and violent victimization was not accounted for by the shared risk factors. This is very important because it suggests that violence and victimization may be linked to one another directly through interactional processes such as provocation or retaliation, or chronic relationship conflict, rather than because they are rooted in common causes (Silver et al., 2011).

Maldonado-Molina et al., (2010) conducted a study to explore the joint, longitudinal overlap between offending and victimization among a sample of Puerto

Rican adolescents living in the Bronx, New York, and San Juan, Puerto Rico. These researchers used structural equation modeling to examine the victim-offender overlap, in addition to examining how this overlap varies over time (Maldonado-Molina et al., 2010). The reason these researchers used this particular methodology was to allow for victimization and offending behaviors to vary over time, while simultaneously evaluating the influence of multi-level risk factors on offending, victimization, and the overlap between the two. The results from this study indicated four key findings:

1. An overlap between offending and victimization persisted over time;
2. A considerable overlap in the number, type, direction, and magnitude of the effect of individual, familial, peer, and contextual factors on both offending and victimization exists;
3. Some of the factors related to offending were only relevant at baseline and not for the growth in offending, but that several factors were associated with the growth in victimization; and
4. Various risk factors could not explain much of the overlap between offending and victimization (Maldonado-Molina et al., 2010).

A number of studies have been conducted internationally to examine the victim-offender relationship, such as in the countries of Colombia, the Netherlands, and Canada. For example, in Bogota, Klevens et al. (2002) sampled 3,500 random individuals to be selected as representatives of the population. The researchers found that 38.6% of the population was victim only, 2.9% were offenders only, and 32.2% were both victims and offenders. Another example involves a study using data from the Netherlands Survey on Criminality and Law Enforcement found that offenders of violent and property crimes along with vandalism had higher chances of experiencing victimization compared to non-offenders who committed the same type of crime (Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta, 1999). The risk was greatest for those individuals who committed violent crimes. Following

violent crimes, the risk was greatest for those who committed vandalism and then for those who committed property crimes.

A final example of a study that was conducted internationally to examine the victim-offender overlap is the study conducted by Regoeczi (2000). This research study provides a conflicting interpretation of the presence of a victim-offender overlap group. This study was conducted in Canada using homicide data from the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1991-1995, involving young victims (ages 12-17). Out of the 114 victims killed, 67.4% did not have a previous criminal record. However, 13 victims had a record for a violent offense, 17 had a record for a property offense, and 4 had a drug conviction. The researchers concluded that these statistics did not provide support for the presence of a victim-offender overlap, although there were no analytical tests of significance provided.

The research studies discussed above help to highlight the different results and findings that support the existence of the victim-offender overlap. Specific examples of the victim-offender overlap and criminal behaviors are discussed below.

### **Existence of Overlap in Criminal Behaviors: Dating Violence**

Other criminal behaviors, besides homicide, support the existence of the victim-offender overlap. The criminal behavior of dating violence has found support for the existence of the victim-offender overlap. For example, a study conducted by Reingle et al. (2012) reported significant overlap between victims and perpetrators of dating violence in a nationally representative sample of young adults within the United States.

Out of the 30% of the sample who reported any exposure to dating violence, 11.9% reported both victimization and perpetration.

Another example includes Jennings et al.'s 2011 research study. This study used data obtained from a sample of 1,399 South Korean graduate students attending a Midwestern university within the United States to evaluate dating violence experiences and other related behaviors. The sample of students came from a medium to large sized city between May and June of 2007. These researchers used bivariate probit models to examine the victim-offender overlap by evaluating the predictors of joint occurrences of both psychological and physical dating violence perpetration and victimization (Jennings et al., 2011).

These researchers found that older individuals, and those in exclusive relationships, were more likely to be involved in both psychological violent offending and victimization. This suggests that the demographic correlates of psychological violent offending and victimization do overlap. This overlap is further confirmed by the fact that the disturbance parameter remained strong and significant when the demographic correlates were entered into the equation. Additionally, the results indicate that individuals who experience physical abuse during childhood are more likely to experience psychological dating violence victimization and offending as an adult (Jennings et al., 2011). Upon further analysis, the researchers found that the disturbance parameter remained very strong and significant, which suggests that even after controlling for the array of demographic, social learning, and self-control factors, there still exists a strong and significant correlation between psychological dating violence offending and victimization. Thus, Jennings et al. found a substantial overlap between

both physical and psychological victimization and perpetration within their research findings (Jennings et al., 2011).

Studies outside of the United States have also been conducted to examine the victim-offender overlap in relation to dating violence. For example, in New Zealand, Paterson et al. (2007) evaluated a group of new mothers past year's dating violence reports and uncovered that few mothers were perpetrators only or victims only. Specifically, 21% reported perpetrating minor violence (with only 2% being just perpetrators), 35% reported minor victimization (11% were victims only), 19% were victims of severe violence (1% were victims only), and 11% were perpetrators of severe violence (none were exclusively perpetrators).

### **Existence of Overlap among Specific Groups: Hispanics**

Specific groups of cultures tend to experience this overlap more when compared to other groups, even though the victim-offender overlap exists within general populations. The relationship between victimization and offending is very noticeable within the Hispanic culture, especially among those individuals who are living within the United States. A number of recent studies have identified Hispanics who become acculturated to the American lifestyle as being "at risk" for disease, disability, and death from a number of high-risk behaviors (Caetano and McGrath, 2005; Caetano et al., 2008; Caetano et al., 2000; Maldonado-Molina et al., 2011). Additionally, Hispanics living within the United States have a unique set of exposures, which include cultural stress, neighborhood disorganization, transiency, and poverty, that increase this group's chances for being both a victim and offender. Examples of studies evaluating the extent of the



victim-offender overlap using exclusively Hispanic populations involves Reingle et al.'s 2011 study and Maldonado-Molina et al.'s 2009 study.

In Reingle et al.'s 2011 study, researchers sampled Hispanics living within the United States and found that delinquency was a significant predictor for the exposure to violence steadily over time. These results indicated that individual delinquency had an association with victimization among Hispanics. Maldonado-Molina et al. (2010) used the Bronx Puerto Rican youth data to evaluate the extent of the longitudinal victim-offender overlap. These researchers found that the overlap exists and persists over time (from the time of an individual's childhood into adolescence). The largest group involved victims only (32-44% of the sample), followed by the non-victims and non-offenders group (31-36%), victims and offenders group (15-27%), and offenders only group (4-9%). Almost 5% of the sample included "chronic victim-offenders" who reported being both an offender and a victim at each of the three time points. The percentage of youth who were in the "victim-offender group" decreased over time, but those individuals within this group were at exceptionally high risk in terms of individual, familial, peer, and contextual risk factors (Maldonado-Molina et al., 2010).

## **Methodologies**

The most common methodological technique used to examine the victim-offender overlap involves simple bivariate examinations of prevalence, which includes the use of frequencies, correlations, cross-tabulations, Chi-squared tests, and tests of mean differences (Chang et al., 2003; Fiegleman et al., 2000; Jensen and Brownfield, 1986; Klevens et al., 2002; Kuhlhom, 1990; Mawby, 1979; Regoeczi, 2000; Savitz et al., 1977;

Wolfgang, 1958). This particular technique has proved successful in the examination of the extent of this overlap as several studies have employed bivariate methods. The use of these bivariate methods have produced results that indicate the use of regression methods helps to predict an individual's involvement as being both an offender and victim (Bryant et al., 2003; Fiegelman et al., 2000; Jensen and Brownfield, 1986; Maldonado-Molina et al., 2010).

Many studies will also use the regression methods approach to examine the presence of an overlap, which is what the researchers Reingle et al. (2011) did within their study. Additionally, on many occasions, researchers used standard logistic regression procedures to examine the victim-offender overlap to see if offending will predict victimization, and vice versa (Jennings et al., 2012). Other regression methods are useful to assess the victim-offender overlap. For example, multinomial regression methods are useful for individuals who want to examine more than two categories (e.g. victims only, offenders only, victims and offenders, and non-victims and non-offenders (Jennings et al., 2012). Several studies also have found this particular methodology useful in predicting group membership (Jennings et al., 2010; Maldonado-Molina et al., 2009; Reingle et al., 2012).

Aside from using traditional regression methods, other methods are beneficial in the examination of the victimization/offending relationship. For example, group-based trajectory modeling is useful in the evaluation of trends in victimization and offending over time. The results from these types of studies, as applied typically to crime, indicate that substantial heterogeneity exists in the shape and volume of offending over an individual's life-course. Additionally, results from these studies typically identify several

different groups (low-, medium-, and high-rates) that follow distinct age and crime trajectory profiles (Brame et al., 2001; Nagin and Tremblay, 2001; Nagin and Tremblay, 2005). Expanding upon the application of this particular type of trajectory methodology approach within victimization research, several studies have assessed the degree to which adolescents belong to both high-offending and high-victimization latent groups (Jennings et al., 2010; Maldonado-Molinda et al., 2009).

Some studies have found that the use of case-control methodological approaches useful in examining the victim-offender overlap because it involves the use of conditional logistic regression procedures to examine the overlap (Daday et al., 2005). However, only a small number of cases involve the use of case-control studies. As discussed earlier, Dobrin used the case-control methodological approach to examine the victim-offender overlap and had success through the use of this approach.

Bivariate probit models have also been successful in the examination of the victim-offender overlap. This model is useful when researchers want to examine the overlap, but standard regression techniques are not adequately designed to handle situations where the purpose of the research is to explain the co-occurrence of two jointly related dependent variables and their correlates. Researchers will use bivariate probit models in these situations because they are designed specifically to model separate binary outcomes jointly (Greene, 1997). The bivariate probit is a special case of the standard probit with two exceptions: (1) it accommodates more than one equation, and (2) it allows the disturbances from these two equations to be correlated with one another (Greene, 1997). Jennings et al. (2011) and Silver et al. (2011) found this particular

analytic strategy useful when evaluating the victim-offender overlap within their research studies.

Upon further examination, analytical methodologies are much more widespread within the literature evaluating the victim-offender overlap (Broidy et al., 2006; Heyman and Smith, 2002; Hiday et al., 2001; Mayhew and Elliott, 1990; Sampson and Laub, 1990; Silver, 2002; Singer, 1981; Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta, 1999). However, the immense majority of the literature uses victimization as a risk factor for delinquency (Chang et al., 2003; Dobrin, 2001; Fagan, Piper, and Cheng, 1987; Fiegelman et al., 2000; Heyman and Smith, 2002; Hiday et al., 2002; Maldonado-Molina et al., 2009; Mayhew and Elliot, 1990; Singer 1981), rather than the reciprocal or bidirectional relationship approach that some studies will use (Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen and Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen and Quinet, 1995; Lauritsen et al., 1991; Reingle et al., 2011; Sampson and Lauritsen, 1990; Savitz et al., 1977; Silver, 2002; Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta, 1999).

### **Literature Review Conclusion**

After roughly five decades of research, 37 key studies and results have added to the scientific literature to explain the victim-offender overlap. Not all 37 studies made it into this literature review, but the information gained from these studies is robust as 31 studies found considerable support for the overlap and six additional studies found mixed/limited support. Additionally, the evidence is remarkably consistent across historical, contemporary, cross-cultural, and international assessments of the victim-offender overlap and among a diversity of analytical and statistical techniques. The results from these studies find that the most reliable predictor of victimization is

offending. Additionally, numerous research studies conducted on self-report and official records of lethal and nonlethal violence using cross-sectional, in addition to longitudinal designs, have brought observations related to a strong correlation between both offending and victimization (DeLisi and Conis, 2012). Thus, this correlation known as the victim-offender overlap, helps explain why both victims and offenders are not two distinct, separate groups, but rather come from the same group.

The majority of the studies employed a hybrid approach that used bivariate methods to examine the presence of a relationship and regression methods to predict the offending and victimization overlap. However, other alternative methods are useful for research studies in examining this overlap, especially for those studies that allow for changes in violence and victimization over time (Jennings et al., 2010; Maldonado-Molina et al., 2009; Maldonado-Molina et al., 2010). These particular models are useful for a wide range of reasons, but the three main reasons these types of models are useful in examining the victim-offender overlap are as follows:

- These models allow for patterns of criminal behavior and victimization to vary as adolescents age
- They help with the identification of distinct trajectories of offending, victimization, and the victim-offender overlap
- The models assist in the assessment of how risk and/or protective factors distinguish between trajectories, which thereby reflects the emerging prominence of the life-course perspective for understanding the development over time

From the many studies conducted on the victim-offender overlap, it is clear that individuals who commit violence and individuals who suffer from violence share similar demographic and social profiles. The need to conduct further research on why this overlap occurs inspired the development of this study to begin making strides towards

better understanding the victim-offender overlap. To do this, it was important that the current researcher engaged with participants, female inmates from the Greene County Jail, who identified as both being victims and offenders. The researcher felt it was important to gain female's perspectives on how they identified as both victims and offenders as well as examine the characteristics of these females to gain a better understand of the victim-offender overlap. Previous research findings indicate that males are more likely to have characteristics of both victims and offenders, thus the researcher wanted to see if the current results were similar to results found from previous studies over characteristics shared between victims and offenders. This study began this much needed research by exploring the victim-offender overlap in regards to the following research questions:

- 1) Does the "victim-offender overlap" truly exist?
- 2) Why is there a "victim-offender overlap"?

In the following chapter, an outline of the methods used in the current research study will occur in greater detail, including its participants and instruments of inquiry.

## **CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design and Rationale**

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between crime victimization and offending, especially among those individuals who identify as both, as well as gain a better understanding on how this connection impacts policy development and program implementation. The employment of a qualitative methodology when examining individual and social interactions and/or the perceptions and experiences of others allows for data of greater depth and detail than does the quantitative interpretation and categorization of these experiences (Lindlof and Taylor, 2002; Miller and Tewksbury, 2006). Additionally, a qualitative design allows for inductive processes of discovery which are particularly appropriate for under studied populations (Leavy, 2009). As noted above, the research literature documents a significant overlap between victimization and offending. However, there is little study on the nature and extent of why this overlap exists, with even less research focusing on the perspective of the offenders who identify themselves as victims. Thus, the need to further explore this connection guided the development of this study to begin making strides towards better understanding the victim-offender overlap. A predominately qualitative approach was utilized in order to gain a more comprehensive, in-depth understanding of the factors and variables associated with the victim-offender overlap.

While this study was largely qualitative in design, it did include some quantitative elements. Questionnaires are useful alongside qualitative methods, such as focus groups and interviews, in order to provide the researcher with important demographic data

relevant to data analysis and interpretation, as well as a foundation from which to explore the study's focus in greater depth (Lindlof and Taylor, 2002). In light of this, the study utilized a blended methodological approach which incorporated an initial questionnaire component to retrieve demographic information followed by in-depth, face-to-face interviews. Each phase of the study included both qualitative and quantitative elements, which described below, will further explain the elements involved within the research study. The research design was submitted to, and approved by, an Institutional Review Board (Appendix A) and the Greene County Jail Director of Mental Health Services (Appendix B).

### **Participants and Setting**

The targeted population for this study was female offenders who identified as being both victims of crime and criminal offenders who resided at the Greene County Jail located in Springfield, Missouri. The participants were adults (eighteen years and older) and were recruited on a voluntary basis through an informational flier (Appendix C) describing the study. The choice to interview inmates from a diverse range of cultures, ages, educational background, and among other variables, was a deliberate attempt to capture the voices and experiences of as many female inmates as possible. Additionally, interviewing inmates from diverse backgrounds allows the researcher to explore differences in perceptions and experiences based upon the individual's life experiences as being both a victim and offender.

It is important to disclose that, the researcher in this study, did provide supervision and support for all the female participants involved in this research study as



part of my position as the main researcher at the facility central to the study. In addition, I did have my mentor, Dr. Aida Y. Hass, assist with the research study and accompany me in my visits to the Greene County Jail to provide professional guidance and assistance to the research study. An officer of the jail, Mr. Troy Ruch, escorted us to and from the location of the research study (the jail's chapel) for the majority of the visits.

The Director of Mental Health Services hung up the fliers (Appendix C) throughout the female pods and corridors several weeks prior to commencement of the study. Through the use of these informational fliers, female inmates were invited to attend a "Participation Opportunity". The administration of the survey instrument to the inmates occurred once a week on Thursday mornings between 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. The fliers provided the time of the research study, the location (the jail's chapel) and the beginning date of the study (Thursday, March 26, 2015). Additionally, information regarding the main focus of the research as well as other areas the research focuses on were included on the flier to give the participants an idea of why the study was being conducted. These other areas the research focuses on included on the flier are as follows:

- The connection that exists between criminal offending and criminal victimization
- The struggle with crime victimization and its effect on making criminal choices
- The inmate's perspective on the role of victimization in criminal offending
- The inmate's perspective and opinion on how researchers and policy administrators can address the overlap between victimization and offending within the criminal justice system

The fliers stated that the study would consist of in-depth, face-to-face interviews that would discuss these areas and provided encouragement for female inmates to

volunteer to participate. The goal was to obtain responses from 30 female inmates. At any given time, the Greene County Jail has 90 to 110 female inmates in custody. Over the course of two and a half months, 35 female inmates volunteered to participate. This resulted in an approximately 35% participation rate. The range of inmate participants in each session of the study was anywhere between 3 and 10 women. The sessions continued until the targeted number of participants was reached.

It is important to note that out of the 35 individuals who participated in the research study there were two individuals who participated in the study multiple times; one individual participated in the research study three times while the other individual participated in the research study twice. For the purpose of this study, the first questionnaire and interviews that these two individuals participated in were used for the data analysis portion of the research study, such as the participation rate. The additional questionnaires and interviews for these two individuals were used for comparison purposes to determine if their answers were similar against one another or if their answers varied for each questionnaire and interview. The results from this comparison are discussed in Chapter 5.

## **Questionnaire**

The in-depth qualitative interviews were conducted in a group setting consistent with the Greene County Jail standards, protocol and criteria for research studies. Data collection began on Thursday, March 26, 2015, with the first group of female inmates who came to participate in the research study. The in-depth, face-to-face interviews were held in the chapel located within the Greene County Jail. Mr. Ruch escorted the inmate

volunteers to the chapel where each interview session began with the participants being greeted individually, had their hands shaken at times, exchanged small talk, and were provided with a brief introduction of the researcher. After this meet and greet exchange, the researcher proceeded to explain the concept of the victim-offender overlap, theories associated with this overlap, how the inmate's answers to the question would remain confidential, why the researchers were conducting the study, what the researcher hoped to gain from their participation, how the participant's answers were beneficial for the success of the research, and how the study would be conducted for the hour the inmates would be there.

After this brief explanation occurred, a consent form, blank sheets of paper, pens, and a song book to write on were handed out to each participant. Participates were then asked to read and sign an informed consent form (Appendix D).

Upon reading and signing the informed consent, participants then filled out a questionnaire consisting of demographic and background related questions. The questionnaire (Appendix E), consisting of five questions, asked the participants to identify certain demographic characteristics, such as the individual's sex, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, and highest level of education completed. The questionnaire also included open-ended questions regarding the number of times the respondent committed any criminal offense within the past year and throughout the respondent's lifetime, in addition to the number of times the respondent experienced crime victimization within the past year and throughout the respondent's lifetime (Appendix E). These questions allowed for the participants to respond in an open manner without the constriction of having answers already provided.

After completing the demographic and background questionnaire, participants were guided through a series of open-ended questions that offered them the opportunity to reflect on the question, engage in a discussion, and record their thoughts and responses. This then began the guided interview portion of the study (Appendix F) where questions were asked pertaining to the participant's daily routine activities, socialization processes (i.e. individual, family, peer, neighborhood, community, etc. interactions), and individual characteristics about the participant. Questions were communicated to participants orally, and ample time was given for them to ask questions, reflect on their thoughts, discuss a particular subject, and record their responses on the provided blank sheets of paper (Appendix G). The participants had the opportunity to write as much or as little in response to a particular question on the blank sheets provided to them. This process encouraged dialog and discussion among the researchers and participants about the different perspectives and experiences regarding victimization, offending, and the elements that are common to both.

The guided interview questionnaire was created and designed to explore the common theoretical perspectives within the study of the relationship between victimization and offending. Questions were asked pertaining to the participant's daily routines and lifestyles, their experiences and quality of life growing up, their diverse interactions with family, peers, and society in general, individual attitudes about norms and values in society, and their experiences with certain types of activities such as using drugs and participating in a gang.

The original guided interview questionnaire consisted of a total of 43 questions, but one question ("What percent of people in your neighborhood or people you know

would you say are poor? Unemployed? Didn't finish high school?' under the 'Socialization Constructs' section) was thrown out in the beginning phase of the research study as the researcher realized the question closely resembled another question asked previously within the questionnaire. Another question ("How often do you go out drinking, partying, etc., without friends?" under the 'Routine Activities Constructs' section) was also later thrown out due to the misleading nature of the question.

After throwing these two questions, the final guided interview questionnaire used for each of the group interviews conducted throughout the research study consisted of a total of 41 questions. The 'Routine Activities Constructs' section consisted of 10 questions, the 'Socialization Constructs' section contained 19 questions, and the 'Individual Experiences/Trait Constructs' section consisted of 12 questions. Throughout the research study, the participants were always encouraged to ask questions if confusion occurred as a result of the wording of a question, and if participants needed a question repeated, wanted clarification on a particular question, or wanted to ensure that an answer would be counted as an appropriate answer.

## **Interviews**

Interviews were beneficial for the researcher to further explore the study's main themes of victimization, offending, and the victim-offender overlap. Interviews are a common qualitative approach when studying the perceptions and experiences of research participants (Lindlof and Taylor, 2002). Qualitative interviews are more structured and consistent in regards to the order the researchers ask the questions, the particular questions asked, and how the wording of the questions occurs. However, semi-structured

or unstructured interview guides can be beneficial for the researcher to have greater flexibility in terms of what questions to ask and how to phrase those questions (Lindlof and Taylor, 2012).

As mentioned above, one of the purposes of the study's questionnaire was to provide a foundation from which to explore the study's focus in greater depth and provide direction for the interviews. In other words, the use of an interview guide, which in this research study was the last part of the questionnaire that involved a guided interview questionnaire, allowed for a more in-depth, face-to-face interview process to occur. Additional questions asked by the participants within each interview session allowed for the researcher to better understand an interviewee and/or explore the response of an interviewee in greater depth. These additional questions occurred at random and depended on what the topic of discussion was at the time the question/discussion occurred.

### **Data Analysis**

Due to the blended nature of the study's design, the use of both qualitative and quantitative analyses was beneficial for the researcher. Quantitative data from the demographic section of the questionnaire went into an SPSS statistical software system and the creation of a codebook occurred to aid in the numerical translation and interpretation of the data. Frequencies were calculated to provide more accurate information concerning the demographic characteristics of the population utilized in the study, including, but not limited to, such qualities as race/ethnicity, sex, educational level,

and perceptions regarding victimization, offending, the victim-offender overlap, and the criminal justice system.

Qualitative data collected within the study included elements from demographic/background section of the questionnaire regarding participant's victimization and offending experiences, as well as all of the data from the interviews. Using the qualitative responses from the guided interview questionnaire, the creation of data sheets occurred for each qualitative question included within the questionnaire. The researcher then grouped the responses together by question so that all of the responses to each question were easy to compare and analyze.

Primary data analysis focused on the development of themes, patterns, and common elements within the responses surrounding theoretical traditions that help explain the overlap in victimization and offending. Theoretical traditions formed the foundation of the guided interview questionnaire with the questions being created over various theoretical constructs, such as *routine activity/lifestyle theories*, *socialization theories*, and *individual trait theories*. Information gathered from the data analysis was examined to determine if it indeed related to the theories used to explain the victim-offender overlap. Notes taken over recurring words, phrases, or concepts were useful to help explain the victim-offender overlap and compare these recurring items to these theoretical traditions that exist to explain the victim-offender overlap. The notes and comparisons regarding the questionnaire are discussed more thoroughly in the result section of this thesis, or Chapter 5. These notes and comparisons are useful for future researchers who wish to conduct research studies over victim-offender overlap by providing additional information on the subject.

The following chapter explains the results from analyzing the recurring words, phrases, and concepts taken from participant's responses within the questionnaire and the resulting common patterns, themes, experiences, and concepts that emerged from this analysis. The following chapter will also explain the results and their connection to theoretical traditions used to explain the existence of the victim-offender overlap.



## **CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS**

As mentioned above, the current problem associated with the victim-offender overlap involves the lack of studies on the nature and extent of why this overlap exists, with even less research focusing on the perspective of the offenders who identify themselves as victims. As a result, these two areas have not been adequately explored or presented within the existing literature. In light of this, many questions in this study were devoted to gaining a better understanding over the victim-offender overlap, in addition to gaining a better insight into the research participants themselves.

In this chapter, results pertaining to the study's two research questions are presented, as well as demographic data on the research participants. The following section details the data collected from the demographic/background portion of the questionnaire. Please note that, where the questionnaire respondents and interviewees have been quoted, spelling and grammatical errors have been retained so as to avoid interpretative bias on the part of the researcher.

### **Questionnaire: Demographic/Background Data**

Out of the 90 to 110 female inmates held in custody at the Greene County Jail who had the opportunity to participate in the current research, thirty-five, approximately 35%, volunteered to be participants in this study. As already mentioned, two of these female inmates participated in the study multiple times. Upon comparing the multiple responses for the questionnaires and interviews these two individuals participated in, the researcher noticed differences in responses for one participant, while the other participant

maintained similar responses across the border. Due to the inconsistency of responses associated with the first participant, the researcher threw out this participant's questionnaire and interview responses. The other participant's responses were included in the research. Thus, the final sample of volunteer participants in the study included 34 female offenders, which exceeded the target goal of obtaining 30 female volunteer participants for the research. This sample is roughly 34% of the total population of female inmates who reside at the Greene County Jail in Springfield, Missouri.

In the demographic/background section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to disclose certain characteristics about themselves such as their age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, and level of education. Under this same section, additional questions were asked about the number of times the participants had committed any criminal offense or experienced crime victimization within the past year, as well as their experiences as being a criminal and/or a victim over their lifetime.

Though one respondent's questionnaire was thrown out, there was a 97.1% ( $n = 34$ ) response rate of the total population of the participants who indicated their age. The age of the female participants who did respond ranged considerably with the highest percentage of respondents 32% ( $n = 11$ ) being between the ages of 20 and 25. The data collection over the participant's age shows that respondents were overwhelmingly young, with 64% ( $n = 21$ ) being under the age of 30, and only 14% ( $n = 13$ ) being above the age of 40. Table 1 displays a summary of the demographic data on the age of the questionnaire respondents, and provides both the number of respondents, as well as the percentages, within each range.

Table 1: Age of Questionnaire Respondents.

<i>Age (range)</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
20 to 25	11	32.4
26 to 30	10	29.4
31 to 35	5	14.7
36 to 40	3	8.8
41 to 45	2	5.9
46 to 50	0	0.0
51 to 55	3	8.8
Total	34	100

In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify their gender. They were specifically asked to indicate whether they identified as female or male. Again, one questionnaire was thrown out, which resulted in the total population of participants who indicated that they identified as being female at 100% ( $n = 34$ ). Even though the researcher's main target was females, it was important to include the male option for identification purposes so as not to discriminate against anyone and to provide the participants with another answer option if they felt it would better represent their individual gender identity.

The questionnaire also asked each respondent to indicate their race and/or ethnicity. Within the questionnaire, respondents were given a list of the following racial identities: *Native American or Alaskan Native*, *Asian*, *African American*, *African Nationals/Caribbean Islanders*, *Hispanic or Latino*, *Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders*, *White (Non-Hispanic/European American)*, *Multi-racial*, and *Other*. Respondents were

asked to indicate which racial identity they felt best described what they considered themselves to be, and were provided the ability to indicate ‘*Other*’ if any of the ethnic categories were not already specified within the questionnaire. The results indicated that participants were predominantly white within the sample population (76.5%,  $n = 26$ ). Table 2 provides a complete account of each racial identity indicated by the questionnaire respondents, including, once again, the total number of responses, as well as the percentages for the sample population, associated with each category.

Table 2: Race/Ethnicity of Questionnaire Respondents.

<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
African American	2	5.9
Hispanic or Latino	1	2.9
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders	2	5.9
White (Non-Hispanic/European American)	26	76.5
Multi-Racial	2	5.9
Other	1	2.9
Missing	0	0.0
Total	34	100.0

In addition to characteristics such as age, race/ethnicity, and gender, participants were asked to disclose other aspects of their identity such as marital status. Though one respondent, or 2.9% of the total population, chose not to indicate their marital status, the marital status of those who did respond indicated that the majority of the participants, or

47.1 % ( $n = 16$ ) were single. Table 3 displays the marital status among the questionnaire respondents.

Table 3: Marital Status of Questionnaire Respondents.

<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Married	8	23.5
Partnered	1	2.9
Single	16	47.1
Divorced	2	5.9
Widowed	2	5.9
Separated	4	11.8
Total	33	97.1
Missing	1	2.9
Total	34	100.0

Also important to our understanding of this sample population was knowledge obtain from participant's responses regarding their highest level of education. In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify their highest level of education from a selection of categories. These categories included: *some high school, high school diploma or GED/some trade/vocational training, some college, two year college degree, and a four year college degree*. The results from this sample population indicated that half of the participants, or 50% ( $n = 17$ ) had a high school diploma or less, while the other half of the participants, or 49.9% ( $n = 17$ ) had some college education. One-third of the sample population, or 32.4% ( $n = 11$ ) responded as having some high school

education. Table 4 provides a complete account of each educational level indicated by the questionnaire respondents, including the number of responses and the percentages for the sample population, associated with each category.

Table 4: Education Level of Questionnaire Respondents.

<i>Education Level</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Some High School	11	32.4
High School Diploma or GED/Some Trade/Vocational Training	6	17.6
Some College	15	44.1
Two-Year College Degree	1	2.9
Four-Year College Degree	1	2.9
Missing	0	0.0
Total	34	100.0

A Pearson bivariate correlation analysis test was run in order to see if there were any statistically significant correlations in the overall data between age, race/ethnicity, and level of education. The final results from this analysis concluded that there were no statistically significant correlations between any of the categories represented under the “Demographic/Background” section of the questionnaire.

The researcher compared the demographic data found from the current study to the demographic data found from the Bureau of Justice Statistics regarding characteristics of adult women residing within local jails. The researcher found similarities between characteristics regarding adult women offender’s marital status (single-never married)

and highest level of education (some high school education). When comparing the demographic characteristics regarding adult women offender's age and race/ethnicity, the researcher noted differences between the two groups. The current study found that majority of the participants were between the ages of 20 and 25 and were predominantly white. The Bureau of Justice Statistics found that majority of the participants were between the ages of 25 to 34, or 46%, and were predominantly African American, or 44% of the adult women population residing within local jails. This examination of characteristics of adult women offenders between the current research and the Bureau of Justice Statistics helps the researcher gain a better understanding of how demographic data obtained between the two compare to one another. Table 5 displays the characteristics and percentages of adult women residing in local jails and women who are on probation. Table 5 displays the characteristics of adult women residing in local jails and women who are on probation. The purpose for examining women who are residing within local jails, in addition to women who are on probation, allows the researcher to gain a more in-depth understanding of the characteristics of adult women correction populations who are under supervision within a community setting.

While general demographic data, such as that detailed above, was important to gaining a more clear profile of the female inmates who resided at the Greene County Jail in Springfield, Missouri, other information was also vital to increasing our understanding of this particular population. Under the "Demographic/Background" section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to share their own personal involvement with committing criminal acts and being victimized. In regards to their own criminal history, respondents were only asked to disclose the number of times they had committed any

Table 5: Characteristics of Adult Women on Probation and in Local Jails.

<i>Characteristics of Women</i>	<i>Probation</i>	<i>Local Jails</i>
Race/Hispanic Origin		
White	62.0	36.0
African American	27.0	44.0
Hispanic	10.0	15.0
Other	1.0	5.0
Age		
24 or younger	20.0	21.0
25 to 34	39.0	46.0
35 to 44	30.0	27.0
45 to 54	10.0	5.0
55 or older	1.0	1.0
Marital Status		
Married	26.0	15.0
Widowed	2.0	4.0
Separated	10.0	13.0
Divorced	20.0	20.0
Never Married	42.0	48.0
Education		
8th grade or less	5.0	12.0
Some high school	35.0	33.0
High school graduate/GED	39.0	39.0
Some college or more	21.0	16.0

*Note.* Adapted from “Bureau of Justice Statistics- Special Reports: Women Offenders,” by L. A. Greenfeld and T. L. Snell, 1999, *United States Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs*, pp. 1-14. Copyright 1999 by the United States Department of Justice.



criminal offense in the past year and total for their lifetime. Additionally, respondents were only asked to disclose the number of times they had experienced crime victimization in the past year and total for their lifetime. The researchers exclude specific examples of the types of criminal acts committed and types of crime victimization experienced by the respondents for one reason. The participants included in the study were presently incarcerated for various criminal acts. It was not clear whether they had prior convictions or had engaged in criminal behavior that did not result in a conviction. The researcher did not want to put the participants at risk for self-incrimination if they were to honestly disclose previously unknown and/or uncharged criminal acts.

With regard to committing crime, respondents were asked the number of times they committed any criminal offense in the past year. Of the 34 respondents, 16 answered as having committed a criminal offense in the past year less than nine times (47% response rate), six answered between 10 and 25 times (18% response rate), four answered more than 100 times (12% response rate), and eight answered other (24% response rate). Those that answered “other”, recorded written, non-numerical classification responses to this question compared to other participants’ responses that were written in a numerical manner. Some of these participants’ responses for “other” included:

- “Millions”
- “A lot”
- “Man, I got no clue, its all to help others”
- “Probably over 10,000”
- “More than I can count”

- Idk
- Too many
- “Roughly 6,635”

Respondents were then asked the total number of criminal offenses they had committed throughout their lifetime. Of the 34 responses to this question, nine answered that they had committed zero criminal acts throughout their lifetime (26% response rate), 22 answered less than nine (65% response rate), 10 answered more than 10 (29% response rate), and two answered otherwise (6% response rate). Again, as mentioned above, the “other” responses included participant’s responses that did not have a non-numerical classification to them. These two participant’s responses were “?” and “a lot”.

Participants in the study were also asked to disclose their experiences as victims of crime. Much like their criminal history, the majority of questionnaire respondents identified themselves as victims of crime. Of the 34 respondents’, two did not answer this question, which resulted in only 32 responses for this particular question. The overwhelming majority (94%) of respondents identified themselves as victims of crime. When asked the number of times they had experienced crime victimization in the past year, 25 answered less than five times (78% response rate) and seven answered more than 10 times (22% response rate).

Finally, participants were asked the total number of times they had experienced crime victimization throughout their lifetime. With regard to total number of times they had experienced crime victimization throughout their lifetime, of the 32 total responses, 26 respondents, or 82%, indicated that they had been victimized less than 50 times in their lifetime. Two respondents, or 6%, indicated that they had been victimized more

than 100 times throughout their lifetime, and four respondents, or 12%, answered “other”. One respondent who identified as being victimized more than 100 times throughout her lifetime indicated that she had been victimized a total of 7,300 or more times. Tables 6 and 7 displays participants’ responses regarding their experiences involving crime victimization and offending. A more in-depth look at the participants’ responses to questions asked regarding their experiences with criminal victimization and offending can be found in Appendix H and Appendix I, respectively.

### **Interview and Responses Questions**

The guided interview questionnaire was created and designed to explore the various theoretical constructs used to explain the victim-offender overlap. In order to explore these various constructs, questions examined a wide range of areas, such as:

- Participant’s involvement in activities outside of the home
- Appearance of their home(s) and neighborhood(s)
- Viewpoints on aggression and violence relating to how they respond to being threatened
- Who was head of the household
- Role of law enforcement within participants’ home(s) and/or neighborhood(s)
- Involvement in activities inside and outside of school
- Type of friends they associate themselves with (past and/or present)
- Attitudes towards various situations (living in the moment or preparing for the future)
- How the participant grew up
- Types of friends they have (past and/or present)

- Attitudes on various personal preferences
- Involvement with or use of mind altering items, such as alcohol and drugs
- Types of decisions made by the respondents while either using drugs and/or alcohol or as a result of having used the two together

Table 6: Offending Experiences of Questionnaire Respondents.

<i>Offending Experiences</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Past Year		
Less than nine times	16	47.0
Between 10 and 25 times	15	44.1
More than 100 Times	4	12.0
Other	8	24.0
Lifetime		
Zero criminal acts	9	26.0
Less than nine	22	65.0
More than 10	10	29.0
Other	2	6.0

These particular questions were asked of the respondents with the intention of gaining a more thorough understanding, insight, and sense of the women's experience with, and feelings about, the criminal justice system, such as their history as victims, offenders, and/or both, and various questions regarding their own personal habits, childhood/adulthood experiences, and the types of activities they have been involved with or currently are involved in.

Table 7: Victimization Experiences of Questionnaire Respondents.

<i>Offending Experiences</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Past Year		
Less than five times	25	78.0
More than 10 times	7	22.0
Lifetime		
Less than 50 times	26	82.0
More than 100 times	2	6.0
Other	4	12.0

Specific examples of the types of questions asked within the guided interview questionnaire as well as the condensed responses participants provided to these questions are presented below:

**Question #1: How much time do you spend away from your home?**

- Most of the time
- 8 to 24 hours
- < 7 hours
- Few hours within a week
- 3 times a week
- A lot
- Stay at home mom, spend all time at home
- Didn't like to be at home
- Did not spend time away from home/rarely left home
- Did not have a home

**Question #4: How often do you spend time away from the home each day doing other activities (walking, shopping, bar, club, hanging out with friends/neighbors)?**

- Sometimes

- Never, none
- 3 hours
- I walk constantly most of the time day and night
- 9 to 10 times a day
- 9 hrs at night- all day
- 0
- Almost every night (15 to 20 minutes per night)
- Every night
- All the time, a lot
- I don't
- Not very often if ever at all, rarely
- A few times
- Participant did not answer
- 15 minutes maybe a week
- If I walk at night, I do alone
- If walk at night walk alone
- I don't walk anywhere ever
- Anytime, I walk alone, I walk alone

**Question #7: Does your neighborhood have a watch? Security? Dog? Good lighting? Gates? Etc.?**

- My neighborhood is safe
- Yes
- NO NO NO, not really, no
- Every day/night
- Yes, it has security, but I never feel safe
- Neighborhood watch signs, but not affective to any knowledge
- No, my husband made me feel protected
- Yes and neighbors
- I have a husband and a pitbull
- I suppose
- The neighborhood has nothing
- My neighbor had Bobby's Diner in front-big light
- No security
- Security
- Yes-security doors
- Police car few times a week

**Question #8: How often do you come into contact with individuals you can identify as delinquent/criminal? (Peers, spouse/significant other, drug users, gang members, etc.)**

- Every day/all day, all 24/7, on a daily basis, all the time
- Almost everyone I know, so very often

- Constantly
- Once or twice a week
- Every day- 2 to 3 people
- 3 to 10 people daily
- Participant did not respond
- 2 times
- None/never
- Rarely

**Question #12: How often is/was violence used in your household to settle a conflict?**

- Every day/ all day
- A lot/sometimes, most often
- Never (in household)/no, none
- Never against them, for them
- Violence was around as a child. I don't think it was necessary
- Growing/always.....now/sometimes
- Growing up/somewhat now/most of the time
- Always
- 2 times a week
- Quite frequently (several times)
- 20%

**Question #23: How often would you say violence is used to establish a reputation, resolve a dispute or defend honor in your neighborhood?**

- Never (Never!), none
- Every day, all day, all the time (almost)
- Depends
- Quite frequently
- A lot
- I stick to myself
- Every other day
- 0
- Quiet neighbors. Don't want to know
- Very rarely, but growing up in Chicago it was quite often
- 75% of the time
- 2
- Rarely, not often
- Violence is not prevalent
- Don't know
- ?

**Question #27: What is your general attitude towards the criminal justice system?**

- Unfair-fuck the police-system is fucked.
- They suck (corrupt, unfair) (power over people)
- Negative
- Unfair at times, but necessary
- As long as you obey the law they are good
- Not equally fair, what they do for me they don't do 4 another
- Sometimes they are wrong, but at times I feel as if they help
- Not fair. Depends on who you are how you get treated
- It has its purpose, but its flawed
- Too money driven/hungry. Good for the most part
- I have respect for law enforcement
- It not trusting, they suck butt
- It's a joke
- I feel that they target certain people and type with criminal past
- I hate the criminal justice (we really don't have any justice) (HATE IT. It's a joke, not fair, its bullshit. Not trusting)
- They mess with people that they shouldn't and don't when they should
- Needs to be adjusted in Greene County Jail
- Fuck the police, the system is fucked. Us against them, fuck it

**Question #28: How important was education to you when you were growing up?**

- Very, very important (went to parochial schools until I got pregnant) (to my mother-I never really was interested in school-now things are different) (school meant a lot to me, my parents stressed school to me), extremely (important), important (I loved school)
- So, so
- I hated it. Its more important to me now than growing up
- Not very important, not at all, it wasn't
- Went cause I had to go
- Not so! Felt alone due to move to state custody
- Was essential
- Education was not very important until I realized how important it really was
- Kinda hard-until got little older then graduated
- Had to go to school every day

**Question #30: Did you engage in such activities as skipping school?**

- Yes (always) (sometimes) (a few times)
- Started skipping in high school
- 1x skipped school
- Skipping school. Sometimes.
- No, nope
- Rarely



- As long as I was passing and getting good grades in my class I might have skipped it
- All the time
- Absolutely!

**Question #32: What type of friends did/do you hang out with?**

- Hung out with cool people (“all walks of life”)
- All new people. They ain’t got no loyalty-the new ones, no morals or ethics. Its horrible.
- Only 1 I can trust
- Drugs and sex
- Bad kids (the ones in trouble and do drugs) (bad ones) (bad criminals), not good ones
- Straight, honest, good ones, bad ass people, drug dealer
- Positive people
- Mostly they are solid; but there are still a few that are questionable
- In jail/prison
- I know all kinds of people
- (druggies), but got criminals goodie friends too
- No friends growing up, and no friends now just my husband
- Always had a lot of friend- “preppy” past, “junky” present
- Preps, jocks-now just my husband
- Childhood friends- criminals, drug dealers, thieves runaways
- Don’t have many, mainly stayed to myself until college- then musicians, don’t have many- when I did they were bad boys
- I don’t know-different at times
- Only people I can’t trust
- Drug addicts and really good people that don’t do anything. Good and bad.
- At first my jock friend until I started using drugs
- Drug addicts, bums, low achievers, white trash

**Question #34: Are you a “risk taker”?**

- Yes (no fear) (daredevil) (adrenaline junkie) (its like a natural high) (only when needed) (all the time, it keeps life interesting) (try to change)
- No, not anymore (I am cautious)
- I love risk
- A lot of the time
- Sometimes
- Extremist!

**Question #37: Do you act on impulse or stop and think about what will happen?**

- Both, depends (a little of both)

- Impulse (used to act on impulse) (Sometimes I stop and think) (IMPULSE! All the time) (most of the time impulse) (but try to think about it)
- I think now- I used to be impulsive, think of what will happen
- Stop and think (both) (but usually think before I act)

**Question #39: How often do you use alcohol/drugs in a given week?**

- Every day (used to) (but not anymore) {(all day)} (every single day), every day- all day long, but in recovery-57 days clean, every day until I got locked up. I am choosing to stay sober, all day, every day- not including the last 3 years, daily. Several times a day- at least 3 to 5 drugs a day, I am an everyday user, every day- never drink
- Maybe once or twice
- Never, not often, never, but I did a year ago!, none, just prescribed, but not abusing
- I don't know
- 10-20 times a week
- 28, 28 times a weekly-meth
- Alcohol- 3 to 4 times a week
- 5 days- drink beer when I get home from work
- 1 drink 2 times a week-don't do drugs at all

**Question #41: Would you say that alcohol or drugs interfere with your daily life?**

- Use to
- Yes (always) (absolutely), yes, it did interfere badly, dah
- No
- Not any more
- When I was using drugs it affected everything, alcohol didn't
- I love getting high, it was my daily life- <3 drugs
- Yes, feel sometimes I do
- Prior to Dec. 2014, yes, have been clean for a bit
- Drinking-no drugs, no cuz I don't do them

The full version of the specific responses participants provided for the questions, as well as the condensed version of these responses, are in Appendix J and Appendix K, respectively. The condensed version of the participants' responses was created to group together the responses by question so that all of the responses to each question occurred in an easy comparative and analytical manner. This grouping together of questions and responses helped with the primary data analysis collection.

### **Questionnaire: Interview Data**

Data sheets were created using the qualitative responses from the guided in-depth interview questionnaire. Primary data analysis focused on the development of themes or common elements within the responses, surrounding the core theoretical constructs exploring an etiological basis for the overlap in victimization and offending. This analysis revealed a significant degree of similarity amongst respondents. Answers were grouped together to identify various themes, phrases, and concepts that emerged surrounding each question. Recurring words, phrases, and themes were noted and used to further develop shared meanings and symbolic expressions within the responses. The following sentiments, thoughts, patterns of behavior, and attitudes developed as common themes:

With regard to daily activities and lifestyles, the majority of participations:

- Spent a significant amount of time away from home daily and/or weekly
- Didn't eat at home, but rather ate outside of the home daily and/or weekly
- Spent the majority of time away from home each day doing other activities
- Never walked alone at night
- Would never leave doors unlocked, windows open, etc., unless they were at home
- Grew up in neighborhood(s) that did not have proper nor effective security measures in place
- Had constant contact with individuals who can be identified as delinquent/criminal
- Grew up with or knew a significant number of people who were poor, unemployed, and/or didn't finish high school

With regard to norms and values, respondents generally expressed that:

- Violence/aggression should never be allowed or tolerated unless it involves self-defense situations/purposes
- Physical force should never be used to accomplish a goal unless it involves self-defense situations
- Violence was used within their household to settle a conflict
- Physical combat should never be used to defend status of self/others unless it involves self-defense situations/purposes
- Violence/aggression should never be used as a way to retaliate unless it involves self-defense purposes/situations
- Violence should never be used to establish reputation unless it involves self-defense situations
- “Giving in” to someone or walking away from an argument is not a sign of weakness
- It is sometimes ok to respond physically/aggressively to being threatened

With regard to their experiences growing up in their neighborhoods, the majority of respondents:

- Came into contact with individuals who they identified as being delinquent/criminal on a daily and/or weekly basis
- Lived in current home less than five years
- Identified their mother, father, or grandparents as “head of household” for most of the time they were growing up
- Identified themselves, their husband, or a relative as the current head of their household
- Said that less than ten people lived with in their home
- Experienced the use of violence in their neighborhood(s) to establish a reputation, resolve a dispute or defend honor
- Perceived law enforcement as a negative presence in their neighborhoods both now and growing up

- Expressed a strong negative general attitude towards the criminal justice system
- Grew up in neighborhood(s) that did not have proper nor effective security measures in place

With regard to family, friends, and personal experiences, most respondents revealed that:

- Education was very important to them as they were growing up
- They participated in school activities such as sports, choir, band, and cheerleading
- They often skipped school
- Their parents sometimes did not know what they did, who they were with, or where they went
- They hung out with many different types of friends, including preps, jocks, criminals, drug-dealers, drug addicts, and low achievers

With regard to individual traits and characteristics, most respondents revealed that:

- They were risk takers
- They preferred excitement and adventure
- They wished to prepare for the future but often lived in the moment
- They often acted impulsively, then stopped to think what might happen afterward
- They often used alcohol/drugs at some point within any given week
- Alcohol/drugs influenced their choices when they were out with friends
- Very often, alcohol/drugs interfered with their daily lives

## Understanding the Results

When examining the demographic information, respondents who identified as experiencing victimization and also as being a criminal offender, are predominately single, White females with the highest percentage of respondents 32% ( $n = 11$ ) being between the ages of 20 and 25. Additionally, the results present the sample population as being divided on the highest level of education obtain by the participants. The results show that half of the sample population, or 50% ( $n = 17$ ) had a high school diploma or less, while the other half of the participants, or 49.9% ( $n = 17$ ) had some college education.

When examining the various responses obtained throughout the guided interview questionnaire, a significant degree of similarity among the respondents becomes apparent. Patterned responses emerged to form common sentiments, thoughts, behavior, and attitudes that reflected the daily activities, norms, values, experiences growing up, and interactions with family and friends. The stories told, and the sentiments expressed formed common themes, concepts, and phrases that appear to be consistent with certain theoretical traditions used to elaborate and understand the victim-offender overlap.

Patterned responses emerged to form a general lifestyle characterized by a significant amount of time that is spent away from the home and hanging out on the street with delinquent and/or criminal peers in an unsupervised manner. Staying at home, fixing meals, and spending time with family seemed to be rare, with some responding to the question “how much time do you spend away from your home” with responses such as “most of the time” and “8 to 24 hours”.

Moreover, when asked about their daily activities, who they saw, and who they spent most of their time with, respondents wittingly admitted that they came into a significant amount of contact with individuals that can be identified as delinquent or criminal, with some actually stating “every day/all day, on a daily basis”. Additionally, when asked about personal safety, this sample population revealed a general lack of safety within participant’s neighborhood(s). Reflections from participants were clear and concise; they collectively felt unsafe in their communities, as there was little or no measure taken for security or crime prevention purposes.

These emerging trends in responses provided a better understanding of the context of lifestyle choices that placed these individuals in positions for opportunities for, exposure to, and engagement in activities that increased their chances of both victimization and offending. This in turn seemed consistent with the routine activity theoretical explanation of variables such as unsupervised out of home recreation, unsafe residential communities, and contact with known offenders not only facilitate criminal events, but also expose individuals to become the victim of a crime. This theoretical framework offers a better understanding of the interactive dynamics of various situations that may have increased the likelihood of victimization and offending to occur among the participants.

Additionally, such routine activities as spending “most of the time” away from home and coming into contact with individuals who can be identified as delinquent/criminal “every day/all day, on a daily basis” places an individual in a position of being in contact with motivated offenders. As a result, their crime victimization risk abounds. This can also be said for individuals whose lifestyle includes criminal

involvement (coming into contact with delinquent/criminals). When this occurs, the individual is more likely to come into contact with diverse offending populations, which increases their risk for becoming a crime victim (Schreck et al., 2008). Thus, the more frequently an individual comes into contact with demographic groups of likely offenders, the greater the risk of experiencing victimization, thereby explaining the overlap in victimization and offending as a byproduct of routine activities and lifestyle choices.

Various themes, phrases, and concepts emerged that also seemed to reflect other common theoretical traditions used to understand the victim-offender overlap. With regard to expressed norms and values, participant responses clearly reflected an acceptance of violence as a means to settle and/or resolve certain situations. For example, in response to the questions “how often is/was violence used in your household to settle a conflict”, responses included “quite frequently”, “several times”, and “every day”. Moreover, respondents generally agreed that physical confrontation was an appropriate response to verbal and/or physical threats.

In addition, with regard to experiences growing up and in their current neighborhood(s), the predominant theme emerged that violence is a common method of establishing a reputation, resolving a dispute, or defending honor. Moreover, a persistent and prevailing theme emerged whereby law enforcement and criminal justice were perceived in a negative light, with some respondents describing police as “unfair” and “feel that they target certain people and types with criminal past”. As for the criminal justice system, the perception was, as told by one inmate, that the “system is fucked.”

An analysis of participant responses reflecting on their norms and values, and their experiences and interactions growing up in their homes and neighborhoods revealed



that sentiments reflected the shared norms and values that are consistent with the cultural acceptance of violence as a normative and patterned means of response, as well as a perceived rejection of law enforcement and values upholding the law and justice. In turn, these norms and values were expressed in a neighborhood context that further facilitated, supported and reinforced the acceptance of violent interactions, through minimal parental supervision, concentrated disadvantage, and residential instability.

Neighborhood-level mechanisms significantly influence the overlap in victimization and offending. Neighborhoods with a high percentage of female-headed households, greater structural density, and higher rates of residential mobility have higher rates of theft and violent victimization (Sampson, 1985). Moreover, these types of neighborhoods are likely to have very little social cohesion, which helps to explain why disadvantaged communities are less able to mobilize effective sources of informal social control to help maintain order, stability, and safety within their neighborhood(s). In addition to neighborhood context, subcultural theories of violence are useful in explaining the nature of the victim-offender overlap.

Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) propose that certain groups use violence to obtain respect, money and power, where legitimate avenues are denied or not available (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967). Within subcultures of violence, the use of force becomes a mechanism of survival, and individuals who attack and victimize place themselves at risk of retaliation from their victims, as norms embedded within a subculture of violence also validate retaliation as a means of gaining respect and honor (Anderson, 1999). Thus, retaliatory violence is a mediating mechanism where victimization will not only lead to offending, but to subsequent victimization as well. An

example of this subculture of violence involves the participant's response to the question "How often would you say violence is used to establish a reputation, resolve a dispute, or defend honor in your neighborhood? - every day, all day, all the time, 75% of time". Here, we can see how the use of force and/or violence becomes a mechanism of survival, in addition to gaining respect and honor for the individual(s).

With regard to personal interactions with family, friends and peers, respondents reflecting on their childhoods and leading up to their involvement with the law revealed a thematic response that indicated that somewhere along the path of socialization, they developed a pattern of behavior that took them along another route. The bewilderment on many of the participant's faces was quite apparent, as they began to reflect on when and how their lives took a turn, as many of them agreed that education was very important early on, and yet at some point they began to skip school "always" and "all of the time," and hang out with negative peers that were described by several as "bad asses", "white trash", "druggies", and "low achievers".

While it was unclear when and how these relationships were formed, an analysis of the overall findings suggests that respondents were exposed to these networks of associates through neighborhood interactions as well as being able to get away with certain behaviors due to parental lack of supervision, as some described they got away with things because their guardian(s) had no clue what they were doing or who they were hanging out with at the time. These dynamics reveal an understanding of the overlap in victimization and offending that are consistent with social process and social structure theoretical explanations whereby learning experiences place individuals in contact with

associates that increase their likelihood of involvement with criminal behavior as well as with crime victimization.

Finally, with regard to responses pertaining to individual traits and characteristics, respondents enthusiastically revealed a strong affinity towards risk taking behavior, with respondents describing themselves as “daredevil”, “adrenaline junkie” and “extremist”. Moreover, a common sentiment expressed was the desire to live an exciting and fast paced life that focused on living in the moment. With this sentiment also came a general lack of ability to predict or properly evaluate the outcome of one’s behavior as respondents expressed that they were quick to act on impulse “most of the time or all of the time”. In addition, in response to questions aimed at assessing their use of alcohol and drugs, and its effect on making choices, respondents indicated a general pattern of alcohol and drug use, with participants indicating alcohol/drug use “several times a day”, “every day”, “28 times a week”, and “10-20 times a week”, that significantly interfered with their lives and impaired their daily choices.

The analysis of participant responses assessing individual traits and alcohol/drug use emphasized the importance of understanding the overlap in victimization and offending from theoretical constructs examining self-control as a mediating variable. Participant responses provided a context within which environment and sociological aspects of crime and victimization are influenced by individual characteristics. These include individuals who are unable to delay gratification, are persistent risk-takers or thrill seekers (“no fear, being a daredevil and adrenaline junkie, and loving risk”), are impulsive and shortsighted, and have a low tolerance for frustration. Individuals with these individual traits and characteristics often engage in activities and interact in risky

social settings that place them at greater risk of participating in a criminal offense or becoming the victim of a crime. Additionally, the lack of self-control may explain why these individuals are more likely to engage in activities and interact in risky social settings, such as “skipping school and hanging out with bad ass people, druggies, low achievers, and white trash” that provide immediate gratification with little effort, which often puts themselves at a greater risk for criminal victimization. Moreover, low self-control contributes to the escalation of a violent situation as the failure to recognize long-term consequences of behavior may illicit a violent reaction in a conflict ridden situation. These dynamics are also clearly compounded by the intervening effects of persistent alcohol and drug use which can impair judgement in a conflict ridden situation.

Persistent alcohol and/or drug use among the participants can be seen in the results from the data analysis conducted on participant’s use of these items. The results conclude that participants often use alcohol and/or drugs at some point within any given week and that the use of these items influenced their choices when they were out with friends. Additionally, the results conclude that very often, the use of these items interfered with participant’s daily lives. Analyzing individual trait along with alcohol and/or drug use among victims and offenders helped the researcher determine whether these components indeed encompass characteristics related to the victim-offender overlap. The analysis indicated that these components do encompasses these characteristics related to this concept.

As discussed above, the primary data analysis focused on the development of themes or common elements within the responses, surrounding the core theoretical constructs exploring an etiological basis for the overlap in victimization and offending.

Responses were analyzed to determine their relationship to the various theoretical constructs used to explain the nature and origin of the victim-offender overlap. Constructs examined included routine activity and lifestyle, structural and social process factors, and individual traits/self-control. Upon analyzing the responses, various recurring words, phrases, and themes arose and were used to further develop shared meanings and symbolic expressions within the responses. After examining the numerous themes and common elements of respondents' answers, relationships to the various theoretical constructs used to explain the nature and origin of the victim-offender overlap became apparent.

Findings from studies exploring the connection between victimization and offending recognize that offenders are at an increased risk for criminal victimization and likewise, victims of crime share many socio-demographic and lifestyle parallels with criminal offenders. The findings from the current study also found that many socio-demographic and lifestyle dynamics are shared by both victims and offenders. Additionally, the results from the questionnaire found an overlap between characteristics representative of both victims and offenders among the sample population. This overlap can be seen by the various responses the participants provided regarding their experiences with criminal victimization and offending. The overlap characteristics representative between the two groups include:

- Falling within the age range of 24 to 26 year olds
- Being single
- Presence of cognitive distortions (low self-esteem, insecure, anxious, deceptive, and blaming)

- Usage of alcohol and drugs was prevalent prior or during crime offending and victimization
- Experience crime victimization and offending within city dwellings
- Experience with crime victimization by a friend or acquaintance
- Personal experience with crime victimization and offending regarding theft

The current results parallel findings from previous studies over shared characteristics between victims and offenders and the individuals who identify as both (Daday et al., 2005). These results help to demonstrate the existence of an overlap between the victim and offender groups. In addition, the current study and results highlight the importance of a theoretical understanding of the connection between crime victimization and criminal offending.

In the following chapter, we will examine the meaning and implications of the results outlined above and how they relate to the role the victim-offender overlap within the criminal justice system. Additionally, the following chapter will explore the limitations of this study, the direction of future research, and provide concluding remarks regarding the victim-offender overlap.

## **CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION**

As previously noted, the goal of the current study was to evaluate and assess the background, social characteristics, shared experiences, and common sentiments among inmates who identify as both victims and offenders, in the context of theoretical traditions used to explain the overlap in victimization and offending.

In this chapter, I will explore the meaning and implications of the results outlined in Chapter 5 and how they relate to the role the victim-offender overlap plays within the criminal justice system. This chapter will also identify the limitations of this study, provide direction for future research, and provide concluding remarks regarding the victim-offender overlap.

### **Role of Victim-Offender Overlap in Criminal Justice**

Criminal justice policies and practices have been built upon the ideological separation of crime victims and offenders into two distinct groups. Current programs and policies tend to focus their attention on addressing issues and providing services to individuals who are only an offender or for an individual who is a victim, but not for both at the same time. Thus, the importance in understanding the connection between crime victimization and criminal offending, as well as applying theories of victimization to offending, and vice versa, has significant policy implications with regard to the representation of both victims and offenders within the criminal justice system. Challenges exist for researchers and policy administrators to not only better understand the victim-offender overlap between victims and offenders, but to also find better ways to

address crime using information gained from the study of this concept. Drawing attention to the possibility that existing theoretical frameworks for explaining the underlying causes of offending might be equally useful for explaining the underlying causes of victimization may offer useful policy suggestions, programs, and initiatives for preventing crime victimization. By recognizing the etiological overlap in the origin of both, policymakers and researchers can combat crime and/or reduce the amount of risk an individual has at being victimized by providing programs and policies to address these areas in a comprehensive manner.

Currently, suggestions exist regarding that a new approach in the study of the etiology of crime victimization needs to occur, especially among women. Women are the fastest growing prison population within the United States (Tripodi, 2012). As a result, women prisoners are increasingly contributing to the societal and financial costs of incarceration and recidivism. Although research on women in prison is constantly emerging, very little is known about women prisoners compared to male prisoners (Tripodi, 2012). Women prisoners often have higher rates of mental health and substance use problem that relate to their trauma histories, which includes childhood victimization and childhood sexual victimization. These problems then contribute to adjustment problems in prison as well as in the community upon the prisoner's release. Thus, it is important to gain a better understanding of how previous victimization histories, as well as mental health and substance abuse problems, relate to recidivism. In gaining a better understanding on crime victimization among women, important implications for assessment, transitional planning, and reentry programming will emerge (Tripodi, 2012). For example, the development of women-specific prisoner reentry programming that



contains appropriate assessment and targeted interventions may help allow women prisoners to address their victimization symptoms and related mental health and/or substance abuse problems, among many others, before transitioning back to their communities (Tripodi, 2012).

Victimization warrants an increase in research, clinical, and administrative attention, especially inside prisons. Prison can be a breeding ground for traumatization and re-traumatization. Most people who go to prison have a legacy of victimization, which in turn increases their risk for drug and/or alcohol abuse, depression, low self-esteem, and criminality before experiencing incarceration (Goff et al., 2007; McClellan et al., 1997; Mullings et al., 2004). The experience of prison itself is likely to activate and exacerbate past trauma. The prison environment, such as the culture and climate, may itself trigger unwelcome memories of prior victimization and provoke symptoms, in addition to creating opportunities for (re)victimization (Wortley, 2002). Additionally, the ecology of prison environments may produce conditions that support or encourage victimization. The potential number of individuals liable to suffer harmful consequences as a result of victimization inside and outside of the prison setting can be expected to be large for several reasons, including the psychological impact of environmental conditions on individuals. Those individuals who are not directly victimized may well be witnesses to violence perpetrated within their environments. The research has found that even such passive activity is associated with emotional and behavioral effects that are similar to those found among direct victims of violence (Buka et al., 2001; Fitzpatrick and Boldizar, 1993; Kitzmann et al., 2003; Nofziger and Kurtz, 2005).

Preventing victimization requires a two-pronged approach (Wolff et al., 2009). It first requires a change in the environment in ways that will reduce the opportunities for victimization as well as eliminate the conditions that encourage predatory and traumatizing behavior. The second requires effective diagnosis and treatment of trauma among individuals (Wolff et al., 2009). Researchers have noted the failure of correctional facilities to take women's victimization experiences into consideration when examining their programming needs (Bloom et al., 2003; Edgar et al., 2003; Wortley, 2002). Victims of trauma tend to internalize their experiences and feelings differently with some of the most common responses including dissociation, affect dysregulation, chronic characterological changes, somatization, and hyperarousal (Harris and Fallot, 2001; Kluft, Bloom et al., 2000; Rosenberg et al., 2001; Sacks, 2004). Trauma-related psychological difficulties are amendable to intervention (Harris and Fallot, 2001). Some interventions most suitable for correctional settings include integrated treatment for comorbid conditions. These interventions are considered optimal, compared to parallel, sequential, or single treatment models (Harris and Fallot, 2001; Mueser et al., 2005).

Additionally, trauma-related difficulties are best treated in stages (Herman, 1992), with the first stage focusing on safety through recognition, education, and skill building, such as cognitive, behavioral, and interpersonal skills. Later stages of trauma recovery focus on processing the trauma directly after the person has achieve stable functioning trauma interventions must be sensitive of the individual's environment (Harris and Fallot, 2001). Trauma processing therapies, such as exposure therapy and cognitive restructuring therapy, while efficacious, require environments that are support (Bradley et al., 2005; Van Etten and Taylor, 1998). Thus, correctional settings are not the supportive

environments that these particular types of therapy should occur within, but rather these therapy treatments should occur before or after the individual is taken into a correctional setting.

Real value for the treatment dollar would require changing the type of environment an individual resides within to make it more humanizing, healthier, and habitable. This could keep with the long-term societal goals and expectations of public safety and rehabilitation. Ignoring the evidence, or doing nothing about the situation regarding the connection between victimization and violent perpetration, only leads to higher court costs, in addition to greater safety and health risks (Wolff et al., 2009). Current studies are being conducted on how to provide better prevention, intervention, and justice programming for women before, during, and after they are taken into and/or released from correctional settings.

Professionals who work with women (i.e. prosecutors, defense attorneys, probation officers, and parole officers and boards), as they enter or exit the justice system are becoming better informed of the type of women with whom they are assisting. For example, these members of the criminal justice community are becoming more fully informed on the perspective of women's past circumstances and future potentials. Instead of only concerning themselves with risk factors for crime, these professionals are now improving their knowledge concerning multiple victimizations and the cumulative impact of victimization over the life span. This type of change in professionals working with women and the criminal justice system has implications for rehabilitation and accountability, including rationale for recommendations during pre-trial services, sentencing, and developing conditions of release (DeHart, 2005). Additionally, these

professionals might benefit from reviewing reports regarding the needs for program design and inmate management strategies. This is especially useful regarding gender-specific program content, as well as helpful to program developers in estimating when various intervention techniques might prove most effective for women prisoners. As a result, reviewing such reports will help these professionals when it comes to examining classification systems for these women, in addition to the development of mental health treatment plans for offenders (DeHart, 2005).

Additionally, professionals working in services with youth can benefit from this knowledge as well. Women's retrospective accounts of their own experiences of coping as youth can inform interventions that are suited to varied life experiences and social contexts (DeHart, 2005). This information regarding the turning points in an individual's life may be useful in the development of targeted prevention programs, reduction of risks, and early interventions so that resources are available not only in a usable form, but as well for an appropriate time. Professionals benefiting from this information ranges from teachers and school administrators, to child welfare and social service workers, to youth counselors and juvenile justice personnel. Having a better understanding of the contexts of hope, despair, and motivation for girls and women will help to target interventions that will help to address victimization as it rests among compounding risk factors for crime, such as poverty and addiction (DeHart, 2005).

Policies and programs need to change in order to better address the needs and issues of individuals who experience victimization and offending, such as increasing programs that target victims of crime. One such program that targets victims of crime is trauma-based therapy, as mentioned above. Other programs and practices exist that have

proven beneficial for reducing rates of general recidivism as well as providing cognitive-behavioral and psychological treatment to treat those individuals who have experienced victimization. Such programs include:

- Motivation Interviewing for Substance Abuse
- “Seeking Safety” for Incarcerated Women
- Changing Course
- Reentry Initiative Programs, such as Boston Reentry Initiative (BRI) program (Corrections and reentry: Inmate programs and treatment, 2015).

By creating and implementing programs and policies to address aspects of victimization and offending simultaneously, individuals who have characteristics of both can receive the appropriate assistance and services they need in order to help prevent other offending and victimization situations from occurring (DeHart, 2005). This will in turn create a safer environment for family members and the community, in addition to redirecting resources elsewhere, such as away from filing police reports and apprehending offenders, to being redirected towards increasing and enhancing these programs and policies being offered. Thus, the existence of an overlap between offending and victimization suggests an overlap or parallel of services and interventions that can simultaneously target the causal variables of both offending and victimization. This would not only save money for departments of corrections, but would also ensure that there is not a gap in the services provided as well.

Additionally, by recognizing the commonalities in the onset of criminality and victimization, researchers and program administrators can address the needs of crime victims and offenders in a more focused, wrap-around approach. Addressing victimization and offending as unique problems rather than symptoms of similar

processes can be counterintuitive and create gaps in the provision of much needed services and interventions. Identifying the social processes underlying the victim-offender overlap along with determining what factors increase the likelihood for both victimization and offending will assist policy makers, program coordinators, and field officers in their decisions about allocating scarce prevention and treatment resources, as well as utilizing resources more efficiently. Further, because many of the same factors that predict offending also predict victimization, it may be possible to simultaneously reduce clients' risk for both. Such an understanding of the victim-offender overlap is imperative to the continued progression of the criminology and criminal justice field to improve policies, programs, and practices thereby strengthening individuals, families and communities as a whole. Identifying and understanding the relationship between victimization and offending is also vital to how individuals who experience criminal victimization and offending are treated. Thus, researchers and policy administrators can view the victim-offender overlap as a vehicle by which to strengthen not only an individual, but family and community connections as well.

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

While the documentation within the theoretical literature indicates there is indeed a victim-offender overlap, there still exists gaps within this literature regarding services provided to address the needs of those individuals who experience criminal victimization and offending, why the overlap exists, and what theoretical explanation is the most comprehensive in explaining this overlap. Thus, it is important to continue to study the victim-offender overlap to better understand why this overlap exists and how this overlap

impacts policy development and program implementation within the criminal justice system.

While the current study provides important insights for consideration, weaknesses within the study limit the understanding of this overlap in several ways. To begin, flaws in the design of the questionnaire and interview guide lead to weaknesses occurring within the study. While the current study serves to enhance our understanding of the victim-offender overlap, the study could have been improved if the questions had been asked in a clearer manner. For example, some questions came off as being “too vague” for the respondents and clarity on what the researcher was asking/meaning from a question had to be addressed. Also, the questionnaire could improve on the usage of some words to help obtain better answers from respondents. For example, the question “Were you ever involved in a gang?” comes off as a close-ended question. What needs to be changed to improve the clarity of this particular question is to either replace the word ‘involved’ altogether or include it with other terms such as ‘associated’ or ‘affiliated’. This will allow respondents to divulge more information about themselves and their experiences, which could then provide a better understanding of the connection of the victim-offender overlap in the context of that particular question. Additionally, the current study could be improved by asking respondents to describe their own understanding of the victim-offender overlap before explaining what the concept encompassed. This would help the researcher get a better understanding of what individuals think of these two groups, their overlap, and whether or not it truly exists. In turn, this information could help with incorporating better policies and programs to better explain the overall concept and the groups that complete it.

Additionally, the questionnaire should have provided a place for feedback regarding the participant's input on how the criminal justice system is doing, what needs to change, what is or is not working, etc. This would help researchers and policymakers get the hands-on feedback that is needed to make improvements within and outside the criminal justice system. Taking greater time and care to changing the questionnaire to make it easier for the respondent to understand what the researcher was asking, cleaning up the questions to make better sense of them, and providing space for the participant's to identify what they feel encompasses the victim-offender overlap, and what needs to change within the criminal justice system, would have benefited the current study.

Though the study of the victim-offender overlap is important to future research, research into the comparison of different victim-offender studies does require the inclusion of other participant perceptions, such as those belonging to victims and offenders. Many of the responses offered within the current study included assumptions about the thoughts, feelings, and experiences of those who identified as victims and offenders. It is therefore vitally important that we attempt to replicate elements of the current study with those of other groups. By comparing the answers from the current study to answers given in other studies, the researcher can get a better understanding of the types of questions that work, how responses vary among different groups of individuals, and the types of format that works best in obtaining answers over the victim-offender overlap (i.e. questionnaires, surveys, qualitative vs. quantitative).

As mentioned previously, the current study aims to get a better understanding of the victim-offender overlap through the use of a qualitative in-depth analytical approach that captures the shared experiences of females who identified as being a victim and



offender. The current study sets an important precedent in regards to the victim-offender overlap research that moves beyond process evaluation and rationale into exploratory research committed to better understanding what exactly encompasses the victim-offender overlap. It is research of this type that will empower us to develop much needed standards of practice that address the gap in services to individuals who are both victims of crime and criminal offenders. Continued research is necessary in order to establish a better understanding of the etiological basis of the victim-offender overlap in order for this concept to continue growing and expanding into new institutions, departments, agencies, and contexts.

### **Concluding Remarks**

In closing, despite important gains in understanding the overlap between victimization and offending, important areas of research remain undeveloped. The etiological processes regarding the connection between victimization and offending, and the social context that determines how the two are reciprocally related continues to be illusive. While no single or unified theory exists to fully explain the overlap in victimization and offending, researchers continue to explore a theoretical understanding of the various interactions, common experiences, and dynamic variables associated with both victimization and offending. The current study was an exploration of the articulated experiences of the respondents through their own words, which allowed for the documentation of participant's struggles, worries, and thoughts in an in-depth and insightful manner. Encouraging a safe discussion in which participants could say whatever they wanted without repercussion, sharing their emotions and personal feelings

allowed the gathering of information that could only be solicited through the rich detail of open-ended dialogue (Krueger and Casey, 2000). Gaining insight and not making predictions were the main goals. This allowed for the set-up of guided in-depth interviews in a group setting helped the researcher get as close to the participants as possible, in an effort to understand their views and create a portrait of the patterns, themes, and experiences they communicated that reflected their experiences as both criminal offenders and crime victims.

Additionally, the study was designed to be an inductive exploration that informs a theoretical understanding of the overlap in victimization and offending and its role within the criminal justice field, by individuals who identify as being both victims and offenders. As a result, the participant's responses were consistent with certain theoretical constructs and traditions, such as the routine activities and lifestyle theories, structural and social process theories/factors, and individual traits/self-control theories, used to understand the nature and extent of the victim-offender overlap. Additionally, these theories and the results found from the current study help to provide additional explanation as to why this relationship does exist and occur between the two groups.

This study began by exploring the theoretical framing of Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), Schreck (1999), and Schreck et al. (2008), in addition to exploring the much needed research over better understanding the victim-offender overlap by exploring the overlap in regards to the following research questions:

- 1) Does the "victim-offender overlap" truly exist?
- 2) Why is there a "victim-offender overlap"?

The research questions from this study were not only answered, but the goals of the research study, such as elaborating on their personal backgrounds and examining their shared sentiments and common understandings, to gain a better understanding of the theoretical grounding of the victims-offender overlap were achieved as well. This is particularly imperative in light of a significant deficit in the research literature with regard to the study of victimization and offending amongst women.

This research study will contribute to the criminal justice field by providing a unique and informative perspective on the nature of the victim-offender overlap that not only provides a better understanding of this concept, but also shows the need to create better policies, programs, resources, and education directives that address the needs and concerns of individuals who identify as both victims and offenders in a more comprehensive manner.

The current research is important in adding to the scientific literature that exists on the victim-offender overlap. It helped gain a first hand, in-depth understanding of the connection that exists between criminal offending and criminal victimization by providing a unique and informative perspective on the nature of this overlap. The insights and perceptions gained from respondents represents an innovative approach that lead to new questions and ways of looking at the victim-offender overlap. While it is important that we continue to explore the victim-offender overlap and its role within the criminal justice system, we must also look at the role it plays on the personal and life choices of individuals who identify as being both victims and offenders themselves. It is through their perspectives and feedback that we will be able to fully understand what needs to be changed inside and outside of the criminal justice system so that these

individuals can begin to get their needs and concerns addressed, through the intervention of support groups, programs, policies, and among many other alternatives, that can help address the etiological roots of victimization and offending. We must begin to see the victim-offender overlap in a new way. We must view this overlap not as an end, as justice is an end, but as a means to a greater end, the opportunity to build and transform these individuals and our communities by understanding this relationship and how it affects everyone and not just those individuals who have hands on experience with both victimization and offending.

## REFERENCES

- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, 30, 47-88.
- Agnew, R. (2002). Experienced, vicarious, and anticipated strain: An exploratory study on physical victimization and delinquency. *Justice Quarterly*, 19(4), 603-632.
- Akers, R. L. (1985). *Deviant behavior: A social learning approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Averdijk, M. (2011). Reciprocal effects of victimization and routine activities. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 27, 125-149.
- Barnes, J., and Beaver, K. M. (2012). Extending Research on the Victim-Offender Overlap: Evidence from a Genetically Informative Analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27, 3299-3321. Doi: 10.1177/0886260512441259
- Baron, S. W., Forde, D. R., and May, F. M. (2007). Self-control, risky lifestyles, and situation: The role of opportunity and context in the general theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 119-136.
- Berg, M. T., and Loeber, R. (2011). Examining the neighborhood context of the violent offending-victimization relationship: A prospective investigation. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 27, 427-451.
- Bird, H. R., Canino, G. J. Davies, M., Duarte, C. S., Febo, V., Ramirez, R., ... Loeber, R. (2006a). A study of disruptive behavior disorders in Puerto Rican youth: I. Background, design, and survey methods. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 45, 1032-1040.
- Bird, H. R., Davies, M., Duarte, C. S., Shen, S., Loeber, R., and Canino, G.J. (2006b). A study of disruptive behavior disorders in Puerto Rican youth: II. Baseline prevalence, comorbidity, and correlates in two sites. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 45, 1042-1053.
- Bloom, B., Owen, B., and Covington, S. (2003). Gender-responsive strategies: Research, practice, and guiding principles for women offenders. *U.S. Department of Justice*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

- Brame, B., Nagin, D. S., and Tremblay, R. E. (2001). Developmental trajectories of physical aggression from school entry to late adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 42, 503-512.
- Brezina, T., Agnew, R., Cullen, F. T., and Wright, J. P. (2004). The code of the street: A quantitative assessment of Elijah Anderson's subculture of violence thesis and its contribution to youth violence research. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 2, 303-328.
- Broidy, L. M., Daday, J. K., Crandall, C. S., Sklar, D. P., and Jost, P. F. (2006). Exploring demographic, structural, and behavioral overlap among homicide offenders and victims. *Homicide Studies*, 10, 155-180.
- Buka, S. L., Stichick, T. L., Birdthistle, I., and Earls, F. J. (2001). Youth exposure to violence: Prevalence, risks and consequences. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 71, 298-310.
- Bryant, A. L., Schulenberg, J. E., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., and Johnston, L. D. (2003). How academic achievement, attitudes, and behaviors relate to the course of substance use during adolescence: A 6-year, multi-wave national longitudinal study. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13, 361-397.
- Caetano, R., and McGrath, C. (2005). Driving under the influence (DUI) among US ethnic groups. *Accidents Analysis and Prevention*, 37, 217-224.
- Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., and Rodriguez, L.A. (2008). The Hispanic American Baseline Alcohol Survey (HABLAS): DUI rates, birthplace, and acculturation across Hispanic national groups. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 69, 259-265.
- Caetano, R., Schafer, J., Clark, C. L., Cunradi, C. B., and Raspberry, K. (2000). Intimate partner violence, acculturation, and alcohol consumption among Hispanic couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 30-45.
- Chang, J. J., Chen, J. J., and Brownson, R. C. (2003). The role of repeat victimization in adolescent delinquent behaviors and recidivism. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 32, 272-280.
- Chen, X. (2009). The link between juvenile offending and victimization: the influence of risky lifestyles, social bonding, and individual characteristics. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7, 119-135.
- Cohen, L. E., and Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 505-524.
- Cohen, L. E., Kluegel, J. R., and Land, K. C. (1981). Social inequality and predatory criminal victimization: An exposition and test of a formal theory. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 505-524.

- Cornish, D. B., and Clarke, R.V. (Eds.). (2014). *The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspectives on offending* (pp. 1-50). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Corrections and reentry: Inmate programs and treatment. (2015). *National Institute of Justice: Office of Justice Programs*.
- Criminal Offender [Education] Law and Legal Definition. (2015). *USLEGAL Definitions*. Retrieved from <http://definitions.uslegal.com/c/criminal-offender-education/>
- Daday, J. K., Broidy, L. M., Crandall, C. S., and Sklar, D. P. (2005). Individual, neighborhood, and situational factors associated with violent victimization and offending. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 18, 215-235.
- Daigle, L. E. (2012). *Victimology: A text/reader* (pp. 1-35). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- DeHart, D. D. (2005). Pathways to prison: Impact of victimization in the lives of incarcerated women. *United States Department of Justice*, 1-94.
- DeLisi, M., and Conis, P. J. (Eds.). (2012). *Violent offenders: Theory, research, policy, and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 17-38). Burlington, MA: Jones and Bartlett Learning.
- Dobrin, A. (2001). The risk of offending on homicide victimization: A case control study. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38, 154-173.
- Edgar, K., O'Donnell, I., and Martin, C. (2003). *Prison violence: The dynamics of conflict, fear, and power*. Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Elliott, D. (2008). *National Youth Survey [United States]: Wave V, 1980*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Fagan, J., Piper, E. S., and Cheng, Y. (1987). Contributions of victimization to delinquency in inner cities. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 78(3), 586-613.
- Fiegelman, S., Howard, D. E., Xiaoming, L., and Cross, S. I. (2000). Psychosocial and environmental correlates of violence perpetration among African-American urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 27, 202-209.
- Finkelhor, D., and Asdigian, N. L. (1996). Risk factors for youth victimization: Beyond a lifestyle/routine activities theory approach. *Violence and Victims*, 11, 3-19.
- Fitzpatrick, K. M., and Boldizar, J. P. (1993). The prevalence and consequences of exposure to violence among African-American youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 32, 424-430.

- Forde, D. R. and Kennedy, L. W. (1997). Risky lifestyles, routine activities, and the general theory of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 14, 265-294.
- Goff, A., Rose, E., Rose, S., and Purves, D. (2007). Does PTSD occur in sentenced prison populations? A systematic literature review. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 17, 152-162.
- Gottfredson, M. R. (1981). On the etiology of criminal victimization. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 72, 714-726.
- Gottfredson, M. R. (1984). *Victims of Crime: Dimensions of Risk*. Home Office Research Study, London, U.K.: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Gottfredson, M. R. (1986). Substantive contributions of victimization surveys. *Crime and Justice: An annual review of research*, 7, 251-287.
- Gottfredson, M. R., and Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Grasmick, H. G., Tittle, C. R., Bursik, R. J., and Arneklev, B. J. (1993). Testing the core empirical implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30, 5-29.
- Greene, W. (1997). *Econometric analysis* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Greenfeld, L. A., and Snell, T. L. (1999). Bureau of Justice Statistics- Special Reports: Women Offenders. *United States Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs*, 1-14.
- Harris, M., and Fallot, R. D. (2001). Designing trauma-informed addictions services. *New Directions in Mental Health Services*, 89, 57-73.
- Hay, C., and Evans, M. M. 2006. Violent victimization and involvement in delinquency: Examining predictions from general strain theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 261-274.
- Heyman, R. E., and Smith, A. M. (2002). Do child abuse and interpersonal violence lead to adulthood family violence? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 684-870.
- Hiday, V. A., Swanson, J. W., Swartz, M. S., Borum, R., and Wagner, H. R. (2001). Victimization: A link between mental illness and violence? *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 24, 559-572.
- Hindelang, M. J. (1976). *Criminal victimization in eight American cities: A descriptive analysis of common theft and assault*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.



- Hindelang, M. J. (1981). Variations in sex race age specific incidence rates of offending. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 461-474.
- 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.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Holtfreter, K., Reisig, M. D., and Pratt, T. C. (2008). Low self-control, routine activities, and fraud victimization. *Criminology*, 46, 189-220.
- Holtfreter, K., Reising, M. D., Piquero, N. L., and Piquero, A. R. (2010). Low self-control and fraud: Offending, victimization, and their overlap. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 188-203.
- Jennings, W. G., Higgins, G. E., Tewksbury, R., Gover, A. R., and Piquero, A. R. (2010). A longitudinal assessment of the victim-offender overlap. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 2147-2174.
- Jennings, W. G., Park, M., Tomsich, E., Gover, A., and Akers, R. L. (2011). Assessing the overlap in dating violence perpetration and victimization among South Korean college students: The influence of social learning and self-control. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36, 188-206.
- Jennings, W. G., Piquero, A. R., and Reingle, J. M. (2012). On the overlap between victimization and offending: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17, 16-26.
- Jenson, G. F., and Brownfield, D. (1986). Gender, lifestyles, and victimization: Beyond routine activity. *Violence and Victims*, 1(2), 85-99.
- Karmen, A. (2013). *Crime victims: An introduction to victimology* (8th ed., pp. 1-94). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Kitzmann, K. M., Gaylord, N. K., Holt, A. R., and Kenny, E. D. (2003). Child witnesses to domestic violence: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 339-352.
- Klevens, J., Duque, L. F., and Ramirez, C. (2002). The victim-offender overlap and routine activities: Results from a cross-sectional study in Bogota, Columbia. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(2), 206-216.
- Kluft, R. P., Bloom, S. L., and Kinzie, J. D. (2000). Treating traumatized patients and victims of violence. *New Directions in Mental Health Service*, 86, 79-102.

- Krueger, R. A., and Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuhlhom, E. (1990). Victims and offenders of criminal violence. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 6, 51-59.
- Lauritsen, J. L., and Laub, J. H. (2007). Understanding the link between victimization and offending: New reflections on an old idea. *Surveying Crime in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Lauritsen, J. L., and Davis-Quinet, K. (1995). Patterns of repeat victimization among adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11, 143-166.
- 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.
- Leavy, P. (2009). *Method meets art: Art-based research practice*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Lindlof, T. R., and Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Loeber, R., Pardini, D., Homish, L., Wei, E., Crawford, A., Farrington, D. P., et al. (2005). The prediction of violence and homicide in young men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 1074-1088.
- Lynam, D. R., Caspi, A., Moffit, T. E., Wikstrom, P. O. H., Loeber, R., and Novak, S. (2000). The interaction between impulsivity and neighborhood context on offending: The effects of impulsivity are stronger in poorer neighborhoods. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 109, 563-574.
- Maldonado-Molina, M. M., Jennings, W. G., Tobler, A. L., Piquero, A. R., and Canino, G. (2010). Assessing victim-offender overlap among Hispanic youth. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 1191-1201.
- Maldonado-Molina, M. M., Piquero, A. R., Jennings, W. G., Bird, H. R., and Canino, G. J. (2009). Trajectories of delinquent behaviors among Puerto Rican children and adolescents at two sites. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 49, 144-181.
- Maldonado-Molina, M. M., Reingle, J. M., Jennings, W. G., and Prado, W. (2011). Drinking and driving among immigrant and US-born Hispanic young adults: Results from a longitudinal and nationally representative study. *Addictive Behaviors*, 36, 381-388.

- Manasse, M. E., and Ganem, N. M. (2009). Victimization as a cause of delinquency: The role of depression and gender. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 371-378.
- Maschi, T., Bradley, C. A., and Morgen, K. (2008). Unraveling the link between trauma and delinquency: The mediating role of negative affect and delinquent peer exposure. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 6, 136-157.
- Mawby, R. I. (1979). The victimization of juveniles: A comparative study of three areas of publicly owned housing in Sheffield. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 16, 98-113.
- Maxfield, M. (1987). Lifestyle and routine activity theories of crime: Empirical studies of victimization, delinquency, and offender decision-making. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 3, 275-282.
- Mayhew, P., and Elliott, D. (1990). Self-reported offending, victimization, and the British Crime Survey. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 83-96.
- McClellan, D. S., Farabee, D., and Crouch, B. M. (1997). Early victimization, drug use, and criminality: A comparison of male and female prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24, 455-467.
- Megargee, E. I. (1982). Psychological determinants and correlates of criminal violence. *Criminal Violence* (pp. 81-168). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- 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.
- Miller, J. M., and Tewksbury, R. (2006). *Research methods: A qualitative reader*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Monahan, J., Steadman, H., Silver, E., Appelbaum, P., Robbins, P., Mulvey, E. P., and Banks, S. (2001). Rethinking risk assessment: The MacArthur Study of Mental Disorder and Violence. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mueser, K. T., Drake, R.E., Sigmon, S.C., and Brunette, M.F. (2005). Psychosocial interventions for adults with severe mental illnesses and co-occurring substance use disorders: A review of specific interventions. *Journal of Dual Disorders*, 1, 57-82.
- Muftić, L. R., Finn, M. A., and Marsh, E. (2012). The victim-offender overlap, intimate partner violence, and sex: Assessing differences among exclusive victims, exclusive offenders, and victim-offenders. *Crime and Delinquency*. Doi: 10.1177/0011128712453677

- Mullings, J. L., Hartley, D. J., and Marquart, J.W. (2004). Exploring the relationship between alcohol use, childhood maltreatment, and treatment needs among female prisoners. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 39, 277–305.
- Mustaine, E. E., and Tewksbury, R. (2000). Comparing the lifestyles of victims, offenders, and victim-offenders: A routine activity theory assessment of similarities and differences for criminal incident participants. *Sociological Focus*, 33, 339-362.
- Nagin, D. S., and Tremblay, R. E. (2001). Analyzing developmental trajectories of distinct but related behaviors: A group-based method. *Psychological Methods*, 6, 18-34.
- Nagin, D. S., and Tremblay, R. E. (2005). Developmental trajectory groups: Fact or a useful statistical fiction? *Criminology*, 43, 873-904.
- Nofziger, S., and Kurtz, D. (2005). Violent lives: A lifestyle model linking exposure to violence to juvenile violent offending. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42, 3–26.
- Osgood, D. W., and Schreck, C. J. (2007). A new method for studying the extent, stability, and predictors of individual specialization in violence. *Criminology*, 45, 273-312.
- Osgood, D. W., McMorris, B. J., and Potenza, M. T. (2002). Analyzing multiple-item measures of crime and deviance I: Item response theory scaling. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 18, 267-296.
- Osgood, D. W., Wilson, J. K., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., and Johnston, L. D. (1996). Routine activities and individual deviant behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 635-655.
- Ousey, G. C., Wilcox, P. and Fisher, B. S. (2001). Something old, something new. Revising competing hypothesis of the victimization-offending relationship among adolescents. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 27, 53-84.
- Paterosn, J., Feehan, M., Butler, S., Williams, M., and Cowley-Malcolm, E. T. (2007). Intimate partner violence within a cohort of Pacific mothers living in New Zealand. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 698-721.
- Pizarro, J. M., Zgoba, K. M., and Jennings, W. G. (2011). Assessing the interaction between offender and victim criminal lifestyles and homicide type. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 367-377.
- Posick, C. (2013). The overlap between offending and victimization among adolescents: Results from the Second International Self-Report Delinquency Study. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 29, 106-124.
- Posick, C., Farrell, A., and Swatt, M. (2013). Do boys fight and girls cut? A general strain theory approach to gender and deviance. *Deviant Behavior*, 34, 685-705.

- 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.
- Raudenbush, S. W., Johnson, Christopher, and Sampson, R. J. (2003). A multivariate, multilevel Rasch model with application to self-reported criminal behavior. *Sociological Methodology*, 33, 169-211.
- Regoeczi, W. (2000). Adolescent violent victimization and offending: Assessing the extent of the link. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42, 493-505.
- Reingle, J. M., Jennings, W. G., Maldonado-Molina, M. M., Piquero, A., and Canino, G. (2011). Investigating the role of gender and delinquency in exposure to violence among Puerto Rican youth. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 27, 361-377.
- Reingle, J. M., Staras, S. A., Jennings, W. G., Branchini, J., and Maldonado-Molina, M. M. (2012). The relationship between marijuana use and intimate partner violence in a nationally representative, longitudinal sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(8).
- Rosenberg, S. D., Mueser, K. T., Friedman, M. J., and Gorman, P. G. (2001). Developing effective treatments for posttraumatic disorder among people with severe mental illness. *Psychiatric Services*, 52, 1453-1461.
- Sacks, J. Y. (2004). Women with co-occurring substance use and mental disorders (COD) in the criminal justice system: A research review. *Behavior Sciences and the Law*, 22, 449-466.
- 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., 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., Raudenbush, S. W. and Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, 918-924.
- Savitz, L. D., Lalli, M., and Rosen, L. (1977). *City life and delinquency: Victimization, fear of crime, and gang membership*. National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice.

- Schreck, C. J. (1999). Criminal victimization and low self-control: An extension and test of a general theory of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 16, 633-654.
- Schreck, C. J., and Fisher, B. S. (2004). Specifying the influence of family and peers on violent victimization: Extending routine activities and lifestyles theories. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 1021-1041.
- Schreck, C. J., Wright, R. A., and Miller, J. (2002). A study of individual and situational antecedents of violent victimization. *Justice Quarterly*, 19(1), 159-172.
- 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.
- Schreck, C. J., Stewart, E. A., and Osgood, D. W. (2008). A reappraisal of the overlap of violent offenders and victims. *Criminology*, 46, 871-906.
- Silver, E. (2002). Mental disorder and violent victimization: The mediating role of involvement in conflicted social relationships. *Criminology*, 40, 191-212.
- 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.
- Singer, S. (1981). Homogeneous victim-offender populations: A review and some research implications. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 72, 779-788.
- Singer, S. (1986). Victims of serious violence and their criminal behavior: Subcultural theory and beyond. *Violence and Victims*, 1, 61-70.
- Sparks, R. F., Glen, A. G., and Dodd, D. J. (1977). *Surveying victims*. New York: Wiley.
- Steadman, H. J., Mulvey, E. P., Monahan, J., Robbins, P. C., Appelbaum, P. S., Grisso, T., Roth, L. H., and Silver, E. (1998). Violence by people discharged from acute psychiatric inpatient facilities and by others in the same neighborhoods. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 55, 393-401.
- Stewart, E. A., Schreck, C. J. and Simons, R. L. (2006). I ain't gonna let no one disrespect me: Does the code of the street reduce or increase violent victimization among Africa American adolescents? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 427-458.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1947). *Criminology* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.

- Tillyer, M. S., and Wright, E. M. (2014). Intimate Partner Violence and the Victim-Offender Overlap. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 51(1), 29-55. Doi: 10.1177/0022427813484315
- Tripodi, S. (2012). Victimization and women prisoners. *Florida State University: College of Social Work*.
- Von Hentig, H. (1948). *The Criminal and His Victim: Studies in the Sociobiology of Crime*. New York: Shoken Books
- Wilcox, P. (2010). Theories of victimization. *Encyclopedia of victimology and crime prevention* (pp. 978-986). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. Doi: 10.4135/9781412979993.n334
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, J., and Herrnstein, R. (1985). *Crime and human nature*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wittebrood, K., and Nieuwbeerta, P. (1999). Wages of sin? The link between offending, lifestyle and violent victimization. *European journal of Criminal Policy and Research*, 7, 63-80.
- Wolff, N., Shi, J., and Siegel, J. A. (2009). Patterns of victimization among male and female inmates: Evidence of an enduring legacy. *Violence and Victims*, 24(4), 469-484.
- 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.
- Wortley, R. (2002). *Situational prison control: Crime prevention in correctional institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval



**Missouri**  
**State**  
UNIVERSITY

**OFFICE OF RESEARCH  
COMPLIANCE**

(417) 836-4132

Web site: <http://orc.missouristate.edu>

Federalwide Assurance (FWA) #4733

**To:** Aida Hass  
Criminology and Criminal Justice  
STRO 461 901 S National Ave Springfield MO 65897

**Approval Date:** 2/11/2015

**Expiration Date of Approval:** 2/10/2016

**RE:** Notice of IRB Approval by Expedited Review (under 45 CFR 46.110)

**Submission Type:** Initial

**Expedited Category:**

7. Surveys/interviews/focusgroups

**Study #:** 15-0315

**Study Title:** Understanding the Victim-Offender Overlap: A Focus Group Study of Greene County Jail Inmates

This submission has been approved by the above IRB for the period indicated. It has been determined that the risk involved in this research is no more than minimal.

**Investigator's Responsibilities:**

Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. It is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to submit for renewal and obtain approval before the expiration date. You may not continue any research activity beyond the expiration date without IRB approval. Failure to receive approval for continuation before the expiration date will result in automatic termination of the approval for this study on the expiration date.

You are required to obtain IRB approval for any changes to any aspect of this study before they can be implemented (use the procedures found at <http://orc.missouristate.edu>). Should any adverse event or unanticipated problem



involving risks to subjects or others occur it must be reported immediately to the IRB following the adverse event procedures at the same website.

This study was reviewed in accordance with federal regulations governing human subjects research, including those found at 45 CFR 46 (Common Rule), 45 CFR 164 (HIPAA), 21 CFR 50 & 56 (FDA), and 40 CFR 26 (EPA), where applicable.

CC: Christine Hannis

## Appendix B. Research Approval from Director of Mental Health Services



**Greene County Sheriff's Office**  
1000 N. Boonville  
Springfield, MO 65802

01/16/15

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been working with Christine Hannis on her proposal to conduct research at Greene County Jail. I have reviewed all of the site requirements with her as well as her research proposal. I am pleased to inform you that she is approved to conduct her study as soon as she is ready to begin.

If you have any questions feel free to contact me at 417-829-6250 or by email at [mussery@greenecountymo.org](mailto:mussery@greenecountymo.org)

Sincerely,

*Melissa L. Ussery, Psy.D.*  
*Licensed Psychologist*  
*MO Lic # 2008004866*

Cc: Christine Hannis

# Participation Opportunity

*An in-depth, face-to-face interview study on  
the relationship between victimization and  
offending*

## **We Will Talk About...**

- The connection that exists between criminal offending and criminal victimization.
- The struggle with crime victimization and its effect on making criminal choices
- Your own perspective on the role of victimization in criminal offending
- How can the criminal justice system address the overlap between victimization and offending

COME JOIN  
THE DISCUSSION

Thursday, March 26, 2015

## **Appendix D. Informed Consent Form**

### **Consent Form**

#### **Title of Research Study**

Understanding the Victim-Offender Overlap: A Focus Group Study of Greene County Jail Inmates. I am a graduate student at Missouri State University in the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department.

#### **What is the Purpose of This Study?**

The purpose of this research is to gain a first hand, in-depth understanding of the true connection that exists between criminal offending and criminal victimization.

#### **What Does Your Participation in This Study Involve?**

You will be asked questions from a survey questionnaire that has been developed for the purpose of this study. It is anticipated that this survey questionnaire will be administered to you twice a week with at least once session occurring on Thursdays during the time period of 10:00 am to 11:00 am.

#### **What Are the Possible Risks of Participating in This Study?**

The study poses no foreseen risks to research participants.

#### **What Are The Possible Benefits Of Participating In This Study?**

You would benefit from participating in this study by providing additional information to the literature over subject material. This information is important to the continued progression of the Criminology and Criminal Justice Field to improve policies, programs, resources, and education of the subject material to officers within the field. This would not only save money for departments of corrections, but would also ensure that there is not a gap in services. You would also benefit by being able to have your voice heard regarding personal instances relating to victimization and offending.

#### **If You Choose To Participate In This Study, Will It Cost You Anything?**

There is no cost to participate in the study. This study will be based solely on you volunteering to participate in it.

#### **What Other Options Are Available If You Do Not Want To Take Part In This Study?**

You understand that your consent to participate in this research is entirely voluntary, and that your refusal to participate will involve no prejudice, penalty or loss of benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

#### **Can You Withdraw From This Study?**

If you consent to participate in this study, you are free to stop your participation in the study at any time without prejudice, penalty, or loss of benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

**How Will The Confidentiality Of Your Records Be Protected?**

The researcher seeks to maintain the confidentiality of all data and records associated with your participation in this research. No personal identifying information will be used at any time during this study. All data collected will be kept secure in a locked cabinet in Strong 227 (researcher's office at MSU).

I, \_\_\_\_\_, CONSENT/AGREE to participate in this research study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Participant      Date

## Appendix E. Demographic/Background Questionnaire

**Code Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Demographic/Background**

1. Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female      2. Age (in years): \_\_\_\_\_

3. Race/Ethnicity: (Please choose the ONE that best describes what you consider yourself to be)

- ☐ Native American or Alaskan Native
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ African American
- ☐ African Nationals/Caribbean Islanders
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders
- ☐ White (Non-Hispanic/European American)
- ☐ Multi-racial
- ☐ Other

4. Marital Status: ☐ Married ☐ Partnered ☐ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ Widowed ☐ Separated

5. Highest Level of Education:

- ☐ Elementary or junior high school
  - ☐ Some high school
  - ☐ High school diploma or GED
  - ☐ Some college
  - ☐ 2-year college degree
  - ☐ 4-year college degree
  - ☐ Master's degree or other advanced degree
- ☐ D Trade/Vocational Training

### **Delinquency/Offending:**

Number of times committing any criminal offense in the past year: \_\_\_\_ Total lifetime: \_\_\_\_

### **Victimization:**

Number of times experiencing crime victimization in the past year: \_\_\_\_ Total lifetime: \_\_\_\_

## **Appendix F. Guided Interview Questionnaire**

### **Routine Activities Constructs**

1. How much time do you spend away from your home?
2. How many adults reside in your home?
3. How often do you eat outside of your home?
4. How often do you spend time away from the home each day doing other activities (walking, shopping, bar, club, hanging out with friends/neighbors?
5. How often do you walk alone at night?
6. How often do you go out drinking, partying, etc., without friends? (Question was later thrown out)
7. How often do you leave your doors unlocked, windows open, etc.?
8. Does your neighborhood have a watch? Security? Dog? Good lighting? Gates? Etc.?
9. How often do you come into contact with individuals you can identify as delinquent/criminal? (Peers, spouse/significant other, drug users, gang members, etc.)
10. What percent of people in your neighborhood or people you know would you say are poor? Unemployed? Didn't finish high school?

### **Socialization Constructs**

11. To what extent do you think violence/aggression should be tolerated?
12. To what extent should physical force be used to accomplish a goal?
13. How often is/was violence used in your household to settle a conflict?
14. When should physical combat be used to defend status of self/others?
15. When should you use violence/aggression as a way to retaliate?
16. What do you think of using violence to establish reputation?
17. Is "giving in" to someone or walking away from an argument a sign of weakness?
18. How do you generally respond to being threatened?
19. How long have you lived in your current home?
20. How many times have you moved in the past 5 years?
21. Who was "head of household" for most of the time when you were growing up?
22. Who is currently head of your household?
23. How many people live with you in your home?
24. How often would you say violence is used to establish a reputation, resolve a dispute or defend honor in your neighborhood?
25. How would you describe the "collective efficacy" of your neighborhood?  
(define)
26. What was the role of law enforcement in your neighborhood? Perception of law enforcement?
27. What did your neighborhood "look like"? (Abandoned buildings, broken windows, trash, no parks, people hanging outside of buildings, etc.)

- 28. What percent of people in your neighborhood or people you know would you say are poor? Unemployed? Didn't finish high school? (Question was later thrown out).
- 29. What is your general attitude towards the criminal justice system?

**Individual Experience/Trait Constructs**

- 30. How important was education to you when you were growing up?
- 31. Did you participate in school activities such as choir, sports, debate, etc?
- 32. Did you engage in such activities as skipping school?
- 33. When you were growing up, would you say your parents knew pretty much what you were doing, who you were with, where you went, etc.?
- 34. What type of friends did/do you hang out with?
- 35. What activities did/do you and your friends engage in?
- 36. Are you a "risk taker"...explain.
- 37. Do you prefer excitement and adventure over security and stability?
- 38. Would you rather live in the moment or prepare for the future?
- 39. Do you act on impulse or stop and think about what will happen?
- 40. Were you ever involved in a gang?
- 41. How often do you use alcohol/drugs in a given week?
- 42. Does alcohol influence the choices you make when you are out with your friends?
- 43. Would you say that alcohol interferes with you daily life?



## Appendix G. Overall Questionnaire Participants Received

**Code Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Background/Demographics**

1. Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female      2. Age (in years): \_\_\_\_\_

3. Race/Ethnicity: (Please choose the ONE that best describes what you consider yourself to be)

- ☐ Native American or Alaskan Native
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ African American
- ☐ African Nationals/Caribbean Islanders
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders
- ☐ White (Non-Hispanic/European American)
- ☐ Multi-racial
- ☐ Other

4. Marital Status: ☐ Married ☐ Partnered ☐ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ Widowed ☐ Separated

5. Highest Level of Education:

- ☐ Elementary or junior high school
- ☐ Some high school
- ☐ High school diploma or GED ☐ Trade/Vocational Training
- ☐ Some college
- ☐ 2-year college degree
- ☐ 4-year college degree
- ☐ Master's degree or other advanced degree

### **Delinquency/Offending:**

Number of times committing any criminal offense in the past year:\_\_\_\_ Total lifetime:\_\_\_\_

### **Victimization:**

Number of times experiencing crime victimization in the past year:\_\_\_\_ Total lifetime:\_\_\_\_

### **Routine Activities Constructs**

(Blank area represents the area left for participants to respond to the guided questionnaire read out loud by the researcher)

### **Socialization Constructs**

(Blank area represents the area left for participants to respond to the guided questionnaire read out loud by the researcher)

### **Individual Experience/Trait Constructs**

(Blank area represents the area left for participants to respond to the guided questionnaire read out loud by the researcher)

## Appendix H. Criminal Victimization Responses

### Victimization:

Number of times experiencing crime victimization in the past year:\_\_\_\_ Total lifetime:\_\_\_\_

- 0, 2
- 365 times, 7300 or more (365X20=7300)
- 10+, multiple
- 10, 10
- 2, 15
- Hundreds, a lot
- 3, 3
- 0, 0
- 5, 0
- Did not answer, idk
- 0, 2
- 3, 8
- 0, 1
- 0, 2
- 0, 4
- 1, 2
- 20+, 100+
- 2, 5
- 10, 30ish
- Did not answer, did not answer
- 0, 3
- 4, 6
- 10, 15
- 1, 25+
- 0, 20
- 1, ?
- 3, 20
- 1, 1
- 0, 0
- 2, 10
- 0, 0
- 2, 12
- 2, 5

## **Appendix I. Criminal Offending Responses**

### **Delinquency/Offending:**

Number of times committing any criminal offense in the past year:\_\_\_\_ Total lifetime:\_\_\_\_

- 0,4
- 1, man I got no clue, its all to help others
- 30+, a lot
- 30, more then I can count
- 4, 25
- ?, millions
- A lot, too many
- 3, 3
- 0, 3
- 8, idk
- 0, 8
- 0, 6
- 2, 7
- 13, 650
- 300, 6635
- 8, 100
- 20+, 100+
- 0, 2
- 100+, probably over 10,000
- 1, did not answer
- 0, 2
- 9, 9
- 10, 20
- 0, 4
- 2, 8
- 1, 12
- 0, 12
- 1, 2
- 1, 1
- 1, 5
- 4, 6
- 0, 9
- 10, 20

## **Appendix J. Specific Participants' Responses (Full Version)**

### **Routine Activities Constructs**

#### **Question #1: How much time do you spend away from your home?**

I try to just stay home and get high and hide from the world to cope with so much hurt and pain and only time I leave is just to go to work or pay a bill and the bad people come and be mean to me till I give in and go with them. They I wind up being so paranoid I won't drive so they drive then I end up being around shoplifting, burglaries, etc. etc. or I try to give someone a ride and they end up mind fucking me into doing what they want.

- Not a very long time away from home
- Sometimes they never let me go to the places I hide
- Most of the time
- Most of the time I see my family every day, but never stay with them
- Don't have a home
- 16 hrs/day- I am never home
- Maybe a few hours a week total, until now anyway
- I am a stay at home mom, so I spend all my time at home
- A lot
- A lot
- 8-10 (treatment?)
- 8-10 hours a day working
- Don't have one
- I don't like being at home
- Don't like just sitting at home unless getting high
- A lot
- 16 hrs
- 14 to 16 hours
- 8-16 hours daily
- 4 to 6 hours
- 3 times a week
- Rarely left my house
- 10-24 hours outside the home
- 3 hrs a day on average
- 10 hours away
- I am home maybe 6 hours home-tops
- 10 to 12 hours
- 4 to 5 hours
- Most time at home
- About 5 hours a day
- About 10-11 a day
- In a given day I'm gone away at least 8 hrs. Sometimes all day.

- 10 hours a day

**Question # 2: How many adults reside in your home?**

- Probably 3 or 4 hours a day, which included working a part-time job
- 1
- 2
- 2
- Don't have a home
- 4
- Including myself, 5 adults
- 2
- 20-30 people
- 30 people
- 2 adults
- 2 adults
- N/A
- Myself and a handful of friends
- Me and bunch of friends
- 2
- 1
- 3 adults
- 2
- 2
- 2
- 2
- 2
- On average 3-6 people
- 3
- 3 adults
- 1 (myself)
- 3
- 2
- 2 adults
- 3
- Just me
- Two
- 2 adults

**Question #3: How often do you eat outside of your home?**

- Adults- 1 + self
- Maybe like I only eat at most 1x a day for a week. I was high. I don't eat. Its about helping other people not me.



- Everyday, I was so high that I didn't need to eat that much
- Every day if I eat. Candy most of the time
- Every day
- Often 2-3x day
- We eat at home everyday
- My little family ate outside of home a few times a week
- Every day
- Every day
- 2 daily
- I eat away from home about twice a week
- Once a day
- I don't eat at home
- Don't eat- stay really high
- 3 or 4 times a week
- 90x
- 90 times a month
- 8 times monthly
- 4 times a day a week
- Never
- 3 times a week
- Hardly ever
- 1-2 times/day-usually lunch
- Monday-Friday lunch
- All 3 males all month long
- Once or twice a day
- Once a day
- 1 or 2 times a day
- 2 times a day
- All meals-most of the time
- Almost every meal
- Every meal except holidays

**Question #4:** How often do you spend time away from the home each day doing other activities (walking, shopping, bar, club, hanging out with friends/neighbors)?

- Hardly ever eat outside
- 19 hours a day
- Every day (getting cars, breaking into houses)
- All day
- Participant did not answer
- No activities-nothing fun
- Maybe 30 minutes to an hour a day, at the most
- A couple hours (1-3)
- 10 hours a day- maybe

- A lot
- 5 hours
- 5-6 hrs
- 24 hours
- I try not to ever be home
- Am only home if I get high with friends, not much at all cuz get high outside to!
- 3 or 4 times a day
- 16 hrs
- 5 to 7 hours
- Maybe 2hrs a day
- 6 hours
- 2 hr
- 2 hrs a day
- Every day- at least 10 hours
- 4 hrs a week (shopping usually)
- Just for work, Monday-Friday
- 18 hours a day?
- 4 hours a day
- Everyday-go walking 45 minutes to an hour
- 1 once a week
- 5 hours a day
- About 10-11 hours a day
- Almost all day or I'm gone all day or for the night
- 8 to 10 hours a day

**Question #5: How often do you walk alone at night?**

- Never walk alone at night
- 3 hours
- Sometimes
- Sometimes
- I walk constantly most of the time day & night
- 9-10 times a day
- Almost every night (15-20 minutes per night)
- Never
- Participant did not respond
- A few times
- 0
- 9 hrs at night- all day
- 15 mins maybe a week
- Every night
- If I walk at night, I do alone
- If walk at night walk alone
- Every night

- Rarely
- Not very often if ever at all
- Never
- Ever
- Never
- I don't
- A lot
- 0
- Never
- I don't walk anywhere ever
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- All the time
- Anytime, I walk alone, I walk alone

**Question #6: How often do you leave your doors unlocked, windows open, etc.?**

- Never leave doors or windows unlocked
- Never leave door unlocked
- No.....
- Never
- No windows or doors
- Never
- A lot, people come home at all hours of the night, most windows don't lock
- When I am home they are unlocked until night time
- No door/ no window
- Never
- Participant did not respond
- Only when I'm at home
- No
- Never!
- Never lock anything
- Participant did not respond
- 2-5 hrs of unlocked time
- Almost every day all the time during the day and night
- 2 to 8 hrs a day
- Participant did not respond
- Every day
- None of my doors are open, windows open during the day
- Never unless I am home
- Never

- Never
- I don't leave em unlocked
- Only when I'm home
- Never
- Every day until dark
- Never
- Only when I'm at home
- Never
- Never

**Question #7: Does your neighborhood have a watch? Security? Dog? Good lighting? Gates? Etc.?**

- Yes, it has security, but I never feel safe
- Every day/night
- No
- Neighborhood watch signs, but not affective to any knowledge
- No
- Not really
- No, my husband made me feel protected
- No
- Yes
- Yes and neighbors
- I have a husband and a pitbull
- I suppose
- NO NO NO
- My neighbor had Toby's Diner in front- big light
- No
- The neighborhood has nothing
- Nope
- Yes
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No security
- Security
- Yes-security doors
- Police car few times a week
- Yes
- No
- No
- No

**Question #8:** How often do you come into contact with individuals you can identify as delinquent/criminal? (Peers, spouse/significant other, drug users, gang members, etc.)

- Depends on where I go if I run into the criminal element
- Everyday- all day
- Every day
- Every day
- Constantly
- Almost everyone I know, so very often
- Every day
- Every day
- Every day
- Every day
- Once or twice a week
- Every day
- Every day
- Every day (<3) plus look in mirror
- Every day
- All 24/7
- Every day- 2 to 3 people
- 3-10 people daily
- Participant did not respond
- 2 times
- On a daily basis
- Every day. Always everyone I know is a criminal
- Twice a week
- Rarely
- I don't associate with anyone that's not. Being "delinquent" in my life. Sigh.
- None
- Never
- None
- All day- every day
- All day-every day
- All the time
- All the time

**Question #9:** What percent of people in your neighborhood or people you know would you say are poor? Unemployed? Didn't finish high school?

- 5% are poor I guess
- All of them that I know struggle every day to make it
- The struggle is real
- 50/50
- Almost all of them- 77%

- All
- 95%
- 30%
- Almost all
- Almost to all
- Majority
- Majority
- No comment
- Ummm?
- Trick question?
- I know ones who own business. All kinds. Both.
- 1%
- 30 to 40%
- 30%
- 1
- 70%
- Middle to upper class
- 95% of them
- 5
- 35%
- I am the only person who pays rent regularly in my neighborhood/apt. complex
- 50%
- None
- 50%
- Done
- Don't talk to anyone-not sure
- 50%
- 50%

### **Socialization Constructs**

Kids off to school @ 7:45, pick up at 3:30, dinner at 5-6, bath, and bed

**Question #10:** To what extent do you think violence/aggression should be tolerated?

- Depends on situations, self-defense and defending the weak and innocent and whats ours
- It depends on the situation-0% tolerance-usually ends badly
- Depends on situation
- I don't think it should be tolerated at all
- None
- Only in self-defense situations
- Never

- Some circumstances
- A little bit (some circumstances)
- Participant did not answer
- Participant did not answer
- Yes
- Yessish
- Yes-ish
- Depends on situation, defending yourself
- Hurting people hurt people-if everyone reacted there would be more to much violence
- None, violence should not be allowed or tolerated
- 0%
- It shouldn't be tolerated
- Never
- Never
- 50%
- 25%
- 0%
- Zero tolerance
- 0
- None
- Depends on what its for
- Depends
- Depends on what they do to me
- 40%
- 10%

**Question #11: To what extent should physical force be used to accomplish a goal?**

- Physical force- depends on where you are
- When its in self-defense or defense of innocent
- When it calls for physical force
- Got to do what you have to do
- Never
- None
- Only when police are trying to catch/arrest a dangerous or violent criminal
- Never, well I guess sometimes you need to put a little umph in it
- Never
- Never
- Depends on how much money they owe me
- Depends on how much money/whatever is owed
- Depends
- Depends
- How I'm being treated. I want to save my own life or kids, dog

- Same, depends on mood, circumstances
- To the point that you have to defend yourself
- You should not have to use physical force to accomplish a goal other than self-defense to save your life
- 0%
- Never
- Never
- Never
- 50%
- Zero
- 0%
- Zero tolerance
- 0
- 0%
- None
- Never
- Never
- 20%
- 20%

**Question #12: How often is/was violence used in your household to settle a conflict?**

- Violence was around as a child. I don't think it was necessary.
- Last relationship only 5x's cause he tried to force me to do illegal shit or shit that scared me
- Never against them, for them
- Never against them for them
- When I was spanked. But, I was physically abused by my adoptive dad ever day
- Every day
- Way too much, when I grew up, and comes a lot from older generation now
- Never
- Every day/ all day
- Every day/ all day
- Never/in household
- Growing/always...now/sometimes
- Growing up/somewhat now/most of the time
- No/never
- A lot/sometimes
- Sometimes arguing. I used beat people beat
- Most often
- Almost every day growing up and in my marriage
- Never
- Always
- 2 times a week



- Quite frequently
- Several times-quite frequently
- Daily (abusive spouse)
- Often very violent spouse
- None
- None
- None
- Never
- Never
- Never
- None
- 20%

**Question #13: When should physical combat be used to defend status of self/others?**

- If attacked, force can be used.
- In self-defense when called for
- When its needed
- Whenever needed
- I use it a lot, but it probably is not healthy
- Never
- Whenever one feels truly in danger
- If you are put in the position don't back down
- When it is necessary
- When its necessary
- Always
- Always
- Always
- Always
- Always if comin at me like that
- To save my life or someone elses. Dog etc....
- Always-stay safe! ☺
- Only when there has been a physical attack on them
- Only when attacked
- Never
- Never
- When the situation calls for it
- If whenever necessary
- 100% for self-defense
- Never did
- Self-defense
- War- self-defense
- Only in self-defense
- Only when needed self-defense

- Never
- When some body put there hands on you- self-defense
- 100%-when I lash out
- War

**Question #14: When should you use violence/aggression as a way to retaliate?**

- Same as last question
- In self-defense or defending weak or innocent
- Depending on situation
- Depending on situation
- I do a lot. Anytime it is necessary
- Only when self-defense
- In self-defense
- I am a peace keeper-I try to find alternative ways
- Never
- Never
- Depends?
- Situations are different/depends?
- When necessary
- I'm tetering on the answer, mostly no
- So, so- I'm on the fence
- Only when needed
- You shouldn't unless it is to defend yourself
- Only when your life has physically been threatened
- Never
- Never
- When your try to prove a point
- Never
- Never unless necessary/self-defense
- Never
- Never
- Self-defense
- Never
- Never
- Never
- Never
- Never
- Never
- 40% when you have done all you can
- When you tried everything else

**Question #15: What do you think of using violence to establish reputation?**

- Depends on reputation you want

- That's stupid and very ignorant
- Sometimes you have to
- Sometimes you have to
- Every day, but I'm working on anger management
- Lame
- It's ridiculous and unnecessary
- I don't think its cool
- I think its stupid, but statistics waiver in it (population)
- I think its stupid
- I believe its happened for me "OG"
- Depends on situations
- Yes
- YES!
- YES-bubble letters
- Depends on who you around. Don't be pussy.
- Never encountered
- It is not acceptable and should not be done
- Only if you want a negative or bullying reputation. Bad idea, personally.
- It should never happen
- Never
- Never
- Not exceptable
- No
- Never
- Nah
- Not
- Never
- Never
- Never
- Never
- None
- None

**Question #16:** Is "giving in" to someone or walking away from an argument a sign of weakness?

- Walking away is okay if the person is unstable
- In our world its weakness, but I don't care. I'll walk away-I have and I've gave in just so they won't be mean to me
- Yes, it depends on who it is
- Yes. Depending on who it is
- I walk away from spousal arguments
- No
- No, never

- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- Yes/no
- Sometimes
- Sometimes
- Don't know cause angry management made me stop think before react
- Incarceration-yes, free-no
- No, it is not a sign of weakness. It's called being reasonable
- Defensive
- Nope
- No
- No
- No when I walk away it means I might really hurt you
- Yes
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- NO!
- NO

**Question #17: How do you generally respond to being threatened?**

- Tell them I have a lot of ?
- Violence-I freak out-defense mode
- Violent
- Violent
- Not tolerate it
- Not well
- Any means necessary
- I put a defense up
- I don't tolerate it
- Go crazy
- Bark back, then see how that turns out
- Ignore it
- Can't let that happen
- I don't, it would be going Down
- I wish I wish I wish a Monday-Friday would

- Do it. Not so nice.
- Defend myself if absolutely necessary
- I generally will cow down and will not confront them to bring on more anger
- Scared
- Walk away
- Back down and try to difuse the situation
- With violence
- Run quickly
- Run away
- I get med
- Not good
- Not highly
- Not highly
- Walk away
- Walk away
- I lash out either verbal or physical
- Not at all

**Question #18: How long have you lived in your current home?**

- Almost 1 year
- My last house is gone-my grandmas-I lived there for 21 years-it got sold in 2006
- Floater
- I move around
- 2 months
- Under a year
- 5 ½ years (off and on)
- 2 months
- Month
- Month
- 1 year
- 1 year
- 10+
- 8 years
- Yes-same places
- 11 months
- 18 yrs.
- 2 months
- My whole life. 32 years.
- Almost 3 years
- 2 ½ years
- 8 years
- 16 years (old house) (1 year new house)
- 4 years

- Since february
- 1 ½ years
- 6 months
- 2 months
- 10 years
- 2 year
- 2 yrs
- 1 year

**Question #19: How many times have you moved in the past 5 years?**

- Moved a lot
- 20 in 2 years
- 100+ (a lot)
- 100+
- 30 x's
- A lot 40+
- 6-10 (off and on at one place)
- 5
- 20x
- A lot
- 2x
- 6 different places
- Mom and dad
- 1-bounce around
- 1-bounce around a lot
- 2 twice
- 3x
- 20+ times
- 0
- 3 times
- 3 times
- 3
- I have moved several times, but always returned to the same house hold
- Twice
- 10 times
- 6x's (+)
- Twice
- 5 times
- 4 or 5 times
- 0
- 5
- 3 times
- 3 times

**Question #20:** Who was “head of household” for most of the time when you were growing up?

- Mom was head of household
- My grandma was the caretaker
- Parents
- Grandma and grandpa
- Adoptive stepfather
- My dad
- My step-dad
- Mother
- Father
- Mom
- Mother or mom- G.F. Family
- Myself
- In the eye of the beholder
- That's in eye of beholder
- My dad- didn't grow up with state
- Stepfather
- Dad/mom
- My dad and mom
- My dad or my mom
- Mom mother
- Grandmother
- Mother or father separately
- Dad when at home, otherwise mom
- My father
- My mother
- Mom and dad
- Both parents
- Mother
- My dad
- Grandmother
- Father and mother
- Mother

**Question #21:** Who is currently head of your household?

- If have a roommate-equal
- Me
- Me
- Me
- Me
- My father in law

- My children's paternal great grandmother
- My husband (5 years)- my dad (childhood)
- Me
- Me
- Dennis/husband
- Husband
- Don't have one
- Me
- Me
- Myself
- Me
- Husband
- Me
- Don't have one
- Steve Clooney
- Myself
- Father
- Me
- Myself
- Me
- Me
- Self
- Me and boyfriend
- My dad
- Me
- It use to be my husband, but we separated. Now just me
- Dad

**Question #22: How many people live with you in your home?**

- 1 other person
- Me and whatever dirt leg boy I'm tryin to save
- 2
- 2
- Me
- 2
- 10 including myself
- 3- me, my daughter, and my husband
- 20
- 2
- 3
- 2 adults and 6 kids=8 people
- 50/50
- 5-7



- 5 to 10
- Myself/dog
- 1
- 6 people
- 2 others besides myself
- There were six of us
- 2 in home
- 3 normally, but sometimes differs
- 3 other people. 4
- 4
- 6
- Just myself
- 3
- 2
- 4 boyfriend, 2 stepson, and my daughter
- 4
- Me
- 2 people
- 2

**Question #23: How often would you say violence is used to establish a reputation, resolve a dispute or defend honor in your neighborhood?**

- Never
- Every day-all day
- Depends
- Depends
- Every day basis
- All the time
- Quite frequently
- I stick to myself
- A lot
- Every other day
- 0
- 0
- 0
- Never!
- A lot
- Quite neighbors. Don't want to know
- None or never
- Almost every day
- Never
- Never
- Never

- Very rarely, but growing up in Chicago it was quite often
- 75% of the time
- 2
- Rarely, not often
- Violence is not prevalent
- Don't know
- Never
- Never
- 0
- Never
- None
- ?

**Question #24:** How would you describe the “collective efficacy” of your neighborhood?

- Collective efficacy-mind their own business. It's okay.
- They try to every day help each other, but then if they need something someone needs they'll take it
- To each there own
- To each their own
- Not many people care, just call cops a lot
- 0-doesn't exist
- Maybe a few people on the block care, but not many
- Family
- 0-nope
- No one
- Yes, close surroundings
- Everyone
- 0
- Oh yes!
- Yes- were all friends
- No, not really!
- Good at being a neighbor
- No support or any interaction
- Doesn't apply
- Very safe
- Safe
- Pretty protected and are helpful
- 50%
- 30%
- Very likely
- We hate em
- 50%-depends on person
- Not very

- Good about 85%
- Not sure
- Yeah 100%
- 85%
- 100% very safe neighborhood
- 75%

**Question #25: What was the role of law enforcement in your neighborhood? Perception of law enforcement?**

- Never saw police until I called them because my friend was suicidal.
- As a child I grew up to respect authority-now screw the police
- Never
- Never-fuck the police
- Hide, but n
- None, bad=cops
- They patrol a lot, but cops aren't liked, and most people are scared due to warrants
- Never a good thing when the cops come
- Don't trust them-hide don't answer any questions
- Don't trust them
- Police ok
- It is norm for them to patrol
- No police
- We don't do cops
- WE HATE POLICE
- No police. Authority sucks
- Viewed as cops protect and serve
- To come and arrest people or solve problems
- Only when called upon
- Hood guys
- Good guys
- Pretty happy with it
- Bothered-hated law enforcement
- Hate it
- Only came when called in county
- It looks normal-a little bit of trash in parking lot
- We hate em
- Not sure
- Its used when needed
- 50/50
- People hated it
- Hate them
- Hate the cops, but love that they protect

- They hate them

**Question #26: What did your neighborhood “look like”? (Abandoned buildings, broken windows, trash, no parks, people hanging outside of buildings, etc.)**

- It's a good neighborhood.
- Growing up very proper kids, playing outside, normal. Now-trap/drug houses
- Nice
- Nice
- Trashy and trapped out
- Ghetto
- Nice neighborhood
- Neighborhood/homey
- No, apartment buildings
- Neat, green grass
- Never- homes going up
- Very nice. I live in the country
- N/A
- Country
- Wonderful
- Clean-diner
- BBQ, walk, kids play
- Nice houses, but no one interacted outside of their homes
- Country living
- Subdivisions
- It look fine
- The houses were on acres of land- mostly country
- Parks, fields, abandoned houses, homeless people
- All houses, rental housing, few kids
- Country fields
- It looks normal-a little bit of trash in parking lot
- Normal
- Nice- south side
- Fields, gas station
- Fields and new houses
- It was a nice neighborhood
- Very clean, upscale. Children, familys
- Cars and shops everywhere

**Question #27: What is your general attitude towards the criminal justice system?**

- Don't let them in your life unless you want to be hassled forever

- You get less time for being a creep child molester (hate them) then having a bag of dope
- Fuck the police, the system is fucked. Us against them.
- Unfair-fuck the police-system is fucked.
- They suck
- Negative
- Unfair at times, but necessary
- As long as you obey the law they are good
- Not equally fair, what they do for me they don't do 4 another
- Suck
- I've screwed up
- Sometimes they are wrong, but at times I feel as if they help
- Fuck it
- Drew a hand flipping the page off and a smiley face
- Drew a hand flipping the page off and wrote fuck off
- Not fair. Depends on who you are how you get treated
- It has its purpose, but its flawed
- I feel that it has it's purpose, but it is very very flawed
- Too money driven/hungry. Good for the most part.
- They need strong laws of D.V. in all places and sittings to make sure families are safe
- They suck
- I have respect for law enforcement
- It sucks. It is a joke. Fuck the police. Untrustworthy, just offered my brother 6 life sentences and he never killed or raped any one
- Sucks, corrupt, unfair
- It not trusting, they suck butt
- It's a joke
- Sucks
- I feel that they target certain people and type with criminal past
- Sucks, they have power over people
- I hate the criminal justice-it's a joke
- I hate the system, we really don't have any justice
- HATE IT. It's a joke, not fair, its bullshit. Not trusting.
- They mess with people that they shouldn't and don't with they should

### **Individual Experience/Trait Constructs**

Cancer! Changes everything

**Question #28: How important was education to you when you were growing up?**

- Very important- went to parochial schools until I got pregnant
- I hated it. Its more important to me now then growing up

- Important
- Important
- Not very important
- Very
- Very important
- Important, I loved school
- Not at all important
- Not very important
- 1
- It was important
- Went cause I had to go
- VERY IMPORTANT
- So, so
- No so! Felt along due to moved to state custody
- Was essential
- It was very important
- Extremely
- Very important
- Very
- Very important
- Education was not very important until I realized how important it really was
- Very important
- Not at all
- Very important to my mother- I never really was interested in school-now things are different
- Very
- Kinda hard- tell got little older the graduated
- Had to go to school every day
- Not at all
- It wasn't
- Very important. School ment a lot to me, my parents stressed school to me
- Extremely important

**Question #29: Did you participate in school activities such as choir, sports, debate, etc.?**

- Did participate in some things
- Yes-everything
- Yes
- No
- Volleyball, choir, basketball, band
- Yes, a lot
- Yes
- No
- Yes-in junior high and elementary

- Yes-basketball
- 1
- Yes/sports
- No
- Yes
- No
- Cheerleading, basketball
- Yes
- No
- Yes, very very much
- Nope
- No
- Cheerleading
- Never until I went to an alternative school
- Yes
- Never
- Yes
- Yes
- Cheerleader and basketball
- Soccer, volleyball
- No
- Yes
- I was a varsity cheerleader all 4 years and volleyball for a little bit in Ozark
- Yes, choir, basketball, volleyball, softball

**Question #30: Did you engage in such activities as skipping school?**

- Started skipping in high school
- Yes-drunk every day
- Yes
- Yes
- 1x skipped school
- Yup
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes/sometimes
- Yes
- Rarely
- Ya
- Skipping school. Sometimes.
- Yes

- No
- No
- Yes
- Yes
- Nope
- Yes always
- No
- Yes
- Absolutely!
- All the time
- Yes, a few times
- 1 once
- No
- Yes
- As long as I was passing and getting good grades in my class I might have skipped it
- Yes

**Question #31:** When you were growing up, would you say your parents knew pretty much what you were doing, who you were with, where you went, etc.?

- Parents didn't know
- No-not once. I hit 14 year olds.
- No
- No
- Most of the time
- Yes
- Yes
- No
- Not til someone told on me
- No, never
- Never
- Not really
- No/yes
- Sometimes, I was a pretty good kid
- NO NO NO-thought they knew
- No
- No
- Yes
- Yes
- Nope
- No, never
- Always
- They were clueless



- Oh yes, controlling
- No, never
- I moved out at 14
- Yes
- Well parents work night, so through high school and at home alone
- My mother was over protective, never really left home
- No
- Yes
- No, I lied to them about the people I was hanging around and what I was doing
- Yes, my mom tried to help me

**Question #32: What type of friends did/do you hang out with?**

- Hung out with cool people
- All new people. They ain't got no loyalty-the new ones, no morals or ethics. Its horrible.
- 1
- Only 1 I can trust
- Drugs and sex
- Bad kids
- The ones in trouble and do drugs
- Positive people
- Did drugs and sex
- Cool kids
- Straight, honest
- Mostly they are solid; but there are still a few that are questionable
- In jail/prison
- I know all kinds of people
- Druggies, but got criminals goodie friends too
- All kinds
- Druggies
- No friends growing up, and no friends now just my husband
- Always had a lot of friend- "prepy" past, "junky" present
- Not good ones
- Good ones
- Preps, jocks-now just my husband
- Childhood friends-criminals, drug dealers, thieves, runaways
- Don't have many, mainly stayed to myself until college-then musicians
- Bad ass people, drug dealer
- Cool ones- "all walks of life"
- Don't have many- when I did they were bad boys
- I don't know- different at times
- Only people I can't trust
- Bad ones

- Bad criminals
- Drug addicts and really good people that don't do anything. Good and bad.
- At first my jock friend until I started using drugs

**Question #33: What activities did/do you and your friends engage in?**

- Barbecues, bonfires
- Man, I don't even do nothing productive
- Criminal
- Criminal
- Drugs and sex mostly
- None
- Movies, hang out, drink
- Lately doing drugs, but that is going to change
- Shopping, hiking, playing cards, doing drugs
- Drugs, "go to work", shopping
- Thrifting, sales, buying
- Family dinners and shopping, spending time
- Drugs, stealing, etc.....
- I get high now/I got high then
- Getting high, painting, listening to music, crime
- Drugs, soccer, hangin
- Drugs, sex, etc.
- No activities, just watch tv and read
- In high school we did harp wings and church stuff. Now we do criminal and drug stuff
- Criminal/drug activity
- Bowling and walking
- Games, pep rallies-now stay at home and spend time with my husband and we watch sports
- Drugs, open mic nights, poetry slams
- Playing music, eating
- Getting high and pilfering
- Just kickin it
- Bowling
- Parks, stores, different things
- Skating or house parties
- Movies
- Movies, bowling, BBQ
- Drugs, going out, bingo, movies, bowling, pool, party
- Using drugs/garage sales

**Question #34: Are you a "risk taker"?**

- Risk taker- yes
- Not anymore
- Yes!
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Sometimes
- No, I am cautious
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, no fear
- A lot of the time
- Yes
- Yes, yes, yes
- Extremist!
- YES!
- Yes, daredevil
- No
- No
- Yes
- Yes
- No
- Yes, adrenaline junkie
- No
- Yes, its like a natural high
- I love risk
- Yes, adrenaline junky
- Yes
- Yes, only when needed
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, all the time. It keeps life interesting
- Yes

**Question 35: Do you prefer excitement and adventure over security and stability?**

- I want both security and excitement
- I want security and stability
- Both
- Both
- Participant did not answer
- No
- Sometimes
- Sometimes, just depends

- Participant did not answer
- Yes
- Yes-on the fence
- Both. It always depends on whether I am high or not
- Yes/no
- Yes, Yes, Yes
- YES!
- Both
- No
- No
- 50/50
- No. I want secured
- No
- Both
- Yes-most of the time-both
- No usually, but once in a while both
- Not at all, I need stabilities
- I crave stability, but live an exciting lifestyle
- Yes and, I want both
- Yes and no
- Yes, growing up never did much
- Yes
- Yes and no
- I'm in the middle. Some days I want both or just one of them
- Yes

**Question #36: Would you rather live in the moment or prepare for the future?**

- Between moment and future
- I try to prepare for the future-the bad people destroy it
- I use the present to create a better future
- I think of future
- Prepare for future
- Future
- Depends, both
- Being a mom- now off drugs-prepare for future
- Prepare the future
- Prepare for the future
- Live for moment
- Was in the moment. Put planning for the future is best
- Both
- A little of both
- Only got today
- The moment-only got today, tomorrow is not promised

- In the moment
- Prepare
- The future
- In moment
- Live for the future
- ?
- I'm in the moment
- Both, mostly in the moment
- Both
- Future
- As I get older, I try to prepare for the future
- Both
- Prepare for future
- Both, but more prepare for my future
- Live in the moment
- Both
- Both
- Both

**Question #37: Do you act on impulse or stop and think about what will happen?**

- Used to act on impulse
- I think now-I used to be impulsive
- Impulse
- Impulse
- Impulse sometimes I stop and think
- Both
- Both, depends
- Think of what will happen
- Act on impulse
- Impulse
- Both
- Impulsive
- Both
- A little of both
- Both
- Impulse
- Stop and think-both
- Stop and think
- Impulse
- Stop and think about it
- Stop and think
- Impulse
- Impulse

- Both, but usually think before I act
- Impulse
- Impulse
- Impulse, but try to think about it
- Stop and think about
- Think
- Act on impulse
- Impulse
- IMPULSE! All the time
- Most of the time impulse

**Question #38: Were you ever involved in a gang?**

- No gangs
- I didn't participate. I thought they was stupid. I was adopted in.
- N/A
- Participant did not answer
- Yes
- Yes
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No gang
- No
- A little bit, Texas!
- LiL
- No
- No
- No gang
- Never
- Nope
- Nope
- Yes
- No, but associated or affiliated
- No
- No, never
- Affiliated
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No

- None
- No

**Question #39: How often do you use alcohol/drugs in a given week?**

- Maybe once or twice
- Everyday all day so I don't think about my life
- Every day (used to)
- Every day, but not anymore
- Every day- all day long, but I'm in recovery- 57 days clean
- All day- every day
- Maybe drink once every few months, used to be a drug addict (2-3 times a day)- recovering drug addict
- Every day until I got locked up. I am choosing to stay sober
- Oh yeah, that's why I am here
- All day/ time awoke till eyes closed
- Every day
- Every day
- Every day
- All day/ every day
- Every single day
- Every day- all day long
- None right now! Drugs every day!
- All day, every day- not including the last 3 yrs.
- Never
- 10-20 times a week
- I don't now
- Never, but I did a year ago!
- 28
- Daily. Several times a day- at least 3-5 drugs a day
- Alcohol- 3-4 times a week
- 28 times a weekly-meth
- I am an every day user
- 5 days- drink beer when I get home from work
- None, just prescribed, but not abusing
- Not often
- Every day-never drink
- 1 drink 2 times a week-don't do drugs at all
- Every day- all day. As much as I can get my hands on it (pills and meth)
- Every day, all day- pills and meth

**Question #40: Does alcohol influence the choices you make when you are out with your friends?**

- Not any more
- Drug- yes. I'm paranoid, I want to do crazy shit
- More numb
- Yes, so I don't think
- Half the time
- Yes
- It did when I was high, no effect on alcohol
- Oh yeah, that's why I am here
- Sometimes
- Nope
- Dah
- Yes
- Yes
- I would have to say...yes
- Uhh, well, I don't, maybe, ya
- No-drugs can't, I can.
- No
- No drugs/alcohol
- Yes
- Yes it did
- No
- Yes
- I do drugs when I drink. Its all bad.
- Yes
- Never drink no
- I am bulletproof on alcohol
- Yes
- Don't drink
- Yes- don't like to drink drunk (only like to drink to feel it not to get drunk)
- No, I don't drink
- No
- I don't like to drink. I barely ever drink
- Yes

**Question #41: Would you say that alcohol or drugs interfere with your daily life?**

- Not any more
- Drugs- yes. I get to where everyone scares me, but it keeps me outta trouble
- Use to
- Use to
- Yes, it did interfere badly
- Yes
- When I was using drugs it affected everything, alcohol didn't
- It did, but I'm not looking back



- Yes
- Yes
- Dah
- Yes. That's why I am here
- Yes
- I love getting high
- It was my daily life- <3 drugs
- Yes!
- Yes
- No
- No, not any more
- Yes it did
- No
- Absolutely
- Yes always
- Yes
- Prior to Dec. 2014, yes, have been clean for a bit
- Absolutely
- No
- Yes, feel sometimes I do
- No
- Yes
- Drinking-no drugs, no cuz I don't do them
- Yes b/c I always have to have it before I do my daily activities
- Yes-it makes me have more balls

Does not include the individuals who took the questionnaire more than once.

## **Appendix K. Specific Participants' Responses (Condensed Version)**

### **Routine Activities Constructs**

#### **Question #1: How much time do you spend away from your home?**

- Most of the time
- 8 to 24 hours
- < 7 hours
- Few hours within a week
- 3 times a week
- A lot
- Stay at home mom, spend all time at home
- Didn't like to be at home
- Did not spend time away from home/rarely left home
- Did not have a home

#### **Question # 2: How many adults reside in your home?**

- 1 (themselves)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- Don't have a home
- Themselves and friends
- N/A
- 20 to 30 people
- Average between 3-6 people

#### **Question #3: How often do you eat outside of your home?**

- Everyday
- Ate away from home 1 to 3 times a week
- Ate away from home 1 to 3 times a day
- Don't eat at home
- 90 times
- Almost every meal/most of the time
- Every meal except holidays
- Never/hardly ever
- All 3 meals all month long
- Monday thru Friday lunch
- 4 times a day a week
- 8 times monthly

- 3 or 4 times a week
- 2x a week

**Question #4: How often do you spend time away from the home each day doing other activities (walking, shopping, bar, club, hanging out with friends/neighbors)?**

- Sometimes
- Never, none
- 3 hours
- I walk constantly most of the time day and night
- 9 to 10 times a day
- 9 hrs at night- all day
- 0
- Almost every night (15 to 20 minutes per night)
- Every night
- All the time, a lot
- I don't
- Not very often if ever at all, rarely
- A few times
- Participant did not answer
- 15 minutes maybe a week
- If I walk at night, I do alone
- If walk at night walk alone
- I don't walk anywhere ever
- Anytime, I walk alone, I walk alone

**Question #5: How often do you walk alone at night?**

- Participant did not respond
- All the time, a lot
- N/A
- Never go drinking or out alone, never
- I never go out alone-too terrified
- Never when I go out without them
- Hardly ever

**Question #6: How often do you leave your doors unlocked, windows open, etc.?**

- Never leave doors or windows unlocked, never unless I am home
- No....., Never!-every day, No
- No windows or doors
- Participant did not respond
- When I am home they are unlocked until night time
- Only when I'm at home

- Every day until dark
- I don't leave em unlocked
- 2 to 5 hours of unlocked time
- Almost every day all the time during the day and night
- Never lock anything
- 2 to 8 hours a day
- None of my doors are open, windows open during the day

**Question #7: Does your neighborhood have a watch? Security? Dog? Good lighting? Gates? Etc.?**

- My neighborhood is safe
- Yes
- NO NO NO, not really, no
- Every day/night
- Yes, it has security, but I never feel safe
- Neighborhood watch signs, but not affective to any knowledge
- No, my husband made me feel protected
- Yes and neighbors
- I have a husband and a pitbull
- I suppose
- The neighborhood has nothing
- My neighbor had Bobby's Diner in front-big light
- No security
- Security
- Yes-security doors
- Police car few times a week

**Question #8: How often do you come into contact with individuals you can identify as delinquent/criminal? (Peers, spouse/significant other, drug users, gang members, etc.)**

- Every day/all day, all 24/7, on a daily basis, all the time
- Almost everyone I know, so very often
- Constantly
- Once or twice a week
- Every day- 2 to 3 people
- 3 to 10 people daily
- Participant did not respond
- 2 times
- None/never
- Rarely

**Question #9: What percent of people in your neighborhood or people you know would you say are poor? Unemployed? Didn't finish high school?**

- <10%
- >25%
- Almost all of them, majority, all
- 50/50
- No comment
- 1
- Middle to upper class
- Don't talk to anyone-not sure
- None
- I am the only person who pays rent regularly in my neighborhood/apt. complex
- 5

### **Socialization Constructs**

#### **Question #10: To what extent do you think violence/aggression should be tolerated?**

- 0%, zero tolerance (usually ends badly)
- None, never
- Yes/yessish
- <10%
- It (depends) on the situation (defending yourself) (what its for) (on what they do to me)
- A little bit (some circumstances)
- Participant did not answer
- Violence should not be allowed or tolerated at all
- Self-defense situations (defending the weak and innocent and whats ours)

#### **Question #11: To what extent should physical force be used to accomplish a goal?**

- None, never, 0%-zero tolerance
- Physical force (depends on where you are)
- When its in self-defense or defense of innocent
- <20%
- (depends) on how much money (whatever is owed) (they owe me)
- Only when police are trying to catch/arrest a dangerous or violent criminal
- You should not have to use physical force to accomplish a goal other than (self-defense) to save your life
- How I'm being treated. Want to save own life or kids, dog
- Same, depends on mood, circumstances

#### **Question #12: How often is/was violence used in your household to settle a conflict?**

- Every day/ all day
- A lot/sometimes, most often

- Never (in household)/no, none
- Never against them, for them
- Violence was around as a child. I don't think it was necessary
- Growing/always.....now/sometimes
- Growing up/somewhat now/most of the time
- Always
- 2 times a week
- Quite frequently (several times)
- 20%

**Question #13: When should physical combat be used to defend status of self/others?**

- Always (if comin at me like that) (stay safe ☺)
- To save my life or some elses. Dog etc...
- Never
- Self-defense (war) (if attacked, force can be used) (somebody put their hands on you)
- When its necessary/needed (one feels truly in danger), when situation calls for it
- Only when attacked/there has been a physical attack on them

**Question #14: When should you use violence/aggression as a way to retaliate?**

- If attacked, force can be used
- (depend)ing on situation
- Never (unless necessary)
- Self-defense (defending weak or innocent) (only when your life has physically been threatened)
- Do a lot. Anytime it is necessary
- Situations are different/depends?
- When you tried everything else/40% when you have done all you can
- When I can't get my point across with my words

**Question #15: What do you think of using violence to establish reputation?**

- Sometimes you have to
- It's ridiculous and unnecessary
- Yes (YES!) (YES-bubble letters)
- Depends on situation, depends on reputation you want
- Never encountered
- It is not acceptable and should not be done
- None/nah/not/no, never
- Not exceptable
- It should never happen
- Never want to be known as a punk

**Question #16:** Is “giving in” to someone or walking away from an argument a sign of weakness?

- No/NO (!), never, nope
- Yes (yes/no) (depends on who it is)
- Sometimes
- Incarceration-yes, free-no
- Defensive

**Question #17:** How do you generally respond to being threatened?

- Violent/angry
- Not tolerate
- Run quickly/away
- Not well
- I put a defense up
- Ignore it
- Defense myself if absolutely necessary
- Scared
- Walk away
- I get mad
- Not good/highly/at all
- Last out either verbal or physical
- Back down and try to difuse the situation

**Question #18:** How long have you lived in your current home?

- 1 year (almost) (under a year) (1 ½ year)
- Floater, I move around
- <6 months
- 2 years (2 ½ years)
- 10 years (+)
- 5 ½ years (off and on)
- 8 years
- Yes-same places
- 11 months
- 18 years
- My whole life. 32 years.
- Almost 3 years
- Since February
- 4 years
- 16 years (old house) (1 year new house)

**Question #19: How many times have you moved in the past 5 years?**

- Moved a lot, a lot, 40+
- 20 in 2 years, 20x
- 100+ (a lot)
- 30x's
- 2x
- 5 (4 or 5 times)
- 1-bounce around (a lot)
- Mom and dad
- 6 different places, 6x's (+)
- 3x
- 6 to (10) (off and on at one place)
- 0
- I have moved several times, but always returned to the same house hold

**Question #20: Who was "head of household" for most of the time when you were growing up?**

- Mom was head of household, mother or mom-G.F. Family
- My dad, my dad-didn't grow up with state
- Grandmother
- My step-dad
- My dad and/or my mom
- Grandma and grandpa
- Adoptive stepfather
- Myself
- Dad when at home, otherwise mom

**Question #21: Who is currently head of your household?**

- Me, myself
- My dad
- Husband
- Father-in-law
- My children's paternal great grandmother
- My husband (5 years) - my dad (childhood)
- Don't have one
- Steve Clooney
- Me and my boyfriend
- It use to be my husband, but we separated. Now just me

**Question #22: How many people live with you in your home?**



- 1 other person
- Me
- 2 (2 in home) (2 others besides myself)
- 10 including myself
- 20
- (3) - me, my daughter, and my husband (3 normally, but sometimes differs)
- 4 (4-boyfriend, 2 stepson, and my daughter)
- 2 adults and 6 kids=8 people
- 50/50
- 5 to 7
- 5 to 10
- Myself/dog
- 1
- 6 people
- 3 other people-4

**Question #23:** How often would you say violence is used to establish a reputation, resolve a dispute or defend honor in your neighborhood?

- Never (Never!), none
- Every day, all day, all the time (almost)
- Depends
- Quite frequently
- A lot
- I stick to myself
- Every other day
- 0
- Quiet neighbors. Don't want to know
- Very rarely, but growing up in Chicago it was quite often
- 75% of the time
- 2
- Rarely, not often
- Violence is not prevalent
- Don't know
- ?

**Question #24:** How would you describe the “collective efficacy” of your neighborhood?

- Collective efficacy-mind their own business. It's okay.
- They try to every day help each other, but then if they need something someone needs they'll take it
- To each their own
- Safe (very safe)
- Not many people care, just call cops a lot

- 0-doesn't exist, 0-nope, 0
- Maybe a few people on the block care, but not many
- Family
- No one
- Yes, close surroundings, oh yes!, yes- were all friends
- Everyone
- Doesn't apply
- No support or any interaction
- Good at being a neighbor
- No, not really!, not very
- Pretty protected and are helpful
- 30%
- 50%
- 75%
- Very likely
- We hate em
- 50%- depends on person
- Good about 85%
- Not sure
- 100% very safe neighborhood
- Don't feel safe after dark, my neighborhood has a lot of events

**Question #25: What was the role of law enforcement in your neighborhood? Perception of law enforcement?**

- As a child I grew up to respect authority-now screw the police
- Never (fuck the police), none, bad=cops, never a good thing when the cops come
- Hide
- Don't trust them (hide, don't answer any questions)
- Police ok
- It is norm for them to patrol
- We don't do cops/ HATE POLICE (hate it) (people hate it) (love that they protect), no police (authority sucks)
- Good guys
- Viewed as cops protect and serve
- To come and arrest people or solve problems
- Only when called upon
- Pretty happy with it
- Bothered-hated law enforcement
- Only came when call in county
- Not sure
- Its used when needs
- 50/50

**Question #26:** What did your neighborhood “look like”? (Abandoned buildings, broken windows, trash, no parks, people hanging outside of buildings, etc.)

- It's a good neighborhood
- Growing up very proper kids, playing outside, normal. Now-trap/drug houses
- It looks normal-a little bit of trash in parking lot
- Trashy and trapped out
- Ghetto
- Nice neighborhood
- Neighborhood/homey
- No, apartment buildings
- Neat, green grass
- Never-homes going up
- Very nice. I live in the (country) (country living) (country fields)
- N/A
- Wonderful
- Clean-diner
- BBQ, walk, kids play
- Nice houses, but no one interacted outside of their homes
- Subdivisions
- It look fine
- The houses were on acres of land-mostly country
- Parks, fields, abandoned houses, homeless people
- All houses, rental housing, few kids
- Normal
- Nice-south side
- Fields, gas station, new houses
- Very clean, upscale. Children, families
- Cars and shops everywhere
- Parks, community centers, schools, a lot of 3 story Victorian homes

**Question #27:** What is your general attitude towards the criminal justice system?

- Unfair-fuck the police-system is fucked.
- They suck (corrupt, unfair) (power over people)
- Negative
- Unfair at times, but necessary
- As long as you obey the law they are good
- Not equally fair, what they do for me they don't do 4 another
- Sometimes they are wrong, but at times I feel as if they help
- Not fair. Depends on who you are how you get treated
- It has its purpose, but its flawed
- Too money driven/hungry. Good for the most part
- I have respect for law enforcement

- It not trusting, they suck butt
- It's a joke
- I feel that they target certain people and type with criminal past
- I hate the criminal justice (we really don't have any justice) (HATE IT. It's a joke, not fair, its bullshit. Not trusting)
- They mess with people that they shouldn't and don't when they should
- Needs to be adjusted in Greene County Jail
- Fuck the police, the system is fucked. Us against them, fuck it

### **Individual Experience/Trait Constructs**

#### **Question #28: How important was education to you when you were growing up?**

- Very, very important (went to parochial schools until I got pregnant) (to my mother-I never really was interested in school-now things are different) (school meant a lot to me, my parents stressed school to me), extremely (important), important (I loved school)
- So, so
- I hated it. Its more important to me now than growing up
- Not very important, not at all, it wasn't
- Went cause I had to go
- Not so! Felt alone due to move to state custody
- Was essential
- Education was not very important until I realized how important it really was
- Kinda hard-until got little older then graduated
- Had to go to school every day

#### **Question #29: Did you participate in school activities such as choir, sports, debate, etc.?**

- Yes (everything) (a lot) (in junior high and elementary) (basketball) (sports) (very very much)
- No, nope, never
- Did participate in some things
- (volleyball), choir, (basketball), band, soccer, softball
- (cheerleading)
- Never until I went to an alternative school
- I was a varsity cheerleader all 4 years and volleyball for a little bit in Ozark
- Honor roll a lot and got the presentatial patch in P.E. every year, a lot of awards

#### **Question #30: Did you engage in such activities as skipping school?**

- Yes (always) (sometimes) (a few times)
- Started skipping in high school
- 1x skipped school

- Skipping school. Sometimes.
- No, nope
- Rarely
- As long as I was passing and getting good grades in my class I might have skipped it
- All the time
- Absolutely!

**Question #31: When you were growing up, would you say your parents knew pretty much what you were doing, who you were with, where you went, etc.?**

- No, never, not really (I lied to them about the people I was hanging around and what I was doing)
- Yes (my mom tried to help me)
- No/yes
- Parents didn't know
- Most of the time, always
- Not til someone told on me
- Sometimes, I was a pretty good kid
- NO NO NO- thought they knew
- They were clueless
- Oh yes, controlling
- Well parents work night, so through high school and at home alone
- My mother was over protective, never really left home

**Question #32: What type of friends did/do you hang out with?**

- Hung out with cool people ("all walks of life")
- All new people. They ain't got no loyalty-the new ones, no morals or ethics. Its horrible.
- Only 1 I can trust
- Drugs and sex
- Bad kids (the ones in trouble and do drugs) (bad ones) (bad criminals), not good ones
- Straight, honest, good ones, bad ass people, drug dealer
- Positive people
- Mostly they are solid; but there are still a few that are questionable
- In jail/prison
- I know all kinds of people
- (druggies), but got criminals goodie friends too
- No friends growing up, and no friends now just my husband
- Always had a lot of friend- "preppy" past, "junky" present
- Preps, jocks-now just my husband
- Childhood friends- criminals, drug dealers, thieves runaways

- Don't have many, mainly stayed to myself until college- then musicians, don't have many- when I did they were bad boys
- I don't know-different at times
- Only people I can't trust
- Drug addicts and really good people that don't do anything. Good and bad.
- At first my jock friend until I started using drugs
- Drug addicts, bums, low achievers, white trash

**Question #33: What activities did/do you and your friends engage in?**

- Criminal
- (barbecues), bonfires,
- Drugs (soccer, hangin) (sex mostly) ("go to work", shopping) (stealing, etc.....) (criminal/drug activity) (garage sales)
- None
- Man, I don't even no nothing productive
- (movies), hang out, drink
- Lately doing drugs, but that is going to change
- Shopping, hiking, playing cards,
- Thrifting, sales, buying
- Family dinners and shopping, spending time
- I get high now/ I got high then
- Getting high, painting, listening to music, crime, pilfering
- No activities, just watch TV and read
- In high school we did harp wings and church stuff. Now we do criminal and drug stuff
- (bowling) and walking
- Games, pep rallies- now stay home and spend time with my husband and we watch sports
- Open mic nights, poetry slams
- Playing music, eating
- Just kickin it
- Parks, stores, different things
- Skating or house (parties)
- Movies
- Going out, bingo, pool

**Question #34: Are you a "risk taker"?**

- Yes (no fear) (daredevil) (adrenaline junkie) (its like a natural high) (only when needed) (all the time, it keeps life interesting) (try to change)
- No, not anymore (I am cautious)
- I love risk
- A lot of the time

- Sometimes
- Extremist!

**Question 35: Do you prefer excitement and adventure over security and stability?**

- Both (it always depends on whether I am high or not)
- No (I want secured)
- Yes (on the fence) (most of the time-both) (yes and, I want both) (yes, growing up never did much)
- Yes and no
- 50/50
- Sometimes (just depends)
- I want both security and excitement
- I want security and stability
- No usually, but once in a while both
- Not at all, I need stabilities
- I crave stability, but live an exciting lifestyle
- I'm in the middle. Some days I want both or just one of them

**Question #36: Would you rather live in the moment or prepare for the future?**

- Between moment and future
- I use the present to create a better future
- I think of future, prepare for future
- Depends, both (a little of both) (mostly in the moment) (but more prepare for my future)
- Being a mom-now off drugs-prepare for future
- Live for moment, in the moment
- Was in the moment, but planning for the future is best
- Only got today
- The moment-only got today, tomorrow is not promised
- ?
- As I get older, I try to prepare for the future

**Question #37: Do you act on impulse or stop and think about what will happen?**

- Both, depends (a little of both)
- Impulse (used to act on impulse) (Sometimes I stop and think) (IMPULSE! All the time) (most of the time impulse) (but try to think about it)
- I think now- I used to be impulsive, think of what will happen
- Stop and think (both) (but usually think before I act)

**Question #38: Were you ever involved in a gang?**

- Yes

- No, N/A, nope, never, none
- Participant did not answer
- A little bit, Texas!
- I didn't participate. I thought they were stupid. I was adopted in.
- Lil
- No, but associated or affiliated

**Question #39: How often do you use alcohol/drugs in a given week?**

- Every day (used to) (but not anymore) {(all day)} (every single day), every day- all day long, but in recovery-57 days clean, every day until I got locked up. I am choosing to stay sober, all day, every day- not including the last 3 years, daily. Several times a day- at least 3 to 5 drugs a day, I am an everyday user, every day- never drink
- Maybe once or twice
- Never, not often, never, but I did a year ago!, none, just prescribed, but not abusing
- I don't know
- 10-20 times a week
- 28, 28 times a weekly-meth
- Alcohol- 3 to 4 times a week
- 5 days- drink beer when I get home from work
- 1 drink 2 times a week-don't do drugs at all

**Question #40: Does alcohol influence the choices you make when you are out with your friends?**

- Yes, dah, yes it did, I would have to say....yes, yes, so I don't think, yes-don't like to drink drunk (only like to drink to feel it not to get drunk)
- No, nope, no drugs/alcohol
- Sometimes
- Not any more
- Half the time
- Never drink no, No, I (don't drink), I don't like to drink. I barely ever drink, no- drugs can't, I can
- I do drugs when I drink. Its all bad.

**Question #41: Would you say that alcohol or drugs interfere with your daily life?**

- Use to
- Yes (always) (absolutely), yes, it did interfere badly, dah
- No
- Not any more
- When I was using drugs it affected everything, alcohol didn't
- I love getting high, it was my daily life- <3 drugs



- Yes, feel sometimes I do
- Prior to Dec. 2014, yes, have been clean for a bit
- Drinking-no drugs, no cuz I don't do them