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The present study explores whether specific juvenile delinquency influences specific victimization experiences. The study utilizes cross-sectional survey data of self-reported delinquency and victimization from 7th to 12th grade students in a Midwestern county. The analysis utilizes multivariate stepwise linear regression techniques to explore the contributions of specific delinquency on specific victimization. Results indicate that juvenile participation in assault and theft behaviors is strongly related to victimization in a similar manner. Juvenile participation in other substance use is related to all forms of victimization while gang affiliation buffers all forms of victimization. It is concluded that there is clear relationship between the specific juvenile delinquency and subsequent victimization risk and that in-school prevention programming must more adequately address the victim/offender overlap to be most effective.
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INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the study of crime and victimization has been approached as if victims and offenders were mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories. Researchers justified the separation of the offender and the victim based on the belief that the two were separate and opposite parts of the overall crime equation (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991). However, the assertion that offenders and victims are unique and mutually exclusive categories has been increasingly challenged over its validity (McDermott, 1983). The earliest break from this tradition was the seminal piece by Thornberry and Figlio (1974), where the authors explored the relationship between victimization and self-reported delinquency in a Philadelphia birth cohort. Thornberry and Figlio’s (1974) research was fundamental in the modern recognition of the potential for a reciprocal relationship between victimization experiences and offense and delinquency behavior.

External social factors, which corresponded with the radical social upheaval of the 1960s and 1970s, can likewise be credited for much of the pressure to expand research and the field of victimology. The women’s movement rebuffed widespread practices of victim blaming and facilitated the creation of victim services such as rape crisis centers, domestic violence shelters, and counseling for abused women and children (Doerner & Lab, 2005). An offshoot of the women’s movement was the increased focus on the rights of children. This included legislative limitations on parent and guardian physical disciplinary practices along with an expansion of children’s bureaus in criminal justice organizations to deal with child maltreatment (Doerner & Lab, 2005). Governmental action, such as the passing of ‘Victim’s Bill of Rights’ legislation, coupled with the increasing popularity of victim compensation programs, all directly contributed
to the social climate which encouraged the victim’s rights movement (Doerner & Lab, 2005; Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991).

While research in offending behavior and victimization relationships has been sometimes restricted due to dataset limitations (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990), other studies have attempted to build on the findings of Thornberry & Figlio (1974) by attempting to disentangle the concept that victims and offenders may be part of a homogeneous population (Baker, Mednick, & Carothers, 1989; Deadman & MacDonald, 2004; Fagan, Piper, & Cheng, 1987; Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen, Laub, & Sampson, 1992; Lauritsen, Sampson, & Laub, 1991; Loeber et al., 1999; McDermott, 1983; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998; Nofziger & Kurtz, 2005; Plass & Carmody, 2005; Singer, 1981; Singer, 1986; Smith & Ecob, 2007; Sparks, Glenn, & Dodd, 1977; Wittenbrood & Nieuwbeerta, 1999; Zhang, Welte, & Wieczorek, 2001). Overwhelmingly the studies have focused on adult populations (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991) and have repeatedly illustrated that victims have a greater likelihood to self-report deviant behaviors (Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Mawby, 1979; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990). These findings on the relationship between victimization and offending behaviors are paramount to the creation and successful implementation of effective crime and victimization prevention policy and programming.

Limitations in the population sample of survey data, however, have restricted the number of studies which have looked into the relationship of juvenile victimization and offending and delinquent behavior (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen et al., 1991; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990; Singer, 1981). In household victimization surveys, juvenile victimization rates may likely be underreported because of the surveyed adult’s lack of knowledge of the juvenile’s victimization experiences or personal perceptions regarding the
severity and significance of the juvenile’s victimizations (Mawby, 1979). The absence of continual research on juvenile victimization is a significant limitation to criminological knowledge as the juvenile populations have a considerably increased risk of both victimization and offending behaviors (Whitehead & Lab, 2006). Lauritsen et al. (1991) noted that juveniles age 12 to 19 are twice as likely as adults aged 20 and over to be a victim of personal crime. In light of the limitations of previous research, it is necessary to expand the base of knowledge regarding the relationship between juvenile victimization and offending and delinquent behaviors.

Beyond broad-based assertions that juvenile victimization is influenced by offending and delinquency behavior (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen et al., 1991; Plass & Carmody, 2005; Sampson & Lauritsen 1990; Sparks et al., 1977; Thornberry & Figlio, 1974; Wittebrood & Nieuwbeerta, 1999; Zhang et al., 2001), a number of studies have looked at the relationship between specific offending and delinquent behaviors and a correlated victimization risk (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Gottfredson, 1986; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen et al., 1991; Lauritsen et al., 1992; Loeber et al., 1999; Plass & Carmody, 2005; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1991; Zhang et al., 2001). Previous research has primarily explored the relationship between juvenile delinquency, such as recreational alcohol and illicit drug use, and overall victimization rates (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Gottfredson, 1986; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen et al., 1992; Plass & Carmody, 2005; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990; Zhang et al., 2001). However, other studies have looked specifically at offending behaviors such as assault (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Lauritsen et al., 1991), larceny theft (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998), and drug sales (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991).
The current study expands upon previous studies in an attempt to better understand the victimization risk of juveniles participating in offending and delinquency behaviors. Building upon previous findings, the potential relationship between specific offending and delinquency behaviors and victimization risk are explored. The current study utilizes in-school self-report surveys of juveniles from a Midwestern county specific to victimization experiences and offending and delinquent behaviors. The primary independent variables in the study are self-reported assault, robbery, and theft offending. Further, gang affiliation will be measured as a secondary independent variable. Corresponding rates of assault, theft, and robbery victimization are measured as the dependent variables.

The findings of this study should increase knowledge of the offending and victimization relationship and contribute to the growing base of research. Better understanding of the corresponding victimization risk for specific offending and delinquency behavior should have lasting criminal justice policy implications. Through the isolation and targeting of specific offending behaviors, victimization prevention and treatment programming can help rebuff the vicious cycle of repeat personal and property victimization. This can be best addressed through the analysis and refining of in-school crime and victimization prevention programming.
CHAPTER I
LITERATURE REVIEW

Victim and Offender Relationship

The belief that criminal offenders and victims are heterogeneous populations has been challenged in the field of criminology (McDermott, 1983). In an attempt to untangle the complex relationship between victim and offender populations, various studies have tried to establish temporal order and expose a casual link between behaviors. One possible directional assertion is that victimization experiences directly influence offending and delinquency behaviors. This potential casual link has been offered in numerous studies and has been justified and supported on a variety of grounds.

One of the first attempts to study the temporal link between victimization and criminal behavior was that of Singer (1981), who considered offenders and victims as part of a homogeneous population and attempted to identify links between victimization and delinquency. What was found was that individual propensity towards violent crime was positively correlated with self-reported victimization. Specifically, victims of serious assaults were significantly more likely to become offenders (Sparks et al., 1977). However, there are several noteworthy limitations and criticisms of the study. Foremost, the study could not solidify a significant casual link between victimization and criminal behavior. Additionally, the study may have suffered from interviewee reporting error in the form of memory decay as subjects, whose mean age was 26, were asked to recall juvenile victimization (Fagan et al., 1987). Despite these limitations, Singer (1981) provided the foundation for future study of the directional proposition that victimization influences criminal propensity.
Gottfredson (1984) elaborated on the work of Singer (1981) through the identification of higher levels of self-reported deviant behaviors for victims of violent crime than for non-victims. Surveyed individuals admitting to at least one violent offense showed a risk of personal victimization seven times greater than non-offenders. Self-reported delinquent behavior increased the risk of personal victimization four times that of non-delinquents. Mayhew and Elliott (1990) attempted to replicate the findings of Gottfredson (1984) using the 1984 British Crime Survey, but were unsuccessful at illustrating a clear relationship between offending and victimization.

Singer (1986) expanded on Gottfredson’s (1984) work and found that when controlling for other offender-related characteristics, serious victimization remained the overall best predictor for reported criminal behavior. Concurrently, victimization experience also accounted for the much debated relationship between race and offender status. Singer (1986) utilized this link as an explanation for the overrepresentation of Blacks in violent crime. Minority overrepresentation in official criminal arrests was at least partially explained through their increased risk for violent victimization. Singer’s (1986) findings helped to give traction to the directional assertion that victimization experience directly influences future offense and delinquency propensity.

Looking to expand the findings of Singer (1981; 1986) and Fagan et al. (1987) surveyed a sample of high school students to test for correlations between victimization and self-reported delinquency. The study found that violent victimization was significantly related to serious juvenile delinquency. At a less significant level, a correlation was also observed between violent victimization and property delinquency. These findings suggest that victimization is a significant factor in relation to delinquency severity; however, directionality remained uncertain.
Fagan et al. (1987) stress that victimization frequency and severity are paramount in prediction of future delinquent involvement. In particular, the social experience of a violent victimization is significantly different, and has a stronger correlation with delinquent involvement, than commonplace larceny theft victimization. Furthermore, Fagan et al.’s (1987) work rebuffed the holding of Jensen and Brownfield (1986) that the production process of victims and offenders are significantly dissimilar. These findings affirmed the belief that victims and offenders are part of a homogeneous population (McDermott, 1983; Singer, 1981; Singer, 1986), best observed in juvenile populations (Baker et al., 1989; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998; Thornberry & Figlio, 1974).

In a more recent study, Zhang et al. (2001) attempted to replicate the findings of Fagan et al. (1987) specific to correlations between victimization and delinquency behaviors in late high school aged juveniles. The study utilized a more holistic operationalization of juvenile delinquency than previously applied by Fagan et al. (1987). Through the inclusion of both offending and substance use behaviors in the composite delinquency scale, Zhang et al. (2001) were able to replicate findings that adolescents who are victimized are more likely to engage in deviant lifestyles. Moreover, a stronger association was identified between victimization and delinquency than for either alcohol or illicit drug use. These findings were potentially consistent with Singer’s (1981; 1986) proposition that victimization experiences may increase offense and delinquency propensity as a form of retaliation.

Nofziger and Kurtz (2005) likewise explored the possible repercussions of juvenile exposure to violence and victimization, notably those of delinquency and offending behaviors. Utilizing a sample of high school aged juveniles, victimization was found to be a substantial risk factor for violent offending. In particular, being a victim of physical assault dramatically
increased the risk of offending by 226 percent compared to non-victimized students, similar to the findings of Singer (1981) and Sparks et al. (1977). Finally, Nofziger and Kurtz (2005) echo the remarks of Fagan et al. (1987) by stressing that the frequency, type, and nature of individual victimization is paramount in the interpretation of juvenile delinquency and offending behaviors.

The work of Smith and Ecob (2007) further strengthened the directional argument of victimization influencing offending behavior. Their study built upon the findings of Schwartz and Proctor (2000), suggesting that victims of crime or bullying are positively related to later offending, particularly bullying and fighting behaviors. Additionally, a marked increase in offending was observed over longitudinal analysis for those victimized juveniles. This suggests that early juvenile victimization may have long-lasting effects specific to delinquency and offending behaviors. This solidified the importance of studying youth victimization and facilitates a greater need for victimization prevention programming in schools.

Offender and Victim Relationship

The opposite directional assertion holds that individual offending and delinquency behaviors are positively correlated with victimization. This directional hypothesis has been the focus of a greater number of studies over the past twenty years and likely illustrates the most promising temporal link between the variables. Offenders serve as particularly vulnerable targets for victimization due in part to the potential to hold less than willing attitudes toward reporting their victimization to authorities (Lauritsen et al., 1991; Peterson, Taylor, & Esbensen, 2004; Sparks, 1982). This may be a repercussion of offenders’ fear of incriminating themselves in illicit activities or simply due to the perception that authorities will discredit or discount their victimization (Lauritsen et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2004; Sampson & Lauristen, 1990). These offender reservations regarding victimization reporting not only hinders victimization prevention
efforts, but leaves a segment of the population almost completely exposed to potential personal and property victimization.

Thornberry and Figlio (1974) were among of the first to explore the correlation between victimization and self-report and official delinquency among juveniles. While no directional relationship was observed, a general juvenile behavioral pattern was formulated. The juvenile experience is “typified by both commission of and victimization by various kinds of mild assaults and property offenses” (p. 109). Building upon the work of Thornberry and Figlio (1974) on juvenile delinquency, Jensen and Brownfield (1986) found that the juveniles most likely to be personally victimized were those who were most involved in crime. Particularly, participation in activities which involve recreational and social pursuits will increase overall victimization risk. Jensen and Brownfield (1986) stress their findings do not seek to ‘blame the victim’; rather, they note that delinquent youth engagement in recreational activities, or a general deviant lifestyle (Gottfredson, 1984), places them at a heightened risk of victimization.

In their 1990 work with the British Crime Survey, Sampson and Lauritsen similarly found that offense activity, whether violent or minor, is positively correlated with personal victimization risk. This proposition asserted that a general deviant lifestyle, indicated through involvement in unsupervised social activities, substance use, and peer affiliations, increases individual victimization risk (Baker et al., 1989; Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986).

Esbensen and Huizinga’s (1991) study of 11 to 15 year old students expanded the study of early aged juvenile delinquency and victimization. The authors observed that those juveniles reporting no delinquent activity reported the lowest level of victimization. Not only did their findings support a general deviant lifestyle’s impact on victimization risk (Baker et al., 1989; Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990), it also affirmed
that victimization risk correspondingly increased with each number of delinquent acts self-reported by juveniles (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990). The findings also indicated that age was positively related with victimization. In the study, 11 year olds reported the lowest rates of personal and property victimization. While others had reported an inverse relationship between age and victimization (Blyth, Thiel, Bush, & Simmons, 1980), Esbensen and Huzinga (1991) attributed the negative relationship to using a neighborhood sample as opposed to an in-school sample.

In an attempt to better understand the longitudinal effects of delinquent lifestyles on victimization risk, Lauritsen et al. (1991) analyzed juvenile subjects aged 11 to 17 through five waves from the National Youth Survey (NYS). While their findings illustrated some reciprocal relationship between victimization and delinquency (see Fagan et al., 1987; Singer 1981; 1986), delinquent lifestyle remained a largely significant predictor of risk of victimization. More specifically, involvement in a deviant or delinquent lifestyle considerably increases assault, robbery, larceny, and vandalism victimization.

Lauritsen et al.’s (1992) fusion of survey data from the NYS and Monitoring the Future focused on the impact of conventional and delinquent activities on juvenile risk for assault and robbery victimization. The findings illustrated that involvement in delinquent activities increased assault and robbery victimization approximately two to three times more than no involvement in delinquency. Involvement in conventional activities had only a minimal buffering effect on victimization once delinquency and demographic characteristics were introduced. Lauritsen et al.’s (1992) findings support the proposition that early intervention and prevention programming to reduce juvenile delinquency is the most significant way to decrease subsequent victimization.
Loeber et al. (1999) examined juvenile victims of homicide in the Pittsburg Youth Study. Their findings revealed that youth homicide victims tended to have histories of serious delinquency, weapon carrying behaviors, and illicit substance use and sale. This elaborated upon the findings of Lauritsen et al. (1992), showing that delinquent juveniles run an increased risk of personal victimization, specifically homicide. Further, association with delinquent peers, gang affiliation, and drug sales systematically contributed to a general deviant lifestyle thereby increasing victimization propensity (Baker et al., 1989; Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990).

Until Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta (1999), the bulk of offending and victimization analysis came from data collected in the United States or the United Kingdom. Breaking from this tradition, Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta (1999) measured lifetime victimization rates in an adult cohort (15 years and older) in the Netherlands. Their findings illustrate that the relationship between offending and victimization risk remains significant outside of the typical US and UK survey population. Engaging in delinquent activities greatly increases deviant lifestyle and thus increases risk of lifecourse victimization. The authors stress the essential nature of early intervention and delinquency prevention programming (Lauritsen et al., 1992). Deadman and MacDonald (2004) similarly studied victimization over the lifecourse and also found a strong relationship between both violent and non-violent offending and later victimization. Offenders experience an increased risk for violent victimization and larceny theft compared with non-offenders. These findings lend greater support to the proposition that delinquent and offending behaviors can have long reaching effects on individual victimization risk over the lifecourse.

Zhang et al, (2001) measured deviant lifestyle into a composite score based upon alcohol use, illicit drug use, and delinquent behavior. This composite measure of deviant lifestyle yielded
a significant link between delinquency and victimization risk. However, uncertain directionality begs the question of whether victimization increases propensity towards delinquency or vice versa. In general, the study lends questionable support to the proposal that deviant juvenile lifestyle will greatly facilitate victimization risk, due in part to the authors’ reservations of link directionality.

One of the more recent studies regarding the effects of delinquency on victimization risk utilized a sample of high school seniors from the Monitoring the Future survey (Plass & Carmody, 2005). The study tested the influence of delinquent and conventional activities on victimization. Conventional activities had little to no buffering effect on victimization once a single delinquent behavior was measured. Students who reported a single involvement in delinquent behavior saw an increase in violent victimization by as much as 3.5 times the rate of their non-delinquent peers. While substance use and risky public activities were significant, their influence on violent victimization was modest. These findings suggest that it is not only spending time in potentially dangerous settings or participating in substance use that makes a ‘risky’ or delinquent lifestyle, but rather the overall context in which these behaviors occur that significantly increase the risk of victimization.

Most recently, Smith and Ecob (2007) sampled students 12 to 17 years of age from the Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime. A clear link emerged between offending and delinquent behaviors and victimization risk, controlling demographic and delinquent lifestyle variables. This was most clearly illustrated through participation in bullying behaviors, which saw marked increases in crime and bullying victimization. Smith and Ecob (2007) also observed that offending increased individual victimization rates for up to two years later, lending support
to the proposition that delinquent behaviors can greatly influence lifecourse victimization rates (Deadman & MacDonald, 2004; Wittebrood & Nieuwbeerta, 1999).

**Gang Membership and Victimization Relationship**

Gangs have received a substantial amount of attention since the work of Thrasher (1927). While studies on gangs have increased, the majority of attention has been focused on the nature of gangs, their activities, and their delinquent involvement (Peterson et al., 2004). With one notable exception (Savitz, Rosen, & Lalli, 1980), studies have repeatedly replicated a positive correlation between gang membership and delinquent activities participation (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1993; Thornberry, Krohn, Lizotte, & Chard-Wierschem, 1993). Gang membership increases propensity toward delinquent involvement, suggesting that gang affiliation may systematically increase juvenile victimization risk (Peterson et al., 2004).

Gang members who participate in a deviant lifestyle may be more vulnerable to victimization (Baker et al., 1989; Gottfredson, 1984; Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Zhang et al., 2001). Members may make appealing targets for larceny or robbery due to potential possession of drugs, money, or weapons (Peterson et al., 2004). Gang members may hold an increased fear of reporting victimizations due to the possibility of criminal incrimination (Lauritsen et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2004; Sparks, 1982) or based upon the perceptions that authorities will discredit or ignore complaints (Peterson et al., 2004; Sampson & Lauristen, 1990). Membership may induce victimization in the form of rival gang retaliations (Peterson et al., 2004; Taylor, Peterson, Esbensen, & Freng, 2007). Additionally omnipresent is the risk of victimization from other members of the same gang, either through initiation rituals or through discipline actions for violations of internal rules and norms (Taylor et al., 2007). These factors all directly contribute to increased gang member vulnerability to victimization.
The first study to attempt to examine victimization risk of gang and non-gang juveniles was Savitz et al. (1980). The study yielded no significant relationship between gang membership and fear of crime or victimization rates. These findings, however, have been criticized as an artifact of the cohort (Peterson et al., 2004), notably because of the increased violent nature of gangs in the late 1980s and 1990s. In more recent studies greater support has been provided by findings based on nationally representative and contemporary sampling.

In one such study, Peterson et al. (2004) directly addressed the nature of gang affiliation and victimization. A clearly discernable relationship between gang membership and victimization was observed. In particular, gang membership for 12 to 16 year olds greatly enhanced violent victimization risk. A relationship was also observed between violent delinquency and violent victimization among the non-gang member population; however, gang membership significantly exacerbated juvenile victimization risk.

Most recently, Taylor et al. (2007) surveyed a sample of 8th grade juveniles to test correlations between gang affiliation, delinquency, and victimization risks. In general, gang members were found to be victims of serious violence more often than non-gang members. However, the magnitude of the differences between gang and non-gang members was moderate once risk factors were controlled for. Taylor et al. (2007) found that gang members had lower rates of general violent victimization, but had elevated rates of serious violent victimization. This suggests that gang membership insulated members from certain forms of personal victimization, while simultaneously enhancing other forms of victimization. These conflicting findings suggest that gang membership may not be the true culprit of exacerbated juvenile victimization rates; rather, gang membership helps to facilitate delinquency and exposure to risky situations. To curb gang affiliation and subsequent victimization, Peterson et al. (2004) and Taylor et al. (2007)
affirm the need for primary school victim prevention and gang education programming.

Educating juveniles about the elevated risk of serious victimization, whether directly correlated or otherwise, of gang affiliation should be vital in the reduction of gang membership.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

When addressing the nature of juvenile victimization and delinquent behavior, several criminological perspectives are utilized. The most commonly proposed theoretical explanations regarding juvenile victimization and delinquency are routine activities theory and lifestyles theory. While many studies concerning the victim-offender relationship utilize these perspectives interchangeably, this study addresses each perspective separately. In addition to routine activities theory and the lifestyles perspectives, crime pattern theory will similarly be applied to explore juvenile victimization to offending. Each perspective will be addressed regarding historic origin, theoretical application, and its application to juvenile victimization and delinquency.

Routine Activities Theory

The routine activities approach suggests that daily human activities, of both the offender and victim, are paramount in the creation of crime opportunities. The work of Cohen and Felson (1979) identifies that for crime to occur there must be a convergence in time and space of a suitable target, a motivated offender, and an absence of capable guardians. The absence of any of these three elements is sufficient to prevent the occurrence of, or negate the opportunity for, any criminal offense or victimization.

The application of routine activities theory focused primarily on property crime. Cohen and Felson (1979) found that an increase in property victimization in the United States was correlated with the rise in unoccupied suburban homes, due to the increased time that homeowners spent away from their homes. In the aftermath of World War II, more American households had become dual-earner incomes, which left many homes unoccupied and unguarded from property victimization during the working day. Further compounding this vulnerability was
the increased mobility and affordability of out-of-home recreational activities. The increased lack of guardianship over suburban homes greatly increased criminal opportunities and explains why property victimizations increased dramatically during this time.

Unlike other criminological perspectives, routine activities stresses that opportunity is paramount in the selection and commission of crime (Felson & Clarke, 1998; Lab, 2007). Felson and Clarke (1998) emphasize the importance of availability of suitable targets and focus on the risk of a target through VIVA. VIVA addresses the fact that the *value, inertia, visibility,* and *access* of a target will increase or decrease the risk of attempted criminal victimization. Value does not necessitate monetary value, but is determined by the offender. Inertia is concerned with the weight and portability of an item. Visibility suggests that an item must be readably visible in order for offenders to select the target. A victim’s property must be physically accessible in order to be victimized. The greater the extent a target meets the requirements of VIVA, the greater the likelihood of its victimization.

The VIVA model was later modified to CRAVED to address inherent limitations (Clarke, 1999). Modifications were implemented as a means of expanding the previous model to make it exclusively focused on the theft of ‘hot products’. CRAVED most efficiently addresses target characteristics and offender motivations for crime. This risk assessment finds six key elements systematically increase an item’s vulnerability for predatory victimization. Specifically, for an item to be considered a ‘hot product’, and therefore have an increased victimization risk, it must be: *concealable, removable, available, valuable, enjoyable,* and *disposable.* Clarke (1999) emphasizes that a target’s concealable, enjoyable, and disposable nature is the best predictor of increased victimization risk.
It is clear that routine activities theory has primarily been utilized as a means of explaining opportunities of property crime. Felson and Clarke’s (1998) VIVA model and Clarke’s (1999) CRAVED model are explicit in their application to larceny opportunities. However, the convergence in time of a motivated offender, suitable target, and an absence of capable guardians can be similarly applied to personal predatory crime (Clarke, 1999; Cohen, Kluegel, & Land, 1981; Doerner & Lab, 2005; Lab, 2007). Notably, predatory crimes such as robbery, sexual assault, and homicide can be greatly increased by victim decisions on where to go, what to do, and how to proceed (Doerner & Lab, 2005; Lab, 2007). The application of routine activities theory to both personal and property victimization has been the catalyst of more recent modifications to the theory.

The most recent modifications to routine activities theory has centered on the overarching absence of capable guardians. Eck (1994) stresses that an absence guardianship increases target suitability. In light of guardianship’s importance, it holds the most promise for a positive impact on controlling opportunities crime. Guardianship can occur over each of the three elements of the crime triangle: handlers over motivated offenders, guardians over suitable targets, and managers over potential crime locations (see Figure 1). Handlers of motivated offenders refers to individuals such as parents, friends, teachers, or parole officers who can exercise some influence over the offender. Guardians of suitable targets include target owners, friends, and authority figures such as police officers and teachers who can act as a protector of the person or property. Lastly, place managers include bar or club owners and managers, public transportation operators, and landlords who can take responsibility for controlling behavior in a specific location. These guardians can have a direct impact on crime through increased surveillance, limiting of offender movement and behavior, and increased protection of the target.
Eck’s (1994) expansion of the crime triangle to include capable guardianship for each element has been a significant adaptation of routine activities theory. Noting that the factors related to property crime are related to the likelihood of personal victimization (Lab, 2007), expansion of potential guardians is a positive attempt at crime and victimization prevention. Routine activities theory remains a relevant and applicable attempt at explaining crime opportunities and victimization in society.
Lifestyles Perspective

As victimization is not randomly distributed across space and time (Garofalo, 1987; Hindelang, Gottfredson, & Garofalo, 1978), lifestyles theory focuses on the activities of the victim as a potentially contributing factor in crime and victimization (Lab, 2005; Lab, 2007). Hindelang et al. (1978) postulate that daily routine behaviors, including vocational and leisure activities, form a lifestyle which directly influences the propensity of becoming a victim of crime. The lifestyles perspective aims to identify patterns of exposure to places and times as well as proximity and association with heightened risk offenders (Garofalo, 1987; Hindelang et al., 1978). If an individual’s lifestyle behaviors place him in an area where motivated offenders are present and capable guardians are absent, opportunities for victimization will be accordingly heightened (Whitehead & Lab, 2006).

Much like routine activities theory (Cohen & Felson, 1979), the lifestyles perspective assumes the omnipresence of motivated offenders (Garofalo, 1987). Furthermore, the perspective makes no attempt to explore unique offender motivations for offending (Garofalo, 1987). The lifestyles perspective’s aim is to identify behavior patterns which may be correlated with an increase in victimization risk (Garofalo, 1987). The theory suggests that an individual’s behavior, such as working or participating in recreational activities in a high crime area, can heighten victimization opportunities and the overall propensity for becoming a repeat victim. While the lifestyles perspective has primarily been utilized to explain personal crime, it is equally applicable for property crimes such as burglary, larceny, and auto theft (Garofalo, 1987; Hindelang et al., 1978).

Lifestyles theory holds that an individual’s lifestyle can facilitate opportunities for victimization; however, it is equally likely that individual lifestyle can similarly facilitate
opportunities to offend or commit delinquent acts. Lifestyles perspective is centered on the belief that patterned exposure to areas of higher crime and offenders with similar demographic characteristics (Garofalo, 1987; Hindelang et al., 1978) effect victimization risk. Victimization risk is increased by the greater proportion of time an individual spends with non-family members in public places, particularly at night (Hindelang et al., 1978). Conversely, it is logical to hold that this exposure and absence of guardians could potentially facilitate opportunities for offending and delinquent behavior (Lab, 2007). This suggests that individual lifestyle, molded through routine daily activities and interactions, not only facilitates victimization opportunities, but opportunities for crime and delinquent behavior.

While routine activities theory and the lifestyles perspective were created as two separate theoretical perspectives of crime and victimization opportunities, innate similarities between the two allow for the natural combination of the perspectives to offer a broader view of individual choice (Lab, 2007). Miethe and Meier (1994) postulate that routine activities theory and the lifestyle perspective are essentially the same theory, as they both focus around four central concepts to explain lifestyle and victimization risk. Proximity to crime, target attractiveness, and lack of guardianship all act as facilitators of crime opportunities, which are central to both perspectives. Furthermore, both assume a motivated offender and downplay social ecological contributions to crime (Miethe & Meier, 1994).

Crime Pattern Theory

Similar to routine activities theory and the lifestyles perspective, crime pattern theory holds that criminal behavior can be identified and best understood in terms to when and where crime occurs (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993b; Lab, 2007). Brantingham and Brantingham (1993b) hold that crime patterns can be identified through consideration of past experiences and
future intentions, molded by routine daily activities and lifestyles perspectives, and environmental factors. This can be best understood through the *environmental backcloth* and *social/crime template* of the unique offender. The environmental backcloth is specific to social, economic, cultural, and physical conditions in which people operate (Lab, 2007). The social/crime template is the anticipated expectations of what will happen in response to behavior in a specific time and place (Lab, 2007). Through understanding of the environmental backcloth and social/crime template, greater understanding of crime occurrence can be gained.

In the creation of the environmental backcloth and templates, daily routine activities serve as the primary method for information collection. Individuals construct *cognitive maps*, or mental descriptions, of the environment their daily operation (Smith & Patterson, 1980). These cognitive maps are created and maintained through four factors: recognition, prediction, evaluation, and action (Smith & Patterson, 1980). Recognition implies that an individual has knowledge of the common objects and features of an environment. Once recognition is gained, individuals then make connections between objects and behaviors, or simply predict about what a behavior will likely lead to in response. Evaluation is the act of using information collected in the earlier stages, determining what options are available, and deciding which have favorable and unfavorable consequences. Finally, the individual must make an informed choice as to the action to be taken. These four factors, taken together, illustrate that the cognitive map is merely a template for whether or not an individual will act upon a criminal opportunity.

With the increased necessity and availability of transportation in modern society, individual mobility has become an accepted norm. This increased individual mobility, due to affordability of personal and public transportation, has given citizens the opportunity to live, work, and participate in recreational activities in geographically separated areas. Each of these
areas is considered to be a node of activity, the commuting routes a path, and the edge or area of furthest familiarity along the cognitive map (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993b). Taken together, nodes and paths help to develop cognitive maps of surrounding areas. Increased knowledge of the environmental backcloth increases the likelihood of individual action for crime or delinquent acts.

Knowledge of the environmental backcloth is gained by two means. The primary means for gaining a cognitive map, for both legitimate and illegitimate purposes, is through daily routine activities, such as commuting to and from one's residence to place of employment. By going about normal activity, information about the environment backcloth can be acquired without prolonged time and effort (see Figure 2). A secondary means of creating a cognitive map of an area is gained through purposeful inspection and monitoring of a location. While this may be effective, the monitoring of a location through intentional loitering may risk recognition by legitimate area users and guardians. Aside from offending in nodes and paths, the edges of cognitive maps also serve as prime locations for crime and deviant behavior (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993a; Lab, 2007). This rise in deviant behavior is due in part to the knowledge of the environment, greater diversity of people and activities, reduced surveillance, and anonymity (Lab, 2007). Conversely, the likelihood of action, legitimate or criminal, diminishes in areas which are less known than around nodes and paths.

In some instances, nodes may act as either crime generators or crime attractors. Brantingham and Brantingham (1995; 2003) define crime generators as locations, or nodes, to which large numbers of people are attracted. Locations such as shopping malls, entertainment districts, ATMs, and schools can create criminal opportunities through the concentration of people or targets in a setting which may be conducive to criminal offending. These locations
include a mix of individuals, some of whom may be potential offenders, who did not come to the area for the purpose of criminal offending. However, if a criminal opportunity presents itself, these potential offenders may choose to take immediate or later-premeditated action.

Figure 2: Crime Pattern Cognitive Map

![Crime Pattern Cognitive Map](image)

**Figure 1.** Target choice behavior. ■, Awareness space; □, potential targets; ■, targets.


Crime attractors are locations where criminal opportunities are well known and motivated offenders purposefully seek out the location to capitalize through criminal acts (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1995; 2003). These locations can include bar districts, drug markets, red light districts, or insecure parking garages in business and commercial districts (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1995; 2003; Lab, 2007). Crimes in these locations are primarily committed by outsiders who will travel to the location based on its social reputation or their personal history there. Offenders will most likely engage in selective target hunting based on the availability of
victims or targets (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1995; 2003; Lab, 2007). While crime
generators and attractors are fundamentally different in their attraction of offenders to a specific
area, it is rare for a location to be exclusively one or the other. Most locations exhibit examples
of premeditated offending and spontaneous opportunistic crime.

Routine activities theory, lifestyles perspective, and crime pattern theory all attempt to
address the underlying factors contributing to offending and victimization risk. Each of these
theoretical perspectives is applicable to gaining a more holistic understanding of juvenile
offending and delinquency opportunities as well as victimization risk. The subsequent section
will discuss how these perspectives have driven research specific to the relationship between
juvenile offending and delinquent behaviors and victimization.

Juvenile Delinquency and Victimization: Theoretical Explanations

Despite juveniles’ increased risk of victimization, relatively few studies have attempted
to explore and explain the relationship between juvenile delinquency and victimization. As
juvenile victims and offenders are very much part of a homogenous population, this begs the
question of whether there is an influencing relationship between specific delinquency and
specific victimization. The present study aims to explore this question, looking first at the
theoretical rationale for an impact of specific delinquency on specific victimization.

Why would it be that specific offending and delinquent behavior would influence
juvenile victimization risk? Foremost, juvenile victims and offenders share similar demographic
and lifestyles profiles, suggesting that there is something about the daily routines and lifestyles
of the juvenile that influences frequency of delinquency and victimization. It is the influence of
‘delinquent lifestyle’ – engaging in offending behavior, increased participation in leisure
activities, and greater time spent away from home – which strikingly enhances both delinquency
and victimization opportunities. Juvenile lifestyle directly facilitates both delinquency and victimization opportunities by immersing youths in situations lacking capable guardians and with a greater proportion of motivated offenders. The lifestyles perspective and routine activities theory keenly compliment each other in explanation of why juveniles participating in specific delinquency will likely be victimized in a similar manner.

The lifestyle perspective generally holds that ‘delinquent lifestyle’ is greatly influenced by substance use. The acquisition and use of illicit substances greatly increases the number of situations where juveniles are outside the supervision of capable guardians as well as in closer proximity or direct contact with motivated offenders. The increased likelihood of being placed in such high risk situations, during either the acquisition or recreational use of substances, logically increases the opportunities for juvenile offending and victimization. Consistent with the lifestyle perspective, gang affiliation will further compound juvenile risk of engaging in a ‘delinquent lifestyle’. The daily routines and lifestyle of gang affiliated juveniles dramatically increases proximity to motivated offenders, i.e. fellow or rival gang members. Gang membership also increases the likelihood of being in locations and situations with the absence of capable guardians. Due to the heightened proximity to motivated and offenders and the absence of capable guardians, gang affiliated juveniles experience dramatically enhanced opportunities for both delinquency and victimization.

The amalgamation of the lifestyles perspective and routine activities theory seems the most founded theoretical explanation of a relationship between specific delinquency and specific victimization. The daily routines and interactions of juveniles forge a lifestyle which can be conducive to delinquency and victimization opportunities. Through the everyday interaction of juveniles engaged in a ‘delinquent lifestyle’, juveniles are increasingly thrust into situations
lacking capable guardians while being in more frequent proximity to motivated offenders. As delinquent juveniles are likely to associate with similar juveniles, it is logical to propose that specific delinquent behavior will directly facilitate similar victimization by their peers.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

General Research Design

From the findings of previous studies, it is clear that more research is needed on the link between delinquency and victimization. Knowledge of the correlations between specific delinquency and specific victimization has been limited by the scarcity of self-report surveys measuring both delinquency and victimization. The current study utilizes a unique survey where juveniles self-reported both their delinquent and victimization experiences. The study will attempt to identify specific relationships between juvenile delinquency and victimization. This chapter will detail the methodology used, the sample, the variables being analyzed, and the statistical analysis.

Study Location

The data utilized in this study were collected as part of a 1994 National Institute of Justice funded grant awarded to Steven P. Lab (Bowling Green State University) and Richard D. Clark (John Carroll University) from a sample of junior and senior high school students in a large Midwestern county (hereafter ‘Midwestern County’). The sample is comprised of ten school districts, containing public, private, and parochial schools. The total student population of the county was approximately 40,000 students and is reasonably representative of similarly composed counties in the United States.

At the time of the 1990 census, the Midwestern county population was 462,361, with a racial composition of 82% White and 15% Black. The county was largely urban, with 95% living within the confines of an urban area. Median income was $28,245, with 15% of citizens living below the poverty line. The unemployment rate was reported as 7.9% for males and 9% for
females, with more than 10% of citizens receiving some form of public assistance. Similar to other counties of its size and location, the largest employers are manufacturing, retail, and health and educational services.

The crime rate for Midwestern County was higher than other similarly sized counties in the state. However, the reported crime rate was lower than other cities in the United States with populations greater than 250,000. Lab and Clarke (1997) held that the sampled county is comparable and thus generalizable to other United States cities of similar size.

*Data Source and Sampling Procedures*

The primary aim of Lab and Clarke’s 1994 study was to ascertain the effectiveness of various discipline and control strategies within junior and senior high schools. The original study surveyed eight of the ten school districts in the county, the Catholic school system, and the largest of the private schools. School districts that did participate were a representative cross section of the county. Non-participating public school districts represented the richest, smallest, most exclusive schools located inside the city limits of the county seat of Midwestern County. Thus, the participating schools are most representative of other schools in the Midwestern county.

The 1994 study (Lab & Clarke, 1997) was able to obtain information from students at a total of 31 separate public schools. Of those 31 schools, 15 were public junior high schools and 16 were public high schools. The participating 15 public junior high schools represented 88% of all public junior high schools in Midwestern County. The participating 16 public high schools represented 89% of all public high schools in Midwestern County.

Lab and Clarke (1997) gathered data from 12 different parochial Catholic schools in the county. Midwestern County was comprised of 33 Catholic schools that educated 7th and 8th grade students as well as six schools that exclusively educated 9th through 12th grade students. Of those
six surveyed Catholic high schools, two were all boys schools and two were all girls schools. The original study was able to survey students in 24% of Catholic schools with 7th and 8th grade students (8 of 33) and 67% of high schools (4 of 6). One caveat specific to parochial schools which educate 7th and 8th grade students is that they also educate 1st though 6th grade students. This is uniquely different from public junior high schools which exclusively educate 7th and 8th grade students, with the occasional exception of 9th grade students being included.

The original sample consisted of three separate populations from each participating school: students, teachers, and principals (Lab & Clarke, 1997). For the purpose of this study, only self-reported survey results from students will be analyzed.

**Student Data**

Over 11,000 students in 7th through 12th grade were anonymously surveyed during a two week period in early 1994. The self-report surveys probed level of victimization in school as well as perception of violence, fear of crime, responses to victimization, delinquency activities, and school-based discipline/control policy and practice. This survey was conducted simultaneously with another survey that measured drug use and abuse levels, which had been conducted biannually in Midwestern County since 1990.

The selection of students to be surveyed was random and conducted by the individual schools. Each school received a packet of questionnaires for every teacher who taught a class which included 7th through 12th grade students. The two questionnaires were alternated in the packets so that half the class would receive the school victimization survey while the other half received the drug use and abuse survey. On the testing date, the school would select a class period and each teacher who taught a class involving 7th through 12th grade students would
administer the surveys. Once administered, the completed surveys were placed in a sealed envelope and returned to the school administration office (Lab & Clarke, 1997).

The school victimization survey contained items on respondent demographics, school discipline/control procedures, victimization both at school and on the way to and from school, fear and avoidance behaviors, gang affiliation, possession of weapons for protection, delinquent activities, and several other topics. These survey questions were closed ended and printed on Scantron forms. Students were asked to answer all questions in relation to “since school started this year,” which covered an approximately six month window of self-report victimization and behavior.

Over 11,000 surveys were administered and returned for analysis. Surveys with missing school codes, inaccurate grade levels, or inconsistent or plainly erroneous information were excluded from analysis. This natural attrition yielded 11,085 usable surveys, which represents approximately 35% of the students in each of the participating schools. The surveyed population revealed only minor variance compared to grade level, sex, and racial distribution for each of the schools. Furthermore, the drug use and abuse survey similarly revealed only minor variance. Lab and Clarke (1997) concluded that despite minor demographic variance, the data were representative of the participating schools.

One potential limitation with the original study’s sampling procedure was the inability to survey students who were absent, refused to answer, had dropped out of school, or were in classes where the teacher had elected not to administer the survey. As survey packets were created for each individual class, unused packets were clearly identifiable. There was no evidence of teacher resistance to administration of the survey. However, the concerns of students being absent, refusing to answer, or dropping out of formal education are not as easily addressed.
Confidentiality and anonymity requirements did not allow for any tracking and follow up with non-participating students. These limitations are consistent with most in-school surveys and difficult to circumvent. However, insignificant variance observed between the surveyed and non-surveyed population demographics suggests that the data are representative in nature.

Table 1: Student Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4,981</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,974</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11th</td>
<td></td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th</td>
<td></td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8,281</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Amer.</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,649</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Variables

*Dependent Variables*

The dependent variables in this study were the level of in-school specific victimization of students. The students were surveyed regarding assault, robbery, and larceny/theft victimization. Victimization was measured at the ordinal level. Specific in-school victimization was measured on a five point Likert scale: (1) Never, (2) Once, (3) 2-3 times, (4) 4-5 times, (5) 6+ times.
Independent Variables

The primary independent variables of this study were specific self-reported delinquent behaviors: assault, robbery, and larceny/theft offending behaviors. These offending behaviors were measured at the ordinal level. Each measure of juvenile offending behaviors was measured on a six point Likert scale: (1) Never, (2) Once or Twice, (3) Once a month, (4) Once every 2-3 weeks, (5) Once a week, (6) More than once a week. Specific offending behavior was measured through composite scores of multiple questions. The Assault Offending composite scale is a simple additive scale of questions regarding frequency of assaulting a teacher, fighting, group fighting, aggravated assault on another, and assault with a gun. The Robbery Offending composite scale is an additive scale of frequency of robbing and theft with a gun. Finally, the Theft Offending composite scale is an additive scale of frequency of committing a theft under $50 and theft over $50.

Substance use behaviors were similarly explored for their potential contribution to an overall delinquent lifestyle. Students were asked to report their substance use for the following: alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, pills, inhalants, LSD, cigarettes/tobacco, and other illicit drugs. Each measure of specific substance use were measured on a six point Likert scale: (1) Never, (2) Once or Twice, (3) Once a month, (4) Once every 2-3 weeks, (5) Once a week, (6) More than once a week. In this study, substance use was measured as frequency of alcohol use and a composite score of other substance use. The other substance use composite score was created through an additive scale based on questions of frequency of marijuana, cocaine, pills, inhalants, LSD, and other illicit drug use. Cigarettes/tobacco use was excluded from the other substance use category due to the lack of psychopharmacological link to juvenile delinquency.
Gang affiliation was also measured as a potential facilitator of juvenile victimization. Affiliation was measured in a nominal dichotomized manner through a survey question asking whether a student ‘belonged to a gang’.

Control Variables

Several variables were considered in an attempt to control for their potential impact on delinquent behavior. Those variables were sex/gender, age, and race/ethnicity. Each of these control variables were examined during the analysis of the relationship between specific delinquency and specific victimization.

Hypotheses

Based on previous research findings and the availability of juvenile self-report delinquency and victimization data from the National Institute of Justice study, several hypotheses were proposed. In total, five different hypotheses were tested specific to whether specific delinquent behaviors subsequently impact specific victimization.

(H1) Assault behaviors will increase assault victimization more than other forms of victimization

(H2) Robbery behaviors will increase robbery victimization more than other forms of victimization

(H3) Theft behaviors will increase theft victimization more than other forms of victimization

(H4) Substance use will increase all forms of victimization

(H5) Gang affiliation will increase all forms of victimization
Statistical Analysis

For the purpose of this study, the primary method of analysis is multivariate linear regression. The study utilized a stepwise linear regression approach to explore the contribution of the independent variables. The first step included demographic characteristics (sex/gender, age, and race/ethnicity), gang affiliation, and substance use (alcohol and other illicit substance use). The second step included assault, robbery, and theft offending behaviors. Stepwise regression allows comparison of the explained variance for each group of independent variables. Further, this statistical method allows for comparisons of the total explained variance (adjusted $R^2$) of the model in predicting different forms of victimization.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The study utilizes stepwise linear regression techniques to understand the influence of the control and independent variables on specific victimization experiences. Stepwise regression forced demographic, gang affiliation, substance use, and offending variables sequentially into the equation. This allowed for inspection of what each variable contributed to the model, through comparison of the Adjusted R². For the purposes of this analysis, the Adjusted R² measures were compared for two steps. The first step included demographic characteristics, self-identified gang affiliation, and substance use. The second step included assault, robbery, and theft offending behaviors. The Adjusted R² serves as an indication of the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables of interest, or the overall prediction of the model.

Table 2 represents the results for assault victimization. The findings show that participation in assault offending (B = .255) has the greatest influence on the propensity to suffer an assault victimization. This is determined by the fact that it has the largest standardized regression coefficient. Also significant for assault victimization, but to a lesser extent, is the frequency of other substance use (B = .129) and theft offending (B = .063).

Additionally, Table 2 illustrates a marked increase in the Adjusted R² between the first and second steps. The first step forced in demographic characteristics, self-identified gang affiliation, and substance use and had an Adjusted R² of .113. The second step, which forced in offending behaviors, increased the Adjusted R² to .151. This marked increase in the Adjusted R² illustrates that offense behaviors influence the predictive power of the model.
Table 2: Assault Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients (b)</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients (B)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Affiliation</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Substance Use</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault Offending</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Offending</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Offending</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next analysis explored the impact of control and independent variables on robbery victimization (see Table 3). The findings illustrate that self-reported participation in assault offending (B = .237) has the largest influence on the likelihood of robbery victimization. Other influential variables include frequency of other substance use (B = .123), participation in theft offending (B = .060), and participation in robbery offending (B = .049).

The Adjusted R² of robbery victimization similarly indicates an increase between the first and second steps. The first step yields an Adjusted R² of .130, while the second step yields an Adjusted R² of .182. Robbery victimization experiences the largest increase in the Adjusted R² once offending behavior is forced into the equation. This suggests that robbery victimization, of all three forms of victimization, is best explained by offending behaviors.

The third analysis explored the impact of control and independent variables on theft victimization (see Table 4). The findings depict that participation in theft offending (B = .183) is the most influential factor in increasing the propensity of theft victimization. Also influential, but to a lesser extent, is assault offending (B = .163), other substance use (B = .063), and alcohol use...
(B = .044). Conversely, robbery offending (B = -.132) serves as an influential buffer to theft victimization.

Table 3: Robbery Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients (b)</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients (B)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Affiliation</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Substance Use</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault Offending</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Offending</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Offending</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Theft Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients (b)</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients (B)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Affiliation</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Substance Use</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault Offending</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Offending</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Offending</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Adjusted R² of theft victimization similarly indicates an increase between the first and second steps. The Adjusted R² of the first step is .069, while the Adjusted R² of the second step is .095. This increase illustrates that some variance in theft victimization is explained by
offending behaviors. However, the limited strength of the Adjusted R² in the model suggests that theft victimization may be a general youth phenomena, influenced less by delinquent lifestyle.

Frequency of alcohol use and specific victimization (see Tables 2-4) seems to have mixed results. Self-reported alcohol use is negatively related to assault victimization (B = -.040) and robbery victimization (B = -.036). Conversely, alcohol use positively influences theft victimization (B = .044). Despite the findings, self-reported alcohol use is a weak predictor of all forms of victimization due to the small Beta weights.

The findings of frequency of other substance use and specific victimization (see Tables 2-4) are more directionally consistent. The composite measure of other substance use - marijuana, cocaine, pills, inhalants, LSD, and other illicit drugs – is found to be positively related to assault (B = .129), robbery (B = .123), and theft victimization (B = .063).

The influence of gang affiliation on specific victimization is less clear. Self-reported gang affiliation is found to have a significant negative relationship with robbery victimization (B = -.019). Despite failing to reach significance levels of .05, gang affiliation is also negatively related to both assault (B = -.007) and theft victimization (B = -.017).

It is also worth mentioning that, despite being a study control variable, age had a clear relationship with all forms of victimization. Juvenile age was the third strongest relationship between assault (B = -.100) and robbery victimization (B = -.064) and the fourth strongest for theft victimization (B = -.118). The study finds a clear inverse relationship between age and victimization that is consistent across all forms of victimization.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The present study explored whether specific offending behavior contributed to specific victimization experiences in a juvenile population. It also sought to understand whether substance use and gang affiliation influenced specific victimization experiences, by contributing to a delinquent or risky lifestyle.

The findings illustrate that $H_1$ – assault offending will increase assault victimization more than any other form of offending – is supported. Self-reported assault offending is positively related to a marked increase in assault victimization, more than any other form of delinquency. While theft offending is significantly related to assault victimization, the standardized coefficient is significantly smaller than that for assault offending. Additionally, despite not reaching statistical significance, a negative relationship is observed between robbery offending and assault victimization. This buffering relationship should be further explored in future research.

These findings are similar to those of previous studies which have attempted to better understand the impact of violent offending behavior, specifically assault offending, on specific victimization experiences. Prior research has uncovered a link between violent delinquency and a significant rise in assault victimization (Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen et al., 1991; 1992). Lauritsen et al. (1991; 1992) found that 45% of those who had reported delinquent behavior experienced assault victimization, compared to only 12% of the non-delinquent population. Most similar to the current study’s findings, Esbensen and Huizinga (1991) found that 86% of juveniles who engaged in assault offending two or more times suffered increased assault victimization. Through the combined findings of previous research and the current study,
participation in assault offending is perhaps the strongest predictor of assault victimization and must be addressed accordingly in crime and victimization prevention programming.

The current research fails to support H2 – robbery offending will increase robbery victimization more than any other form of offending. While robbery offending is a significant predictor of robbery victimization, assault offending remains the most influential predictor. Assault offending is a better predictor of robbery victimization due to the larger Beta weight. Robbery offending, while not as strong as either assault of theft offending, is likewise positively related to the propensity for robbery victimization. However, robbery victimization is a weaker predictor of robbery victimization due to the smaller Beta weight.

Previous research is scant in relation to the impact of offending behavior and subsequent rates of robbery victimization. Lauritsen et al. (1991; 1992) studied the impact of delinquent behavior on self-reported robbery victimization of juveniles. The findings illustrate that increased frequency of delinquent activities is the most significant predictor of increased robbery victimization. However, the present study, by isolating specific offending behavior, has been able to identify that robbery victimization is influenced least by participation in robbery offending behavior, but most significantly by participation in assaultive offending behavior. This finding suggests that assault offending behavior may be most predictive of the delinquent lifestyle explored in previous research.

The current study finds that H3– theft offending will increase theft victimization more than any other form of offending – is supported. The results indicate that theft offending explains the greatest proportion of variance in the model, compared to all other forms of offending behavior. While assault offending does remain an influential predictor of theft victimization, it does not explain as much as theft offending. Conversely, the study indicates that robbery
offending is negatively related theft victimization. This negative relationship between robbery offending and theft victimization should be explored in future research.

Prior research specific to the impact of delinquency on larceny/theft victimization has yielded convoluted findings. Lauritsen et al. (1991) found only marginal differences in theft victimization from delinquent and non-delinquent students. Moreover, Esbensen and Huizinga (1991) found that participating in theft offense behavior only slightly increased the likelihood of theft victimization. Conversely, other studies have found that increased delinquency significantly influences increased theft victimization (Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998). Specifically, Jensen and Brownfield (1986) found that increases in property offending behaviors explained the greatest variance on theft victimization. The findings of Jensen and Brownfield (1986) are echoed in the current study, when theft offending remains the best predictor of theft victimization in the juvenile sample.

The broadest assertion of H4 – substance use will increase all forms of victimization – is both supported and refuted. Alcohol, being the most commonly utilized substance for experimental use (51.2% of the sample had tried alcohol at least once), is positively related with an increase in theft victimization. Despite reaching statistical significance, alcohol use remains a weak predictor of theft victimization due to the small Beta weight (B = .044). Self-reported alcohol use is also negatively related to assault and robbery victimization. However, alcohol use still remains a weak predictor of assault and robbery victimization due to low Beta weights (B = -.040 and B = -.036). Based on the study findings, H4 is rejected, specific to alcohol use, as only theft victimization saw a marked increase in occurrence.

Previous studies have predominately indicated that alcohol use is significantly correlated with marked increases in victimization experiences. In particular, the likelihood of personal
victimization significantly increases specific to frequency of alcohol consumption (Jensen & Brownfield, 1986; Lauritsen et al., 1992; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990). Specifically, juvenile alcohol use has been found to be a significant predictor of assault (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Lauritsen et al., 1992) and robbery victimization (Lauritsen et al., 1992). However, Lauritsen et al. (1991) found that juvenile alcohol use provided a weak and insignificant effect on victimization risk. The present study found that alcohol use, while significant, explains only a small proportion of the variance in all forms of victimization. Interestingly, alcohol consumption is negatively correlated with both assault and robbery victimization. These findings are a break in the widely proposed belief that alcohol use is highly correlated with general delinquency and thus victimization.

Conversely, the findings of the study support H₄ specific to other substance use (marijuana, pills, inhalants, LSD, and other illicit substances) and a corresponding increase in all forms of victimization. Other substance use is the second strongest predictor of both assault ($B = .129$) and robbery victimization ($B = .123$) and the third strongest for theft victimization ($B = .063$). These findings illustrate that substance use, apart from alcohol and tobacco use, serves as a significant predictors of juvenile victimization.

In past studies of victimization, the predominate proposition has been that substance use is a significant predictor of increased victimization risk. Abstinence from substance use has been routinely found to reduce the risk of general victimization (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Gottfredson, 1986). Studies have repeatedly found that those who engage in substance use risk increased personal victimization (Lauritsen et al., 1992; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1990). Specifically, marijuana use has been found to significantly increase assault and robbery victimization (Lauritsen et al., 1992) as well as minor theft victimization (Mustaine
& Tewksbury, 1998). However, the study of use of marijuana as the primary substance variable of interest, specific to victimization, may oversimplify juvenile drug use. The present study included marijuana, pills, inhalants, LSD, and other illicit substances in the composite measures of other substance use and was able to gain highly significant correlations to specific victimization. The current findings illustrate that substance use, when expanded beyond marijuana use, is one of the most significant correlates of both assault and robbery victimization. This finding is of great significance in the creation and execution of effective school-based victimization prevention programming.

Finally, the present study indicates that $H_5$—gang affiliation will increase all forms of victimization— is unsupported. Gang affiliation was found to be significant only for robbery victimization and the direction of the relationship was contrary to the hypothesis ($B = -.019$). While gang affiliation failed to reach an acceptable level of significance for assault or theft victimization, the findings suggest that gang affiliation is negatively correlated to all forms of victimization. At least in the present study, it appears that gang affiliation (approximately 10% of juveniles in the sample claim affiliation) may buffer all forms of specific victimization.

Due to gang members’ increased propensity towards delinquency, research has repeatedly suggested that gang affiliation will greatly increase violent personal victimization (Peterson et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007). However, recent research has indicated that gang affiliation itself may not be the culprit behind enhanced victimization risk, once other risk factors are controlled (Taylor et al., 2007). Moreover, Taylor et al. (2007) found that while gang affiliation may facilitate placement of members in higher risk situation, members may actually be insulated from certain forms of victimization. The current study similarly found that gang affiliation, while not always statistically significant, is negatively correlated with all forms of
victimization. This finding should not suggest that gang affiliation definitively insulates membership from victimization; rather, gang affiliation is a moot factor after controlling for offending and substance use behaviors.

The present study found a clearly inverse relationship between age and all forms of victimization. Despite being utilized as a control variable, the beta weights of age on all forms of victimization were some of the strongest. However, this and other studies’ findings of a negative relationship between age and victimization may be confounded due to reliance on in-school surveys (Blyth et al., 1980; Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991). This is consistent with the proposition that the most delinquent older juveniles either voluntarily drop out of school or are involuntarily expelled due to delinquent lifestyles, and thereby are excluded from the in-school survey. It remains uncertain whether the inverse relationship uncovered in the present study is meaningful or an artifact of the potential bias of an in-school survey.

The findings of the current study have illustrated that certain specific offending behaviors are correlated with specific victimization experiences. Furthermore, alcohol use and gang affiliation did not predict of victimization risk; rather alcohol use and gang affiliation exhibit some buffering capacity against specific forms of victimization. Finally, other substance use (marijuana, cocaine, pills, inhalants, LSD, and other illicit substances) increases all forms of victimization. These findings, while consistent with theoretical explanations specific to juvenile victimization risk, are both consistent and inconsistent with previous research findings specific to substance use and gang membership.

As suggested by routine activities theory and the lifestyles perspective, the findings support the premise that juvenile involvement in offending behaviors is associated with an increased risk of victimization. The present study expanded this principal by exploring
correlations between specific offending behavior and corresponding victimization risk. In all but robbery victimization, a positive relationship was observed between the specific type of offending behavior and corresponding victimization risk. This finding is consistent with routine activities theory and the lifestyles perspective. It is most likely that juveniles will fall victim to the form of offending in which they actively participate through association with peers who engage in similar offending behaviors.

Findings of a positive relationship between other substance use and all forms of victimization gives further support to the proposition that through a ‘delinquent or risky lifestyle’ juveniles are more prone to victimization. Through the requisition and use of illicit substances, juveniles will likely place themselves in situations in which they will encounter a greater proportion of motivated offenders and a general absence of capable guardians. This convergence of the three major elements of routine activities theory explains why use of other illicit substances increases all forms of juvenile victimization.

The principles of the lifestyles perspective illuminate how gang affiliation may in some ways buffer victimization of members. Gang allegiance may encourage interaction solely within the gang and away from non-gang members. This social isolation of gang members may insulate members from specific forms of victimization. This is consistent within the premise of the lifestyles perspective, in that an individual’s everyday lifestyle or routine can facilitate or in this instance buffer opportunities for victimization.
CHAPTER VI

LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH:

Limitations

The present study does have several notable methodological limitations. Foremost, the cross-sectional nature of the study does not allow for the determination of time-order between offending and victimization. The nature of the study was to attempt to uncover relationships between offending behavior and victimization experiences; however, in no way should causation be inferred, as the study operates under the theoretical assumption that delinquent lifestyles facilitate victimization. This temporal order has been the focus of a great number of studies as offenders are particularly vulnerable targets due to heightened interaction with offender populations and reduced rates of reporting victimization to school or law enforcement authorities.

Further, the nature of an in-school self-report survey inherently suffers from an inability to sample chronically sick or truant students, the non-response bias from students who elected not to complete the survey, and deliberate inaccuracy on survey questions due to malicious intent by students or fear of disciplinary repercussions. Complicating the issue of in-school surveying of students is the possibility that overly fearful or repeatedly victimized students may intentionally feign illness or skip school to avoid their victimizers. Non-response bias is always a fundamental problem with in-school sampling; however, the student demographics of the sample and school population were similar enough to believe that the sample was not compromised by non-response bias.

Further limiting the study, juvenile victimization does not begin and end at the school bell; rather victimization can occur in transit, at work, or at home. The present study explicitly limited data to in-school victimization based the desire to provide practical policy suggestions
for school-based programming. Despite these inherent methodological limitations of in-school surveys, the study findings remain empirically founded and are able to provide generalizable information for practical programming implications.

Conclusions

The present study has been instrumental in providing greater insight into the complex relationship between juvenile offending and victimization. Through the study of specific delinquency and corresponding rates of specific victimization, a better understanding of the lifestyle surrounding juvenile delinquency has been gained. The research has exposed a significant link between assault offending and assault victimization as well as theft offending and theft victimization. The findings are consistent with routine activities theory and the lifestyles perspective, in that those who offend likely associate with other similar offenders. It is also likely that juveniles associate with delinquent peers in situations lacking capable guardians, such as parents and teachers, which increase the likelihood of victimization. Juveniles who immerse themselves into a delinquent lifestyle specific to a certain form of offending behavior, with the notable exception of robbery offending, should consistently find they are victimized in the same fashion.

Uniquely, juveniles who participate in assault offending have strikingly enhanced overall victimization risks. This finding suggests that assault offending is most illustrative of a ‘delinquent lifestyle’, as personal and property victimization both increase accordingly. Through the recognition and understanding of the relationship between specific offending behaviors and victimization risk, more targeted and effective prevention programming can be implemented. These findings suggest that for victimization prevention programming to be most effective, equal attention must be paid to prevention of delinquent behavior.
In addition to offense specific correlations with victimization, the findings have provided greatly significant insight into the risks of juvenile substance use. The present study has found that alcohol use, at least in this specific sample population, is not related to any specific form of victimization. However, this may be an artifact of how many students in the sample had experimented with alcohol or that victimization is a risk associated with less readily available and socially unacceptable substances. The finding that other substance use (marijuana, cocaine, pills, inhalants, LSD, and other illicit substances) is strongly correlated with assault and robbery victimization gives great insight into the victimization opportunities facilitated by a substance using lifestyle. An understanding of which illicit substances greatly facilitate victimization opportunities presents unique opportunities for schools and social agencies to better target victimization prevention programming at problematic substance using populations.

The finding that other substance use directly influences assault and robbery victimization is also consistent with both routine activities theory and the lifestyles perspective. Due to the illicit nature of the drugs in the composite measure of other substance use, it is necessary that drug purchases and use be done in the absence of capable guardianship. This requirement for isolation from formal guardianship directly increases the likelihood of the convergence of the routine activities crime triangle. Moreover, juveniles who participate in socially unacceptable substance use will likely associate with other delinquent substance using peers. This interaction with similarly delinquent peers in situations with the absence of formal guardianship directly facilitates a ‘delinquent lifestyle’ which influences victimization risk.

Lastly, the findings specific to self-identified gang members is most unique. At first examination, the application of routine activities theory to gang affiliation would place gang members in proximity to other offenders in situations lacking capable guardianship, thus
increasing victimization risk. However, the findings of this study are directly contrary to this assertion. The findings instead suggest that the so-called ‘delinquent lifestyle’, facilitated through gang affiliation, buffers all forms of victimization. Upon further inspection, the findings are consistent with the lifestyles perspective in that gang members are insulated in their social interactions. Gang members, in this sample, may be discouraged from interaction with any but fellow gang members. This constant interaction with fellow gang members increases capable guardianship and insulates the membership from various forms of victimization. However, it is of great importance to stress these findings do not imply that gang membership is directly related to decreased victimization risk. These finding, while in some ways consistent with both routine activities theory and the lifestyles perspective, may be an artifact of the sample population.

The natural solution to solving in-school juvenile victimization rates has historically been to lock-down school buildings, install metal detectors, and utilize harshly punitive disciplinary practices. However, it is important to stress that the current findings illustrate that victims and offenders are not mutually exclusive groups. The overlap of victim and offender groups is an important factor to address when attempting to construct and implement prevention and intervention programming. By selecting and implementing programming that addresses the victim/offender overlap, victimizations and delinquency can be forestalled and quality of life improved for students in school.

The findings in the present study suggest that assault offending is positively related to all forms of victimization. In light of these findings, it seems prudent that schools focus on improving student quality of life through programming that targets dispute resolution. Conflict mediation programs stress appropriate responses to conflict as well as how to avoid violent altercations. The instruction of problem-solving techniques and utilization of peer mediation to
resolve conflicts between two parties has been found to help to reduce violent crime in participating schools (Lab, 2007). Dispute resolution programming, including the *Gang Resistance Education and Training* (G.R.E.A.T.) program, seek to reduce delinquency and victimization as well as remedy the victim/offender overlap predominately in juvenile populations. Utilizing programming that addresses juvenile tendencies to resort to violent altercations to solve disputes, will likely lead to reductions in all forms of victimization in and out of the school grounds.

When addressing the relationship between theft offending and theft victimization, schools may wish to utilize classic target hardening techniques. As most instances of theft involve an unknown offender, dispute resolution programming may miss the mark on preventing this form of victimization. Target hardening techniques can be effective in reducing opportunities for theft offending. Increased guardianship, through faculty, staff, or student hall monitoring may decrease offending opportunities. A school-wide discouraging of bringing personal valuables to school and encouraging of the secure locking of personal lockers may also reduce the amount of opportunities for theft offending. These basic, and cost efficient, target hardening principles may help to prevent widespread juvenile theft victimization in schools.

Schools have been placed in the unique position to both educate as well as attempt to address behavioral and emotional concerns stemming from substance use. The present study’s affirmation that other substance use (marijuana, cocaine, pills, inhalants, LSD, and other illicit substances) is a significant contributor to of all forms of victimization only reaffirms the need for targeted programming to address the drug problem. Numerous schools currently utilize the widely popular *Drug Abuse Resistance Education* (D.A.R.E.) programs. Despite mixed
effectiveness findings (Lab, 2007), D.A.R.E.’s emphasis of social skills training may be most promising.

Social or life skills training programs aim to incorporate basic personal and social skills development as well as specific resistance skills aimed at substance use issues. The focus of the program is teaching students to be independent, make decisions, and resist poor life decisions. This form of programming has received positive evaluations of effectiveness in addition to being a more cost efficient alternative for schools (Lab, 2007). Programming which addresses underlying social deficiencies of juveniles should improve reliance on substances as a coping mechanism as well as aid in delinquency and victimization prevention.

Another feasible alternative is increased monitoring of drug related disciplinary infractions by the schools. While it may appear in the best interest of a student for a teacher to simply dispose of the confiscated dime-bag of marijuana, it may be better to report the juvenile to the school administration and local law enforcement. By involving the juvenile justice system in the drug infraction, it is more likely that the juvenile will gain needed treatment or counseling to address underlying problems. While this suggestion may be met by teacher and administrator resistance, it is important to stress that a juvenile’s victimization risk is strongly linked to sustained substance use. By allowing the juvenile justice system to attempt to address the problems underlying juvenile substance use, schools may be able to reduce not only substance use and abuse but also all forms of victimization.

Future Research

This study’s findings illustrate that specific offending is differentially correlated with specific victimization experiences. Due to the limited research on this subject, future research must expand measures beyond general delinquency and general victimization. Expanded
surveying of juvenile total victimization experiences is also necessary. Identification of when and where juvenile victimizations are occurring – in-school, in transit, at work, at home, during leisure activities – will help school and law enforcement officials to identify and better defuse crime generators and attractors.

Greater understanding of the daily routines of the most victimized juveniles should also be expanded through greater measures of delinquent lifestyles. Increased measures of the frequency of nights spent away from home, hanging out in bars/dance clubs, substance use, joyriding, and other social entertainment adolescents are engaged in will best illustrate the ‘delinquent lifestyle’ (Lauritsen et al., 1991). Understanding of the most problematic and most prosocial activities in which adolescents engage should positively influence in-school delinquency and victimization prevention programming.

Increased study into other juvenile substance use is imperative. One area for future research is the location of adolescent substance use. The current study was not able to determine whether substance use was occurring in or outside of school grounds. When substances were being used, such as during the weekend or school-week, could provide strong indicators of use dependence and delinquent lifestyle. Future research should address clustering substance use into composite measures based on psychopharmacological effects, such as stimulants, depressants, and hallucinogens. These suggestions should greatly increase knowledge of juvenile drug use and abuse as well as give meaningful insight into the juvenile substance using lifestyle.

Future research should increasingly explore the influence of gang affiliation on victimization experiences. Expansion of the measure of gang affiliation should be expanded in future studies. Asking students whether they current are or have ever been a member of a gang is an adequate way of measuring not just active gang membership, but also those that have ever
been gang affiliated (Peterson, Miller, & Esbensen, 2001). Also, greater information should be collected on gang participation and delinquent activities. The increased measure of gang participation in initiation rituals (such as jumping in), group assault, group robbery, organized theft, drug sales, and gun sales is vital to accurately measuring the relationship between specific offending behaviors and specific victimization.

These suggestions for future research should adequately address some of the study’s limitations as well as build upon the findings of other juvenile victimization research pieces. By stressing increased measure and inspection in juvenile lifestyles, future research can better identify specific offending and delinquent behaviors that may directly increase juvenile victimization risk.
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