

139313

MOTIVES FOR CRIME AND SELF-IMAGE AMONG A SAMPLE  
OF CONVICTED FELONS

NCJRS

NOV. 6 1992

ACQUISITIONS

Ineke Haen Marshall and Julie Horney

Department of Criminal Justice

University of Nebraska at Omaha

DRAFT

Paper prepared for presentation at the American Society of Criminology meeting in San Francisco, November 1991. This manuscript is based on work supported by grant number 89-IJ-CX-0030 from the National Institute of Justice, by a grant from the Urban Conditions Program of the College of Public Affairs and Community Service at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and by the University Committee on Research of the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

139313

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

## INTRODUCTION

There are many ways in which criminologists have attempted to develop explanatory theories of offending. One approach to the complicated question of the etiology of crime is the examination of the explanations for their behavior provided by the law violators themselves. Needless to say, self-reported reasons for behavior are quite distinct from the structural conditions which may be causally related to criminality. Quite possibly, self-reported reasons for criminality may simply represent justifications or after-the-fact rationalizations rather than genuine motives effectively involved in triggering the criminal involvement. Their questionable criminogenic status notwithstanding, self-reported reasons for criminal involvement provide an unique insight into the social-psychological functioning of offenders.

The present study is also interested in a related social-psychological concept central to criminological theorizing--that of deviant or criminal self-identification or self-image (cf. Schur, 1967). Although it is the primary goal of this paper to explore the self-reported reasons for crime provided by a sample of 1,061 convicted Nebraska prison inmates, a second objective is to examine the different types of self-identification provided by this inmate sample. The present study is exploratory in nature--its main concern is to simply describe the empirical observations with regard to self-reported reasons for crime and self-identification in a sample of convicted felons. However, in this paper, we also do begin to examine whether different offender types may be distinguished with regard to self-reported reasons for criminal involvement as well as with regard to self-concept.

## METHODOLOGY

The data presented here come from two self-report studies (Horney and Marshall, 1991; Horney and Marshall, 1992). Interviews were conducted with a total of 1,103 convicted male offenders sentenced to the Nebraska Department of Corrections.<sup>1</sup>

Usually within one week of the time inmates were admitted to the Diagnostic and Evaluation Unit, they were brought to a private visiting room to meet with an interviewer to have the study explained. The interviewer gave a brief explanation of the study and then read aloud an informed consent form, after which the inmate could either sign the form and proceed with the interview or return to his unit or other activity.<sup>2</sup>

The present analysis is based on information from 1,061 inmates (the 43 cases with incomplete information were not used). Table 1

presents socio-demographic and legal background information on the sample.

#### DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Criminal involvement. Part of each interview was a modified version of the instrument used in the RAND Corporation's Second Inmate Survey (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982). Our modifications, which included a three-year reference period, a more detailed calendar system, and month-by-month reporting of criminal behavior were intended to produce more accurate estimates of ~~the~~ the individual frequency of committing criminal offenses (Horney and Marshall, 1991). We asked respondents to consider a three-year reference period immediately preceding the arrest for the offense from which the current incarceration followed. For that period we asked them about the frequency of criminal activity for nine different crimes: burglary, business robbery, personal robbery, assault, theft, auto theft, forgery/bad checks, fraud, and drug dealing.<sup>3</sup> These crimes were defined as in Chaiken and Chaiken (1982). Respondents were considered active in a given crime category if they reported committing that offense at least once during the three-year period.

Reasons for first criminal involvement. We asked the respondents to indicate the main reason for their first involvement in crime. The interviewer presented them with a set of 10 different reasons, and the respondent was asked to answer "yes" to any that applied to him and "no" to those that didn't apply (See Table 2 for a list of the reasons provided by the interviewer.) In addition, the interviewer also asked whether there were any other reasons not listed; if so, what? [Our list of reasons was taken from the question used in the Second RAND Inmate Survey; in our second study we added "involvement in a gang" and "because you were drunk."]

Reasons for current criminal participation. After the detailed questions on criminal offending during the reference period, the RAND Second Inmate Survey asked active offenders (i.e., those who had admitted to participation in at least one of the 9 target crimes) to respond to a "list of reasons men have given for doing crimes." They then provided respondents with a list of 14 items and asked them to show how important each reason was for the crimes they did during the street months on the calendar. The answer categories provided were (1) Did not happen/Does not apply; (2) Not important at all; (3) Slightly important; (4) Somewhat important; (5) Very important. In our survey, we used the RAND question with the added category of "gang involvement." (Table 3 provides an abbreviated listing of the reasons.)

Reasons for differences in frequency of offending. Offenders do not commit crimes at a constant rate; to the contrary, it has been documented that there is considerable variability in offending

rates within individuals (Horney and Marshall, 1991). In order to examine the reasons offenders provide for how often they commit particular types of offenses, we adapted a question from the RAND Second Inmate Survey which asked about reasons for doing any of the target crimes during the reference period. In our adaptation, we asked those respondents who admitted to being active in one (or more) of the 9 target crimes, for each crime, the following question: "Can you tell me which of the following things made a difference in how often you were doing [burglaries, for example]? Answer YES for each item that made a difference and NO for each one that did not." The respondent was then provided with a list of 13 items. (Table 4 provides a listing of the items) (The question was phrased slightly differently for the proportion of the sample that was interviewed using our modified month-by-month calendar.)

Self-Image. Offenders' self-identification is an important theoretical concept in criminological thinking. In our study, we adopted the measure of self-image employed by the RAND Second Inmate Survey. Each offender was asked: "During the street months on the calendar, which of the following best describe the way you thought of your self? Answer yes or no for each one." (Table 5 presents a listing of the 21 different descriptions used in the interview.)

## UNIVARIATE DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR VARIABLES

### Reasons for first involvement in crime.

Table 2 presents the distribution of responses to the question "What were the main reasons that you first got involved in crime?" Half of the sample (50.3%) indicated that "friends" were the main reason of first criminal involvement; four out of ten respondents mentioned "excitement" as a crucial factor. "Money for high living" (28.4%) and "money for day-to-day living" (24.5%) was mentioned by about one-fourth of the respondents; sixteen percent suggested that "money for drugs" was an important reason for first criminal involvement. Less than one-fifth of the respondents answered with "normal way of life" (19.0%), "for the reputation" (17.9%), or "lost temper" (17.5%). The least common response was "gang involvement" (8.6%). About 30% of the respondents provided reasons other than those listed by the interviewer.

### Reasons for Current Participation

Table 3 presents the distribution of responses to the question: "This is a list of reasons men have given for doing crimes. For each one, tell me how important the reason was for the crimes you did during the street months on the calendar." This question was

asked only of those inmates who admitted to at least one of the nine target crimes.

Money. Money for daily support (46.2%) or money for good times (47.3%) was mentioned as important by almost half of those who were active in crime during the three-year reference period. Drug money was somewhat less frequently mentioned: in about one-third of the cases, this particular motive was provided. It should be noted that money for daily support was mentioned as "very important" by almost one-fourth of the active offenders.

High or drunk. One-third of the active offenders mentioned being high or drunk as a reason for their criminal involvement during the reference period. Drinking appears slightly more important than drugs--16.0% of the active offenders lists "had been drinking" as "very important" (contrasted with 11.0% who said that "had been taking drugs" was "very important").

Opportunity. Slightly over half of the active offenders mentioned that a "good opportunity" was an important reason for their criminal involvement during the three-year reference period.

Job. Approximately one out of every ten active offenders ranked "losing your job," "heavy debts," or "couldn't get a job" as a "very important" reason for criminal involvement during the reference period. About one-fourth of all active offenders attributed at least some significance to the job-related category.

Friends or gang involvement. Although about one-third of the active offenders acknowledged the importance of friends as a reason for criminal involvement, only 6.8% of the offenders mentioned that "gang involvement" was of any importance.

Expressive reasons. A substantial proportion of the active offenders indicated that revenge or anger (30.4%), excitement or kicks (38.6%), blowing up or losing cool (28.1%), or feeling nervous or tense (17.5%) were among the reasons for their criminal involvement during the reference period.

#### Reasons for differences in frequency of offending.

Table 4 presents the distribution of responses to the question "Can you tell me why some months you did not do any [burglaries] (or did them at a low rate) and other months you did them at a medium or high rate? Which of the following things made a difference in how often you were doing [burglaries]?" This question was only asked if the respondent had indicated that he had been active in this particular target crime.

Table 4 shows that participation rates vary considerably between the 9 target crimes; over 40% of the inmates reported involvement

in drug dealing over the three-year reference period (n= 394), but only 6.7% admitted to involvement in fraud (n = 61) over the same time period. The participation rates for assault (30.86%), burglary (27.42%), and theft (25.16%) are significantly higher than those for car theft (14.61%), forgery (14.80%), or robbery (9.99%).

For purposes of the current presentation, we have grouped the self-reported motives into five categories: (1) need for money; (2) high or drunk; (3) opportunity; (4) job or family; and (5) friends or partners.

Need for money. Over half of those active in theft (53.8%), fraud (62.3%), business robbery (55.3%), and drug dealing (54.8%) said that their need for money for day-to-day living was important in determining how often they committed these crimes during the reference period. Money for daily support was also frequently mentioned as a rationale for burglary (48.3%), forgery (48.9%), and personal robbery (37.7%). A notable exception to this pattern is car theft: only 14.4% of those active in this crime suggested that monetary need was an important motive.

With the exception of robbery (slightly over half of those involved in either business or personal robbery said that need for drug money was a motive), the need for money for drugs appears to be less significant than the need for money for daily support. Still, drug money was listed by a substantial proportion of each of the different offending categories. However, need for drug money was mentioned by only 11.4% of those involved in car theft.

High or drunk. Table 4 shows that almost half of the personal and business robberies are committed when high on drugs. However, being high on drugs is provided as a reason for criminal activity for a significant proportion of the other target offenses as well, varying between a low of 22.3% of assaults and a high of 33.1% of the burglaries.

Drinking heavily was listed as important for committing burglaries (39.7%), car thefts (36.4%), assaults (36.5%), forgeries (32.1%), business robberies (34.2%) or personal robberies (32.8%). Drinking was also mentioned by more than one-fifth of those involved in theft (29.9%) and fraud (21.3%). Only 15% of those active in drug dealing answered that drinking was related to their varying involvement in this particular offense.

Opportunity. The most consistently mentioned reasons for differential involvement in crime are "opportunity" or "could get away with it." There is some variability between the different crimes, but the proportion of respondents agreeing with the importance of opportunity or being able to get away with the crime never is lower than forty percent, with the exception of assault

(16.8%). Opportunity appears to be a particularly salient motive for drug dealing (64.5%).

The perceived activity level of the local police appears to be fairly unimportant for most of the crimes except perhaps for burglary (25.6%), business robbery (28.9%), or drug dealing (27.9%).

Job or family. Whether or not one had a job made a difference for about three out of ten of those active in burglary (30.2%), theft (33.8%), forgery (29.8%), business robbery (26.3%), and drug dealing (29.9%). Employment did not seem to be important for those active in car theft (14.1%), personal robbery (18.0%) or assault (9.6%).

Having a wife or girlfriend made a difference for one-third (32.0%) of those involved in assault; those involved in assault were also most likely to view family problems as important (31.0%). About one-fourth of those involved in drug dealing (24.4%), personal robbery (24.6%), or fraud (24.6%) mentioned wife or girlfriend as important.

Friends or partners. Having a partner in doing crime or hanging around with friends who do crime seem to be most important for doing personal robberies (respectively 42.6% and 44.3%) and burglaries (respectively 37.2% and 42.6%). Having a partner was mentioned only by 18.3% of those active in forgeries. One-fourth of those active in drug dealing indicated that having a partner (24.9%) or hanging around with friends who do crime (27.4%) made a difference. About 10 % of those active in assault reported that gang involvement was important; 20.8% of this group mentioned hanging around with friends doing crime as significant.

Two general observations present themselves from our preliminary observations. First, there are important differences between offense categories with regard to the importance of motives for differential offending frequencies. At first glance, it appears that the property crimes of burglary, theft, forgery, and fraud share motives--with car theft being an exception. Robbery (both business and personal) seems to form a distinct second group. Drug dealing, although in some respects close to the other property crimes, represent a third category. Finally, assault is a distinct fourth category.

Second, there appears to be a general rankordering of groups of motives, regardless of the inter-offense variability. The most frequently mentioned factors for most of the offenses refer to opportunity or being able to get away with the crime. A close second is the need for money for daily support. High on drugs or drinking heavily, generally speaking, provide the third most-frequently mentioned motives for offending. Having a partner in crime or hanging around with friends doing crime was mentioned

approximately as often as being high or drunk. Job or family problems appear to be the least common motives for the different crimes.

### Self-Image

Table 5 presents the frequency distribution of the responses to the question on self-image. Interestingly, over half of the sample of incarcerated offenders identify themselves as a "working man," (80.7%), "family man," (56.8%), or "non-criminal straight" (53.0%).

Conversely, only 13.3% of the respondents describe themselves as a "misfit." Self-identification as drug- or alcohol abuser is high: 38.8% describe themselves as a drug user or addict, 30.2% as a problem drinker, 30.0% as an alcoholic or drunk, and 24.6% as a drug dealer.

## REASONS FOR CRIME AND SELF-IMAGE FOR DIFFERENT OFFENDER TYPES

### Description of five offender types

In the previous section we provided a simple univariate description of reasons for first involvement in crime, reasons for current participation in crime, reasons for offending at different rates for nine different crimes, and self-image of the respondents. We noted that there is considerable inter-offense variability in self-reported motives (Table 4). In addition to examining differences between offenses, we are also interested in examining differences between offenders. It is reasonable to expect, for example, that an offender who commits only one particular type of crime (e.g., assault) has a different set of reasons and rationalizations for his behavior than his more versatile counterpart who assaults, deals in drugs, forges, robs, and steals. The purpose of this section is to examine if there are any significant differences in self-reported reasons for first criminal involvement, offending during the three-year reference period, and self-image for five distinct offender types.

Using the extent of participation in the 9 target crimes during the three-year reference period as the basis for the offender classification, we distinguished the following five offender types:

1. Violent only (n = 89). This group includes those offenders who have committed assault, personal robbery, and/or business robbery during the reference period. Some of these offenders committed only assault, others committed assault and robbery, and some committed only robbery. Excluded are those violent offenders who also have committed property offenses and/or drug dealing.

2. Property only (n = 196). This category includes all offenders who have committed burglary and/or theft and/or car theft and/or fraud and/or forgery. This group excludes those who have been involved in violent crime (assault, robbery) or drug dealing.

3. Drugs only (n = 121). This category includes those offenders whose only self-reported criminal involvement during the reference period consisted of drug dealing. Drug dealers who also were involved in violent crime or other property crimes are excluded from this category.

4. Property and drugs (n = 103). This group includes offenders who admitted to drug dealing and to one or more of the property crimes (i.e., burglary, theft, car theft, fraud, or forgery). Drug dealers involved in violent crime are excluded from this category.

5. Violent and property or drugs (n = 283). This group is most versatile in its offending patterns--only those offenders who admitted to involvement in violent crime (assault, robbery) and non-violent crime (drug dealing and/or property crime) are included in this category.

Table 6 presents selected socio-demographic and legal history variables for the 5 offender types. It appears that offenders who are involved in both violent and non-violent crime are somewhat younger (mean age is 24.18) and have a somewhat more lengthy arrest history (mean number of lifetime arrests is 4.18) than the other four categories. There does not appear to be a clear racial/ethnic pattern of differences between the groups. Examination of the self-reported conviction charges shows that the five groups differ in the expected direction; that is, in the Violent Only group, over half of the offenders is convicted for either robbery or assault; in the Property Only group, about three-fourth is convicted for burglary, larceny, or forgery (with a negligible proportion convicted of assault or robbery), and so on.

#### Reasons for first involvement in crime, by offender type

Table 7 provides the percentage distribution for reasons for first involvement in crime for the 5 offender types. Chi-square tests indicated that five of the reasons (friends, money for high living, money for daily living, drunk, and normal way of life) were not significantly different between the 5 groups. However, the remaining 5 reasons did prove to differentiate in a statistically significant manner between the offender types.

Examination of table 7 shows some interesting patterns with regard to differences between the offender types. Excitement appears significantly more frequently as a motive for first criminal involvement among those offenders who are involved in a wider variety of offending behavior (Property and Drugs--48.5% and

Violent and Property or Drugs--47.7%) than among those who commit only violent crime, property crime, or drug dealing. Reputation is also listed significantly more often for the Property and Drugs group (22.3%) and the Violent and Property or Drugs group (27.6%) than for the other three groups. Similarly, money for drugs is mentioned most frequently among the Property and Drugs group (35.0%) and the Violent and Property or Drugs group (24.7%). The remaining two motives--lost temper and gang involvement--appear to be most descriptive of offenders involved in violence--either Violent Only (34.1% and 10.7% respectively) or Violent and Property or Drugs (23.3% and 17.4% respectively).

Reasons for current participation, by offender type

Table 8 shows that the 5 offender types differed significantly with regard to self-reported reasons for doing target crimes during the three-year reference period. There is only one exception to this general pattern: the 5 types did not differ in the frequency of use of "felt nervous, tense" as a reason for criminal offending.

Money. Although money is an important reason for all offender types except Violent Only (8.8%, 7.5%, 3.8%), this reason is found most frequently among the Property and Drugs (55.4%, 54.9%, 66.6%) and Violent and Property or Drugs (53.6%, 40.4%, 58.9%) offender types.

High or drunk. Being high on drugs was least important for the Violent Only (17.6%) and the Property Only (16.0%) groups. Exactly half of the Property and Drugs group, on the other hand, reported that drug use was related to their involvement in crime during the reference period. Drugs were also significant for over one-third of those who were only involved in drug dealing (Drugs Only group) or who were involved in both violent and non-violent crime (Violent and Property or Drugs group).

Perhaps not surprisingly, drinking was relatively unimportant for the Drugs Only group (17.8%). Alcohol use was most important for those involved in both violent and non-violent crime (Violent and Property or Drugs group) (43.9%).

Opportunity. This reason was relatively unimportant for the Violent Only group (8.9%); for the groups involved in different types of crimes during the reference period (Property and Drugs--73.8% and Violent and Property or Drugs--60.8%), opportunity was most frequently mentioned as related to involvement in crime.

Job. Economic motives, such as heavy debts, or inability to find a job, are mentioned somewhat more often by the groups who commit different types of crimes (i.e., Property and Drugs; Violent and Property or Drugs). Job-related motives are not important for the Violent Only group.

Friends, gangs. Those who commit only violent crimes are least likely to mention friends as the reason for their criminal activity (13.9%); furthermore, this group never mentioned gang involvement. The Violent and Property or Drugs category, on the other hand, was most likely to list gang involvement (13.4%) as well as friends' ideas (38.0%).

Expressive reasons. Excitement or kicks is mentioned very infrequently by the Violent Only category (7.6%). For the Property and Drugs category and the Violent and Property or Drugs category, on the other hand, excitement is listed very frequently (43.6% and 47.5%, respectively). The pattern is somewhat different for the "revenge, anger" and "blew up, lost cool" reasons: the violent offender types (Violent Only and Violent and Property or Drugs) use these reasons significantly more often than the three other non-violent offender types.

#### Self-Image, by offender type

The findings presented in Table 9 further confirm the notion that significant differences exist between offender types. There is only one category (problem drinker) which does not significantly differentiate between offender types.

One of the most interesting observations concerns the self-image of "non-criminal, straight": the groups least likely to describe themselves in those terms are offenders involved in a larger variety of offenses (Property and Drugs--36.9%; Violent and Property or Drugs--27.2%). Three-fourth of the Violent Only category, on the other hand, uses the term "non-criminal, straight" as a self-description.

The non-specialist categories also are least likely to use the term "family man" to describe themselves (41.7% and 44.9% respectively).

The group involved in Violent and Property or Drugs is most likely to have the self-image of bad tempered (57.2%), being an alcoholic or drunk (37.8%), a player (34.6%), a fighter (46.6%), a con man (29.0%), a misfit (22.6%), a violent person (29.7%), a gang member (13.4%), a booster (8.8%), a robber (10.6%), or a car thief (8.1%).

There appears to be some convergence between the self-reported types of criminal involvement and the self-images. For example, the Violent Only category does not often use self-description such as car thief (1.1%), fence (0.0%), booster (0.0%), forger (2.2%), burglar (1.1%), thief (4.5%), or drug dealer (0.0%). Similarly, the Property Only type only rarely describes himself as a drug dealer (.5%) or violent person (5.1%), and is most likely to use terms such as thief (32.8%), burglar (23.6%), forger (11.9%) or car thief (6.2%). The Drugs Only type describes himself as a drug user (52.5%) or drug dealer (55.8%), rather than as a thief (.8%),

violent person (2.5%), burglar (.8%), forger (0.0%), booster (0.0%), fence (0.0%), fence (1.7%), or car thief (.8%).

#### CONCLUSION

The present study is an exploratory attempt to acquire a better empirical understanding of the role of reasons for crime and self-image as reported by a sample of incarcerated offenders. Further multivariate analysis of the data is required to determine the degree of intra-offender variability in reasons for differential involvement in different crime types; to examine whether the reasons cluster along particular dimensions; to further explore which is the most appropriate offender categorization; to analyze the interrelationship between reasons for first involvement in crime, reasons for current participation, and reasons for differences in frequency of offending; to determine the explanatory power of self-reported reasons for crime in accounting for variations in criminal participation and lambda; and to study the relationship between self-image and self-reported reasons for crime.

Our preliminary observations may be summarized as follows. First, excitement, friends, need for money, being high or drunk, and good opportunity all are important reasons for crime--either for first involvement or for continued participation. Second, there is considerable inter-offense variability with regard to self-reported reasons for differential offending frequency. Third, the most common self-identification of formally identified offenders is that of a "normal" person (working man, family man, non-criminal straight). A close second is self-identification as drug or alcohol abuser. Fourth, there is considerable inter-offender variability with regard to reasons for first involvement in crime, reason for current criminal participation, and self image. It appears that the group of offenders who are involved in both violent and non-violent offenses is different from the groups that specialize in property offenses only, violent offenses only, or drug dealing only. For example, for this group, excitement, reputation, drug money and gang involvement are more important than for the other types.

If, as many believe, self-reported reasons simply represent justifications or after-the-fact rationalizations of criminal behavior, the practical implications of our findings may be negligible. On the other hand, if offenders are somehow able and/or willing to report accurately on the motivations effectively involved in triggering their criminal involvement, our preliminary findings raise some troubling policy questions. That is, need for excitement and kicks, drinking or using drugs, need for reputation and need for money are not conditions amenable to easy manipulation by policy makers.

## ENDNOTES

1. The first study (Horney and Marshall, 1991) tested a new method of asking about the frequency of criminal offending. Interviews were conducted with 403 newly sentenced inmates during 1988-1989. In the second study (Horney and Marshall, 1992) that new method was experimentally compared with the method used in the RAND Second Inmate Survey. In addition, the experimental method was used to ask again about offending frequencies after those in the control condition had answered questions asked in the RAND method. A total of 700 respondents were interviewed in the second study during 1989-1990. For this analysis we have combined the data sets since the variables we are considering were measured in the same way. Complete data were available for 1,061 respondents out of the total 1,103 interviewed (42 inmates in the control group were not asked the supplemental crime rate questions in addition to the RAND questions).

2. The 403 respondents from the first study represent 77% of the inmates admitted to the state Diagnostic and Evaluation Unit during a nine month period. Some admissions were missed because they did not come when the correctional officer conveyed our request that they report to the visiting room (they may or may not have known the reason for the request), and some were transferred out of the institution before we could interview them. The response rate among the inmates who met with an interviewer to have the study explained was 98.5%. In the second study, improved procedures for requesting a meeting with the inmate resulted in our being able to interview 90% of all males admitted to the Department of Corrections during the second nine month period. Our interviewers met with a total of 746 inmates to explain the study and invite participation; 94% of that group completed the interview.

3. We also asked about rape. The overall number of respondents who admitted to committing rapes was so small that the results are not presented here.

Table 1 - Socio-Demographic and Legal History Variables

Variables	All (N = 1,061)	Blacks (n=284)	Whites (n=648)
Race	White 61.1% Black 26.8 Hispanic 5.8 Native Am. 4.3 Other 1.9		
Current Age	$\bar{X} = 27.99$	$\bar{X} = 26.88$	$\bar{X} = 28.36$
Number of lifetime arrests	$\bar{X} = 3.45$ median = 3.0	$\bar{X} = 3.40$ median = 3.0	$\bar{X} = 3.39$ median = 3.0
Number of lifetime felony convictions	$\bar{X} = 1.67$ median = 2.0	$\bar{X} = 1.62$ median = 1.0	$\bar{X} = 1.68$ median = 2.0
Conviction charge			
Burglary	17.7%	12.0	21.3
Drug sales	15.7	14.8	15.6
Larceny	11.5	13.7	11.0
Drug possession	10.2	18.0	6.9
Assault	9.2	11.7	7.3
Forgery	5.9	5.3	6.5
Sex offense	5.6	1.4	7.3
Robbery	4.6	7.7	2.9
Rec. stolen property	4.4	3.9	4.5
Weapon	4.0	7.4	3.2
Rape	3.8	2.8	4.2
Car theft	2.9	2.1	3.4
Murder	1.7	2.1	1.5
Fraud	1.0	.4	1.2
Kidnapping	.3	.4	.2
Other	21.5	11.6	22.9

Table 2 - Self-Reported Reasons for First Involvement in Crime

---

Friends	50.3%
Excitement	40.4
Money for high living	28.4
Money for day-to-day living	24.5
Drunk <sup>1</sup>	24.4
Normal way of life	19.0
For the reputation	17.9
Lost temper	17.5
Money for drugs	16.7
Gang involvement <sup>1</sup>	8.6
Other	29.4

1. This reason was not used in the first study. Therefore, this percentage is based on data collected in the second study only (n=648).

Table 3 - Self-Reported Reasons for Current Participation<sup>1</sup>

	Slightly or Somewhat Important	Very Important	Slightly, Somewhat, or Very Important
Money for living, support	22.7%	23.5%	46.2%
Money for drugs	18.4	14.0	32.4
Money for good times	28.4	18.9	47.3
>			
Had taken drugs	19.3	11.0	30.3
Had been drinking	18.7	16.0	34.7
>			
Good opportunity	36.5	16.4	52.9
>			
Losing your job	15.6	10.1	25.7
Couldn't get a job	15.6	10.1	25.7
Heavy debts	16.0	10.3	26.3
>			
Friends' ideas	25.7	6.8	32.5
Gang involvement	3.5	3.3	6.8
>			
Revenge, anger	17.5	12.9	30.4
Excitement, kicks	30.3	8.3	38.6
Nervous, tense	13.7	3.8	17.5
Blew up, lost cool	17.3	10.8	28.1
>			

1. Those with at least one of the target crimes (n=799).

Table 4 - Self-Reported Reasons for Individual Target Crimes

	Burglary (n = 242)	Theft (n = 234)	Car Theft (n = 132)	Forgery n = (131)	Fraud (n = 61)	Bus. Robbery (n = 38)	Pers. Robbery (n = 61)	Assault <sup>1</sup> (n = 197)	Drug dealing (n = 394)
Money for living	48.3%	53.8%	14.4%	48.9%	62.3%	55.3%	37.7%	NA <sup>2</sup>	54.8%
Money for drugs	30.6	29.5	11.4	29.0	36.1	55.3	44.3	NA <sup>2</sup>	34.3
>									
High on drugs	33.1	27.8	24.2	26.0	27.9	47.4	42.6	22.3	28.9
Drinking heavily	39.7	29.9	36.4	32.1	21.3	34.2	32.8	36.5	15.0
>									
Had opportunity	47.5	53.8	44.7	41.2	57.4	44.7	42.6	NA <sup>2</sup>	64.5
Could get away with it	50.8	57.3	50.8	45.0	55.7	39.5	50.8	16.8	46.7
Local police active	25.6	18.4	13.6	7.6	9.8	28.9	18.0	13.2	27.9
>									
Employment	30.2	33.8	14.1	29.8	31.1	26.3	18.0	9.6	29.9
Wife or girlfriend	21.1	20.5	17.4	16.8	24.6	21.1	24.6	32.0	24.4
Family problems	24.8	23.9	16.7	22.9	19.7	23.7	19.7	31.0	16.8
>									
Partner in crime	37.2	30.3	28.0	18.3	27.9	34.2	42.6	NA <sup>2</sup>	24.9
Friends	42.6	37.2	28.8	23.7	21.3	26.3	44.3	20.8	27.4
Gang involvement	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>	9.6	NA <sup>2</sup>
>									
Other	24.8	25.6	37.1	29.0	34.4	18.4	34.4	49.2	31.5

1. Data for reasons for assault are missing for 132 of the 329 assaults. Motives for assault were not asked in the first study.

2. This response category was not given as an option for the crime category.

Table 5 - Self-Image of Sample of Incarcerated Felons

	<u>Rank</u>	<u>%</u>
Working man	1	80.7
Family man	2	56.8
Non-criminal, straight	3	53.0
Drug user, addict	4	38.8
Bad tempered	5	35.8
Problem drinker	6	30.2
Alcoholic, drunk	7	30.0
Drug dealer	8	24.6
Player	9	23.1
Fighter	11	21.0
Thief	12	18.1
Con man	13	15.0
Misfit	14	13.3
Violent person	15	12.0
Burglar	16	11.9
Forger, check passer	17	6.8
Gang member	18	5.0
Booster	19	4.2
Robber	20.5	4.0
Fence	20.5	4.0
Car thief	22	3.9
Other	10	22.4

Table 6 - Socio-Demographic and Legal History Variables,  
by Offender Type

	Violent Only (n = 89)	Property Only (n = 196)	Drugs Only (n = 121)	Property and Drugs (n = 103)	Violent and Property or Drugs (n = 283)
Age	$\bar{X} = 27.40$	$\bar{X} = 26.47$	$\bar{X} = 28.50$	$\bar{X} = 25.65$	$\bar{X} = 24.18$
Race					
Black	28.1%	25.5%	28.1%	22.3%	27.6%
White	56.2	64.8	57.9	68.9	58.3
Hispanic	7.9	3.6	11.6	3.9	5.3
Native American	5.6	5.6	1.7	1.9	5.7
Other	2.2	.5	.8	2.9	3.2
# of Lifetime Arrests	$\bar{X} = 3.15$	$\bar{X} = 3.55$	$\bar{X} = 2.90$	$\bar{X} = 3.80$	$\bar{X} = 4.18$
# of Lifetime Felony Convictions	$\bar{X} = 1.60$	$\bar{X} = 1.79$	$\bar{X} = 1.39$	$\bar{X} = 1.85$	$\bar{X} = 1.86$
Conviction Charge <sup>1</sup>					
Burglary	3.4	39.3	1.7	27.2	21.2
Drug sales	1.1	1.5	68.6	19.4	14.5
Larceny	3.4	23.0	3.3	18.4	13.8
Drug possession	2.2	1.5	21.5	14.6	9.2
Assault	37.1	.5	.8	1.0	14.5
Forgery	2.2	11.7	.8	12.6	6.4
Sex offense	5.6	3.6	.8	1.9	2.5
Robbery	18.0	2.6	.8	1.9	6.0
Rec. stolen property	4.5	7.7	2.5	4.9	3.5
Weapons	6.7	1.0	4.1	2.9	4.9
Rape	4.5	2.6	.8	1.9	2.1
Car theft	0.0	5.6	0.0	2.9	5.7
Murder	7.9	.5	0.0	0.0	1.4
Fraud	0.0	3.1	0.0	1.0	1.1
Kidnapping	1.1	.5	0.0	0.0	.4
Other	22.5	15.3	7.5	15.5	24.4

1. Percentages add to more than 100% due to multiple charges.

Table 7 - Reason for First Involvement in Crime, by Offender Type

	Violent Only (n = 89)	Property Only (n = 196)	Drugs Only (n = 121)	Property and Drugs (n = 103)	Violent and Property or Drugs (n = 283)
Friends	50.0%	50.5%	56.7%	59.2%	49.8%
Excitement*	33.0	39.8	34.2	48.5	47.7
Money for high living	25.0	30.6	28.3	36.9	37.5
Money for daily living	25.0	29.6	27.5	28.2	26.9
Drunk	25.0	29.7	22.2	24.1	23.9
Normal way of life	19.3	16.3	21.7	21.4	23.0
Reputation**	11.4	16.3	17.5	22.3	27.6
Lost temper***	34.1	13.8	10.0	8.7	23.3
Money for drugs***	14.8	11.7	17.5	35.0	24.7
Gang involvement***	10.7	1.0	7.6	6.9	17.4

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

\*\*\* p < .001

Table 8 - Self-Reported Reasons for Current Participation<sup>1 2</sup>

	Violent Only (n = 89)	Property Only (n = 196)	Drugs Only (n = 121)	Property and Drugs (n = 103)	Violent and Property or Drugs (n = 283)
Money for living***	8.8%	47.9%	46.6%	55.4%	53.6%
Money for drugs***	7.5	18.1	35.6	54.9	40.4
Money for good times***	3.8	43.6	43.2	66.6	58.9
>					
Had taken drugs***	17.6	16.0	34.7	50.0	36.1
Had been drinking***	37.5	36.2	17.8	31.2	43.9
>					
Good opportunity***	8.9	52.4	47.4	73.8	60.8
>					
Losing your job**	15.1	31.4	33.0	42.7	34.3
Couldn't get a job***	8.9	21.3	22.0	35.0	33.3
Heavy debts*	13.7	22.9	30.5	24.3	31.3
>					
Friends' ideas**	13.9	32.0	33.6	34.0	38.0
Gang involvement***	0.0	3.3	4.8	1.8	13.4
>					
Revenge, anger***	57.6	18.1	5.0	15.5	45.9
Excitement, kicks***	7.6	37.8	37.2	43.6	47.5
Nervous, tense <sup>n.s.</sup>	25.1	15.4	10.9	14.7	18.6
Blew up, lost cool***	58.8	14.9	5.0	12.6	42.7
>					

\* p < .05  
 \*\* p < .01  
 \*\*\* p < .001

1. Those with at least one of the target crimes (n = 792).
2. Percentage of respondents answering that this particular reason was either "slightly important," "somewhat important" or "very important."

Table 9 - Self Image by Offender Type

	Violent Only (n = 89)	Property Only (n = 196)	Drugs Only (n = 121)	Property and Drugs (n = 103)	Violent and Property or Drugs (n = 283)
Working man***	86.5%	78.4%	91.7%	74.8%	71.0%
Family man***	69.7	51.8	71.7	41.7	44.9
Non-criminal, straight***	75.3	49.0	57.5	36.9	27.2
Drug User***	21.3	27.7	52.5	69.9	55.5
Bad tempered***	48.3	32.7	22.5	25.2	57.2
Problem drinker <sup>n.s.</sup>	27.0	32.3	25.0	35.9	37.8
Alcoholic, drunk*	23.6	33.8	25.0	31.1	37.8
Drug dealer***	0.0	.5	55.8	46.6	48.4
Player***	19.1	18.5	22.5	29.1	34.6
Fighter***	20.2	10.3	8.3	16.5	46.6
Thief***	4.5	32.8	.8	35.0	28.6
Con man***	7.9	11.8	10.0	22.3	29.0
Misfit***	11.2	13.4	5.0	11.7	22.6
Violet person***	13.5	5.1	2.5	3.9	29.7
Burgler***	1.1	23.6	.8	23.3	18.4
Forger, check passer***	2.2	11.9	0.0	13.6	10.2
Gang member***	3.4	1.5	4.2	1.9	13.4
Booster***	0.0	4.6	0.0	7.8	8.8
Robber***	3.4	2.6	0.0	2.9	10.6
Fence***	0.0	2.1	1.7	7.8	7.8
Car thief**	1.1	6.2	.8	3.9	8.1

\*\* p < .01

\*\*\* p < .001