

DAILY ROUTINES AND CRIME

Using Routine Activities as Measures of Hirschi's Involvement

JAMES E. HAWDON
Clemson University

Since 1969, Travis Hirschi's control theory has been one of the leading explanations of delinquency. The theory has withstood not only the test of time but also rigorous empirical investigations. Although his theory has been generally supported, Hirschi's concept of involvement has been criticized as being, at best, analytically indistinguishable from commitment and, at worst, unrelated to delinquent behavior. However, when reconceptualized as daily routine patterns, involvement is a powerful predictor of criminal activity.

Despite the popularity of Hirschi's (1969) bond theory, critics assert that the theory is underdeveloped (see Gibbons, 1994; Gibbons & Krohn, 1991; Kempf, 1993; LeBlanc & Caplan, 1993). Such criticisms have become especially acute because Hirschi himself has abandoned the theory for the notion of self-control (see Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Nevertheless, Hirschi's theory continues to be the most widely tested criminological theory and a leading topic of journal articles and dissertations (see Kempf, 1993). Sharing the opinion that the theory is underconceptualized but refusing to ignore its appeal, this article builds on the recent reconceptualization of an understudied dimension of Hirschi's theory.

Hawdon (1996) argued that *involvement*, in particular, is conceptually underdeveloped. The current article extends this research to demonstrate the utility of substituting routine activity patterns (RAPs) for involvement. More specifically, the article illustrates the structural

stability of the concept as operationalized in the earlier work. The RAPs that emerged when studying college students are similar to those that emerged when high school students were analyzed. Moreover, the power of the concept for predicting deviant behavior is further demonstrated.

The current research also extends the growing perspective that routine activities (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Hawdon, 1996; Osgood, Wilson, O'Malley, Bachman, & Johnston, 1996) or lifestyle patterns (Hindelang, Gottfredson, & Garofalo, 1978) can explain not only victimization but also crime. Although a number of theorists have discussed this theme (see Felson, 1986, 1994; Felson & Gottfredson, 1984; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Miethe & Meier, 1994), few empirical tests have been conducted (for exceptions, see Hawdon, 1996; Osgood et al., 1996; Riley, 1987). Despite the limited attempts to test this perspective rigorously, however, considerable evidence suggests investigating routine activities as a potential cause of crime is a worthy endeavor (e.g., Agnew & Peterson, 1989; Hirschi, 1969; Riley, 1987; Wallace & Bachman, 1991). Further synthesizing aspects of the routine activities perspective with a prominent theory of crime can strengthen theoretical criminology. Ultimately, such a synthesis is the goal of this research.

INVOLVEMENT AS AN ELEMENT OF THE BOND

According to Hirschi (1969), *involvement* refers to the degree to which individuals engage in conventional activities. The greater the involvement in conventional activities, the less time an individual has to devote to delinquent behaviors. As Hirschi (1969) argued, "A person may be simply too busy doing conventional things to find time to engage in deviant behavior" (p. 22). The intuitive appeal of this line of reasoning is obvious. However, few investigators have found involvement to significantly reduce criminal behavior. The initial test of bond theory, for example, found that some conventional activities were positively related to the commission of delinquent acts (see Hirschi, 1969). In fact, few researchers have found involvement to be a good predictor of delinquency (e.g., Hindelang, 1973; for exceptions, see Agnew, 1985; Wiatrowski, Griswold, & Roberts, 1981).

The reoccurring finding that the influence of involvement on delinquency is, at best, weak have led some theorists (e.g., Conger, 1976) to argue that involvement could and should be dispensed with as a crucial element of the bond. Such criticisms, and the alleged difficulty in analytically separating involvement and commitment, have led several researchers to omit the concept from their tests of Hirschi's theory, (e.g., Akers & Cochran, 1985; Conger, 1976; Marcos, Bahr, & Johnson, 1986; Massey & Krohn, 1986; see also Gibbons, 1994). In fact, in 71 studies conducted between 1971 and 1993 that tested bond theory, involvement was included in only 25 (Kempf, 1993). Yet, Hawdon (1996) found that when reconceptualized, not only was involvement independent of commitment, attachment, and belief, but it was also the best predictor of adolescent marijuana use. The necessary resolution to this empirical contradiction is to operationalize involvement as a set of behaviors, not a single behavior or several behaviors independently.

INVOLVEMENT AS DAILY ROUTINES

The reconceptualization of involvement is based on two insights. First, although certain conventional activities reduce delinquency, other, equally conventional, activities are associated with a lifestyle that permits and encourages deviant behavior (Hawdon, 1996). Thus, Hirschi's original statement inflates the relationship between conforming and deviant behavior. Second, researchers should analyze the relationship between sets of activities and delinquency instead of the correlation between specific activities and delinquency. Because even the most deviant individual performs numerous conventional activities, concentrating on a single activity may conceal the relationship between a set of conventional activities and delinquent acts.

Consequently, instead of operationalizing involvement as engaging in certain activities, the operational definition of involvement becomes engaging in sets of activities, or RAPs. Borrowing from the routine activities theory of victimization (Cohen & Cantor, 1980; Cohen & Felson, 1979; Hindelang, 1976; Hindelang et al., 1978; Messner & Tardiff, 1985; Miethe, Stafford, & Long, 1987), RAPs are defined as the set of behaviors in which individuals recurrently engage.

Once involvement is reconceptualized as RAPS, the correlations among RAPS, or specific patterns of conventional behavior, and delinquency are analyzed. Instead of focusing on a single activity, clusters of activities are examined to illustrate how the conventional activities of delinquents differ from those of nondelinquents. It is therefore predicted that the RAPS of delinquents will differ from the RAPS of nondelinquents. This line of reasoning is echoed by other theorists (see, e.g., Agnew & Peterson, 1989; Hagan, 1991; Matza & Sykes, 1961). Certain RAPS—those that avoid work and maximize free time—increase the delinquent's opportunities to deviate. As Becker (1955) argues, deviant behavior can occur "only when the necessary events and shifts in conception of the activity have removed the individual from the influence of these (forms of social) control" (p. 43). Thus, delinquents will select RAPS that allow them to deflect social control and engage in delinquency (see Hawdon, 1996).

ON THE SOCIAL CONTROL OF RAPS

The social control inherent in a RAP is a function of the visibility and instrumentality of the routine (Hawdon, 1996). The visibility of a RAP refers to the degree to which activities are likely to occur in the presence of authority figures. The instrumentality of a RAP is the extent to which activities are goal oriented.¹ These dimensions influence the amount of social control individuals engaging in a specific RAP face (Hawdon, 1996).²

Certain activities increase the visibility of the individual. Activities that occur under the supervision of conforming adults, such as those that occur in public or in an adolescent's home, increase censorship, or "direct controls" (Nye, 1958) and therefore reduce the ability to deviate (Liska & Reed, 1985). Thus, engaging in an "invisible" RAP, one that avoids frequent contact with adult-run institutions, is one strategy for reducing censorship and enhancing the opportunity to deviate.

Next, instrumental routine patterns are likely to occur in visible locations (e.g., schools, work establishments, community theaters) thereby increasing social control. Conversely, noninstrumental routines often occur in locales where authoritative surveillance is minimized and privacy is maximized (see, e.g., Agnew & Peterson, 1989;

Cavan, 1972; Partridge, 1973; Pope, 1971). Consequently, the instrumentality of a routine pattern produces an indirect effect on social control by increasing the visibility of the routine. Moreover, activities directed toward achieving some traditional goal are often informally monitored by the participants (Lauderdale, 1984; see also Felson, 1986). Conversely, deviant behavior may be encouraged when activities are noninstrumental (Agnew & Peterson, 1989; Pope, 1971).

Based on the theoretical discussion, it is hypothesized that (a) individuals involved in RAPs that are highly visible and instrumental will rarely engage in delinquent behaviors, (b) individuals involved in invisible and noninstrumental activity patterns will frequently be delinquent, and (c) those who are involved in mixed routine patterns (i.e., low visibility/high instrumentality or high visibility/low instrumentality) will be considerably less delinquent than those in invisible and noninstrumental routine patterns.

EXTENDING THE RESEARCH

Despite the support found for the earlier reconceptualization of Hirschi's involvement, numerous questions remain. First, it is necessary to test the conceptual stability of the construct to verify if the RAPs recovered among a nationally representative sample of high school students can be generalized over time and to other samples of adolescents or young adults. Second, because of data limitations in the earlier research, the instrumentality and visibility of the empirically recovered RAPs was inferred instead of empirically established (see Hawdon, 1996). Finally, the utility of RAPs for predicting serious delinquency must be validated. This article attempts to accomplish these three tasks.

THE STRUCTURAL STABILITY OF RAPs

To establish the conceptual stability of the original factor analysis, 108 first-year college students from a large southern university responded to a self-report survey. Students in an introductory sociology course were given the survey. Because sociology can be used to fulfill general education requirements, a relatively representative sample of

students enroll in the introductory course. Comparing the demographic characteristics of the sample with those of the population of the university's 1st-year students (in terms of gender, academic major, and ethnicity) indicated that the sample was an adequate representation of the campus's 1st-year students (t tests and ANOVAs indicated no significant difference between the sample and the population of university students for gender ($p = .18$) or major ($p = .10$). The sample slightly overrepresented minority students. Only students who were 17 or 18 years of age and in their 1st year of college were included in the analysis.

Hawdon (1996) used data from the *Monitoring the Future* survey (Johnston, Bachman, & O'Malley, 1987), which asks respondents about several activities in which they may or may not engage. Questions asking about similar activities were included in the college survey. The activity that was omitted was "work for pay" because most of the students in the current analysis worked "almost every day." Given the lack of variation, this variable was not included in the analysis. Students were asked how often they engaged in a list of activities. These activities were factor analyzed to determine what RAPs would emerge from the data. In the study of high school seniors, seven RAPs emerged (see Hawdon, 1996). Similarly, seven RAPs emerged in the current survey (see Table 1). Somewhat surprisingly, five of the seven RAPs included nearly identical activities to those that comprised the original patterns. Two RAPs that were present in the high school sample did not emerge from the college patterns. Instead, two slightly different patterns replaced them. The seven factors explained 64.1% of the total variance in the 22 questions.³

In terms of the seven RAPs' variability on the instrumentality and visibility dimensions, the two differing RAPs can be seen as structural equivalents. That is, the recreation, athletic, academic, literary, and performing arts patterns emerged in both studies. The arts and crafts pattern that emerged in the current study is similar in some activities, instrumentality, and visibility to the nonsocial pattern that emerged from the high school sample. Similarly, the social pattern in the current research is similar to the automotive pattern from the high school sample. Thus, the two patterns that differ between the two studies are similar with respect to visibility and instrumentality. Given the emer-

TABLE 1
Factor Analysis Results

<i>Item</i>	<i>(Communality)</i>	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>	<i>Factor 3</i>	<i>Factor 4</i>	<i>Factor 5</i>	<i>Factor 6</i>	<i>Factor 7</i>
Sports	(.810)	.8576	.1144	-.0186	-.0569	-.1695	.0224	.1684
Exercise	(.686)	.7542	-.0423	.1473	-.0166	.3024	-.0402	-.0037
Team sports	(.778)	.8429	-.0478	.0316	.0654	.0314	.1404	-.1984
Cars	(.534)	.4774	.0166	-.0196	-.0835	.2224	-.2255	.4448
Parties	(.788)	.0787	.8802	.0583	.0315	.0323	.0021	.0420
Go out	(.711)	.0882	.7886	-.0858	-.0598	-.2302	.0520	-.1221
Visit	(.748)	-.0637	.7697	-.2055	-.0573	.3165	.0766	-.0092
Ride	(.491)	-.2469	.4780	.2449	.2070	-.2856	.0402	.1231
Date	(.582)	.0825	-.0982	.7374	-.1013	-.0191	.1033	.0208
Concerts	(.624)	-.0416	.0898	.7151	.1811	-.0145	-.2624	.0353
Shop	(.661)	.0724	-.0605	.7208	.0192	.2196	.2839	-.0579
Write	(.723)	.0536	-.0483	-.0678	.8385	.0722	.0342	.0590
Music	(.528)	-.1310	.0392	.1175	.6542	.0750	.0659	.2393
Read	(.642)	.2780	.1258	.2638	.4479	.5010	.0898	.1404
Study	(.681)	.1189	.0096	.2235	-.0367	.7696	.0659	.1382
Alone	(.576)	-.0139	-.1223	-.2045	.3224	.6086	.1197	-.1747
Clubs	(.767)	-.0943	.0200	.0112	.4029	-.1546	.8251	.0352
Theater	(.671)	.1277	.0200	.0112	.4029	-.1547	.6831	.0345
Volunteer work	(.513)	-.0455	.3117	.1182	.2619	.3104	.3960	.2794
Movies	(.337)	.2549	-.0269	.2709	.1048	.0959	.3578	.2228
Crafts	(.703)	.0626	-.0851	.0082	.0835	-.0851	.0793	.8194
Art	(.557)	-.0992	.0712	.0069	.3224	.1031	.1271	.6412
Eigenvalue		3.549	2.599	2.252	1.711	1.559	1.313	1.128
Percentage of variance		16.1	11.8	10.2	7.8	7.1	6.0	5.1

gence of the same number of factors and the relatively high amount of variance these factors explain, the construct appears to be stable.

The similarity in patterns is somewhat surprising given the obvious lifestyle differences between college and high school students (e.g., living away from instead of with parents, the dramatically increased skill level needed to participate in athletics or performing arts at a major Division I college). Nevertheless, the similarity in patterns is striking and encouraging. The construct appears stable in form if not entirely in content. This stability holds across age groups that reflect two

major stages of the life course. Moreover, the construct is relatively stable despite being applied to a group of young adults who, on average, would be more committed in Hirschi's sense than would the respondents from a large sample of high school students. The current sample includes only college students who are assumed to be at least somewhat committed. The high school sample, however, included highly committed, college-bound students as well as those who despised school and planned to seek no further education (see Johnston et al., 1987). Given the differences in the sample and the similarities in the emergent patterns, operationalizing involvement as RAPs and measuring RAPs through factor-analyzing activities appears to be a valid practice.

DETERMINING THE RAPs' VISIBILITY AND INSTRUMENTALITY

As previously stated, one shortcoming of Hawdon's research was the inability to establish an empirical connection between the RAPs and their level of visibility or instrumentality. Although high levels of intercoder reliability were established among the coders who ranked the activities on these dimensions, no adequate operationalizations of visibility or instrumentality were available in the data. Therefore, the variability of the RAPs on the dimensions was inferred. To correct this problem, questions that can be used as measures of visibility and instrumentality were included in the college survey. Visibility was measured by the question, "How often are you supervised by someone of authority like your parent(s), a teacher, or a coach?" The answers for this question ranged from 1 = *almost never* to 7 = *almost always*. Instrumentality was measured by the question, "When you are with your friends, do you like to have set plans or just 'hang out'?" This item also ranged from 1 to 7 (7 = *have set plans*). The correlations between these items and the RAPs are presented in Table 2. Each RAP's predicted relationship with criminal behavior also is presented.

It is evident from the bivariate correlations that RAPs can vary independently on the two dimensions. Although the correlations are not strong (and, in fact, not statistically significant for visibility), they are in the predicted direction for each activity pattern. Based on these correlations, we can state predictions about each pattern's relationship

TABLE 2
Correlations of RAPs With Measures of
Instrumentality and Visibility

	<i>Instrumentality</i>	<i>Visibility</i>	<i>Predicted Delinquency</i>
Athletic pattern	.176*	-.018	Low
Recreational pattern	-.260**	.099	High
Social pattern	.193*	-.147	Moderate
Literary pattern	-.164*	-.135	High
Academic pattern	.234**	.060	Low
Performing arts pattern	.021	.154	Low
Arts and crafts pattern	.169*	-.007	Low

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

with deviant behavior. Individuals involved in the recreational pattern will be the most delinquent, followed by those individuals engaged in the activities of the literary pattern. Both of these patterns are negatively correlated with both dimensions of social control. The social, athletic, and arts and crafts patterns are mixed with respect to visibility and instrumentality. All of these patterns are relatively high on instrumentality but low on visibility. Because informal social control is more effective than formal social control in regulating deviance, those individuals involved in these patterns should commit relatively few deviant activities. Overall, it is predicted that these patterns will be associated with conforming, not deviant, behavior. Finally, the performing arts and academic pattern are both visible and instrumental RAPs. Individuals engaged in these patterns should have the lowest levels of delinquency.

USING RAPs TO PREDICT MULTIPLE DRUG USE AND LARCENY THEFT

The final stage of the analysis uses the RAPs and Hirschi's other concepts to predict criminal behavior. Because one ongoing criticism of Hirschi's work is that it fails to explain serious criminal involvement, this research analyzes serious drug use and the non-drug-related crime of larceny. Drug use was constructed by indexing the use of the

following drugs: cocaine, crack, heroin or other opiates, LSD, other hallucinogens, barbiturates, amphetamines, sedatives, and tranquilizers. The coding for these drugs was 0 = never used and 1 = have used. Students were also asked to estimate the number of times they used marijuana and alcohol in the past month. These variables ranged from 0 = has not used to 7 = more than 50 times. The standardized alpha reliability for this index was .719. Criminal behavior was measured using a four-item index. These questions asked the students the number of times in the past 2 years that they had avoided paying for services (e.g., bus rides, dinner), stole something from a car, stole something worth less than \$50, and stole something worth more than \$50 ($\alpha = .763$).

The central predictor variables are the seven RAPs discussed previously. Hirschi's remaining concepts were operationalized as closely to Hirschi's original research as possible.⁴ For example, Hirschi divides attachment into five subdimensions: child to parent intimacy, parent to child intimacy, affection, peer attachment, and school attachment. Thus, measures of all five subdimensions of attachment are included in the analysis. Although Hirschi (1969) divided belief into values and techniques of neutralization, only the values item was used. The questions Hirschi used to measure techniques of neutralization failed to index adequately. Moreover, none of these items was significantly correlated with the dependent variables. They were therefore omitted from the analysis. Commitment was measured using the same questions Hirschi used in his original study. The items used to construct all of the variables, the univariate statistics for all items, and scale statistics are presented in the appendix.

PREDICTING MULTIPLE-DRUG USE

A regression analysis including 14 variables (the seven RAPs, five dimensions of attachment, commitment, and belief) were used to predict multiple-drug use. The model was statistically significant ($F_{14,90} = 8.001$; $p = .000$) and explained 54.6% of the variance in drug use. Residual diagnostics indicated that the model met all of the assumptions of ordinary least squares regression.⁵ The only apparent problems of multicollinearity were between child-to-parent intimacy and parent-to-child intimacy. Although the tolerance and variance inflation factors (VIF) for these variables were within acceptable levels, a model

TABLE 3
Regression Analysis: Multi-Drug Use

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>Standardized Coefficient</i>	<i>t Value</i>
Athletic pattern	-.164	.226	-.052	-0.723
Recreational pattern	1.483***	.251	.461	5.896
Social pattern	.452*	.235	.143	1.920
Literary pattern	.054	.272	.017	0.200
Academic pattern	-.216	.273	-.064	-0.791
Performing arts pattern	-.766**	.241	-.242	-3.182
Arts and crafts pattern	-.408*	.226	-.130	-1.802
Parent-to-child intimacy	.112	.135	.088	0.828
Child-to-parent intimacy	.025	.232	.013	0.107
Peer attachment	.039	.129	.025	0.301
School attachment	.223	.207	.093	1.081
Affection	-.142	.163	-.095	-0.873
Commitment	-.411**	.154	-.233	-2.676
Belief	-.501***	.133	-.309	-3.767
Constant	18.501***	3.918	—	4.723

NOTE: $R^2 = .546$; $F = 8.001$; $p < .000$.

* $p < .05$ one-tailed. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

was run without parent to child intimacy. This corrected the slight problem of multicollinearity but did not significantly change anything else in the model. Therefore, the original model is presented. The results of the multiple-drug use model are presented in Table 3.

Six of the fourteen variables significantly predicted drug use using a one-tailed test of significance. The strongest predictor was the recreational RAP (beta = .461). The recreational pattern was closely followed by belief (-.309). The next two best predictors were the performing arts pattern (-.242) and commitment (-.233) RAPs. These four variables were significant predictors of multiple-drug use at the .05 level or better. The social pattern (.143) and the arts and crafts pattern (-.130) were significant using a one-tailed test. No other variables achieved statistical significance. All variables except parent-to-child intimacy, child-to-parent intimacy, and school attachment had the predicted effect on multiple-drug use.

Given the importance of peer drug use for predicting an individual's drug use (Becker, 1963; Elliott, Ageton, & Canter, 1979; Elliott, Huizinga, & Ageton, 1985; Goode, 1989; Jessor, 1979; Jessor & Jessor,

1980; Marcos et al., 1986; Massey & Krohn, 1986) and delinquency in general (McBroom, 1994; Patterson & Dishion, 1985; Pfuhl, 1986; Sutherland, Cressey, & Luckenbill, 1992), peer use was included to ensure that any influence of the RAPs was independent of, and could not be subsumed by, delinquent associations. Peer use was determined by the question, "How many of your friends use marijuana or hashish?"

A model including peer use, the seven RAPs, commitment, and belief was analyzed. This model was statistically significant ($F_{10, 95} = 22.540$; $p = .000$) and explained 70.1% of the variance in multiple-drug use. Not surprisingly, peer use was the best predictor of an individual's use ($\beta = .530$). The recreational RAP (.232) was the second best predictor. Belief (-.185), the performing arts pattern (-.144), and the arts and crafts pattern (-.140) were also significant predictors in this model. Commitment (-.110) was significant using a one-tailed test. The social, literary, and academic patterns were no longer statistically significant once peer use was included in the model. It is possible that the observed relationships between these variables and multiple-drug use were spurious with respect to peer use. That is, those who were committed or involved in the academic pattern simply did not associate with drug-using peers and that is why these persons do not use drugs. Conversely, it is because people involved in the social RAP tend to associate with drug users that a positive relationship between this pattern and multiple-drug use was found. Yet, the critical issue for this research is that three of the activity patterns remain significant even when peer use is entered into the equation. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.

PREDICTING LARCENY THEFT

A frequent criticism of Hirschi's original theory is that it is better at predicting minor delinquency than serious delinquency. To further demonstrate the utility of using RAPs as measures of involvement, a model predicting larceny theft was analyzed. The original model seriously violated the assumption of homoscedasticity,⁶ therefore, a weighted least-squares regression was used to correct the problem. The weighted model was significant ($F_{14, 104} = 4.163$; $p = .000$) and explained 39.6% of the variance in theft.⁷ Of the 14 variables entered, the

TABLE 4
Regression Analysis: Multi-Drug Use Trimmed Model

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>Standardized Coefficient</i>	<i>t Value</i>
Athletic pattern	-.178	.178	-.056	-1.000
Recreational pattern	.746***	.215	.232	3.474
Social pattern	.241	.186	.076	1.296
Literary pattern	.261	.180	.082	1.449
Academic pattern	-.019	.216	-.006	-0.087
Performing arts pattern	-.457**	.187	-.144	-2.438
Arts and crafts pattern	-.444**	.179	-.140	-2.478
Commitment	-.195*	.118	-.110	-1.625
Belief	-.300***	.099	-.185	-3.016
Peer use of drugs	.522****	.072	.530	7.304
Constant	6.886*	2.778	—	2.479

NOTE: $R^2 = .701$; $F = 22.540$; $p < .000$.

* $p < .05$ one-tailed. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$. **** $p < .001$.

performing arts pattern was the strongest predictor of theft ($\beta = -.401$). The recreational pattern ($\beta = .337$) and belief ($\beta = -.238$) were the next best predictors of theft. These items were the only statistically significant predictors at the .05 level. The academic pattern ($-.226$) was significant using a one-tailed test. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 5.

Although bond theory is not as successful in predicting larceny as it is for predicting drug use, it does, nevertheless, account for nearly 40% of the variance in theft. Moreover, what is critical to this analysis is that three of the RAPs significantly predict theft. The comparative failure of the model to predict theft is possibly due to the relative lack of serious delinquency in the sample. Although few of the college students were thieves, a number of them were multiple-drug users.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The wedding of Hirschi's bond theory and the emerging routine activities perspective of crime was successful. When involvement is reconceptualized and operationalized as routine activities, it becomes an effective predictor of minor acts of delinquency. Moreover, routine

TABLE 5
Regression Analysis: Larceny Theft

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>Standardized Coefficient</i>	<i>t Value</i>
Athletic pattern	-.086	.073	-.129	-1.180
Recreational pattern	.268***	.089	.337	3.009
Social pattern	.036	.070	.049	0.517
Literary pattern	-.079	.084	-.127	-0.944
Academic pattern	-.140*	.084	-.226	-1.639
Performing arts pattern	-.169**	.063	-.401	-2.679
Arts and crafts pattern	.100	.089	.102	1.133
Parent-to-child intimacy	-.028	.050	-.097	-0.552
Child-to-parent intimacy	-.075	.080	-.172	-0.929
Peer attachment	-.035	.043	-.100	-0.804
School attachment	-.053	.068	-.089	-0.783
Affection	.084	.054	.220	1.545
Commitment	-.034	.052	-.072	0.659
Belief	-.117**	.046	-.238	-2.551
Constant	1.091	1.269	—	0.860

NOTE: $R^2 = .396$; $F = 4.323$; $p < .000$.

* $p < .05$ one-tailed. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$.

activities were the best predictors of a relatively serious crime. Individuals engaged in routine patterns such as the recreational and literary patterns face little social control and tend to have higher rates of crime and delinquency. Involvement in routine patterns with mixed levels of visibility and instrumentality, including the social, athletic, and arts and crafts patterns, has little effect on delinquency. None of these patterns was a significant predictor of either multiple-drug use or larceny theft. Finally, involvement in those patterns with high levels of instrumentality and visibility (the academic and performing arts patterns) significantly reduces multiple-drug use and larceny theft. In fact, being involved in the performing arts pattern was the best predictor of larceny theft—those who were involved in this pattern were much less likely to commit this crime. Thus, the current research has several implications for the theoretical strategy employed herein and criminological research in general.

First, Hirschi's bond theory, if involvement is reconceptualized using the insights of the routine activity perspective, provides an excellent framework for explaining crime and delinquency. This research

demonstrates the efficacy of synthesizing two theoretical perspectives. Despite the emergence of the routine activity perspective as an independent framework for explaining crime (see Osgood et al., 1996), an argument can be made that a better, more efficient strategy is to subsume the insights of this perspective within Hirschi's bond theory. A reconceptualized bond theory provides an explanation that includes both historical and situational explanations of crime (see Sutherland et al., 1992, for a discussion of the difference between these types of explanations). Moreover, unlike the work done thus far in the routine activity perspective, the reconceptualization of involvement as RAPs provides a multidimensional concept that can clearly distinguish between sets of conventional activities. Several of the RAPs that emerge from the data in both the high school and college samples include activities, which, if analyzed separately, are correlated with delinquent behavior. However, individuals who perform these activities are generally involved in other conventional activities that decrease the likelihood of delinquency. It is only when the activities are simultaneously considered that a predictable pattern emerges. The relationship between an activity pattern and criminal behavior can be predicted based on the visibility and instrumentality of the activities that comprise the RAP.

Next, the reconceptualization of involvement as daily routine patterns appears legitimate. The construct seems reliable and valid even when applied to samples of youth who are in very different stages of life. Despite the very different lifestyles of high-school students and college students, similar activity patterns emerged from the data. This fact reaffirms the assertion that certain activities tend to cluster together despite the status of the individuals performing the activities. This insight has implications not only for criminologists and how they measure their concepts but also for policy makers who are attempting to reduce delinquency or rehabilitate offenders.

Third, the reconceptualized measure of involvement illustrates the conceptual and analytical independence of involvement and commitment. Earlier claims that commitment subsumes involvement and that these are not independent concepts are inaccurate. Moreover, at least in a sample of 1st-year college students, there is relatively little distinction in terms of commitment and attachment. These concepts were either weak predictors of delinquency or, in the case of attachment,

unrelated to drug use or theft. This research further illustrates the power of focusing on behaviors instead of attitudes. Although most college students are committed and have relatively good relationships with their parents (i.e., they are attached), their daily leisure activities vary considerably. Although the historical aspects of Hirschi's theory (i.e., commitment, attachment, and belief) can distinguish between serious delinquents and conforming youths, the situational variable (i.e., the reconceptualization of involvement) is the best element of the bond for making the finer distinction among minor delinquents. The greater ability of behaviors to predict criminal behavior also circumvents the troublesome connection between attitudes and behaviors. People often do not act in complete accordance with what they feel. Because behaviors are easier to measure than attitudes and they appear to explain more variance in criminal behavior, reconceptualizing involvement as a set of behaviors has an obvious utility.

Although considerable research needs to be conducted, the current research further demonstrates the value of substituting the multidimensional concept of routine activity patterns for Hirschi's concept of involvement. The construct appears to be stable over time and across samples that differ in terms of life-course stages. Although the sample was small and can only be generalized to the university in question, routine activities and Hirschi's other elements of the bond significantly predicted multiple-drug use and larceny theft. Consequently, these results support the reconceptualized theory.

APPENDIX

All items are 5-point Likert-type scales.

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>(Alpha)</i>
<i>Attachment</i>				
Parent-to-child intimacy (scale)	11.35	2.49	3-15	(.822)
How often do your parents explain their reasons for the rules they make? (<i>not often at all to very often</i>)	3.70	1.01	1-5	

APPENDIX Continued

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	(Alpha)
How often do your parents explain why they feel the way they feel? (not often at all to very often)	3.79	0.99	1-5	
How often do your parents help explain things to you? (not often at all to very often)	3.86	0.89	1-5	
Child-to-parent intimacy (scale)	7.68	1.76	2-10	(.701)
How often do you share your thoughts with your parents? (not often at all to very often)	3.68	1.01	1-5	
How often do you talk to your parents about your future? (not often at all to very often)	3.98	0.94	1-5	
Affection (scale)	22.63	2.11	7-25	(.665)
My family is important to me. (strongly disagree to strongly agree)	4.82	.38	2-5	
How would you describe your relationship with your mother? (not good at all to very good)	4.53	.84	1-5	
In general, how would you describe your family life? (not good at all to very good)	4.28	.75	2-5	
I respect my parents' opinions. (strongly disagree to strongly agree)	4.37	.69	1-5	
It is important for my mother to respect me. (strongly disagree to strongly agree)	4.63	.50	1-5	
To peers (scale)	14.76	2.05	4-20	(.684)
It is important to me for my friends to respect me. (strongly disagree to strongly agree)	4.32	0.57	1-5	
I want to be like my friends. (strongly disagree to strongly agree)	2.94	0.82	1-5	
I respect my friends' opinions. (strongly disagree to strongly agree)	4.43	0.58	1-5	
It is important to me to be popular with my friends. (strongly disagree to strongly agree)	3.05	0.95	1-5	
To school (scale)	10.17	1.31	5-20	(.673)
Do you respect the opinions of your teachers? (very little respect to respect a lot)	4.21	0.88	1-5	
Do you like school? (not at all to very much)	4.19	0.77	1-5	
In general, how do you feel about your teachers? (do not like them at all to like them a lot)	4.19	0.53	2-5	
Generally speaking, would you say the teachers here care about the students? (do not care at all to care a lot)	3.98	1.38	1-5	

(continued)

APPENDIX Continued

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	(Alpha)
<i>Commitment</i> (scale)	17.62	1.78	7-20	(.740)
How hard do you try in school? (<i>not hard at all to very hard</i>)	4.15	0.69	1-5	
How important is it to you that you get a good education? (<i>not important at all to very important</i>)	4.64	0.60	2-5	
What is your grade point average? (1 = F; 5 = A)	3.99	0.64	2-5	
How important is it to you that you get good grades in school? (<i>not important at all to very important</i>)	4.64	0.65	1-5	
<i>Belief</i> (scale)	14.39	1.94	4-20	(.746)
You should respect the police. (<i>strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>)	3.96	0.65	1-5	
You should obey the rules of adults. (<i>strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>)	3.72	0.64	1-5	
It is all right to do something your parents tell you not to do as long as you can get away with it. (<i>strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>)	3.41	0.77	1-5	
The police are honest. (<i>strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>)	3.29	0.72	1-5	
<i>Involvement</i>				
See Table 1.				

NOTES

1. Activities are said to be instrumental only if they are oriented toward a traditionally defined, acceptable goal.

2. Osgood and his associates (1996) include similar concepts in their extension of the routine activities perspective. Their variables of time with peers and absence of authority figures is similar to visibility. The distinction between structured and unstructured activities is similar to instrumentality. I maintain the present conceptual framework because it relates directly to the concepts of formal and informal social control found in the social control literature (e.g., Nye, 1958). Moreover, maintaining the current conceptualization allows RAPs to include activities that are both supervised and unsupervised or structured and unstructured. It is the preponderance of activities in either direction and the combination of the dimensions that determine the RAP's relation with deviant behavior. I therefore believe the current operationalization is a more sophisticated measure.

3. In Hawdon's original analysis, 54.8% of the variance was explained by the seven factors (see Hawdon, 1996, p. 170).

4. The only departure from Hirschi's operationalizations is the occasional addition of items that directly relate to his concepts. All constructs met acceptable alpha levels and are presented in the appendix.

5. A histogram and p-plot of the residuals indicated that the residuals were normally distributed, a scatterplot of the residuals and the predicted values and White's test for heteroscedasticity indicated that the variances were equal, and VIF and tolerance statistics indicated no serious problems of multicollinearity (see Norusis, 1985, for further discussion of these diagnostic tests). Moreover, although there were two condition indexes that were high (over 30), there was only one variance-decomposition proportion that was large (over .50). These results also suggest that no serious problems of multicollinearity exist in the model (see Belsley, Kuh, & Welsch, 1980).

6. White's test for heteroscedasticity (see White, 1980) revealed a violation of the assumption: $\chi^2 = 24.328$ at 14 degrees of freedom; $p > .05$.

7. The weighted least-squares procedure in the SPSS statistical package was used. McClendon (1994, pp. 192-195) discusses this technique and how it is performed using SPSS.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, R. S. (1985). Social control theory and delinquency: A longitudinal test. *Criminology*, 23(1), 47-61.
- Agnew, R. S., & Peterson, D. M. (1989). Leisure and delinquency. *Social Problems*, 36(4), 332-350.
- Akers, R. L., & Cochran, J. K. (1985). Adolescent marijuana use: A test of three theories of deviant behavior. *Deviant Behavior*, 6(4), 323-346.
- Becker, H. S. (1955). Marijuana use and social control. *Social Problems*, 3(2), 35-44.
- Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Belsley, D. A., Kuh, E., & Welsch, R. E. (1980). *Regression diagnostics: Identifying influential data and sources of collinearity*. New York: John Wiley.
- Cavan, S. (1972). *Hippies of the Haight*. St. Louis, MO: New Critics Press.
- Cohen, L. E., & Cantor, D. (1980). The determinants of larceny: An empirical and theoretical study. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 17(2), 140-159.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44(4), 588-608.
- Conger, R. D. (1976). Social control and social learning models of delinquent behavior: A synthesis. *Criminology*, 14(1), 17-40.
- Elliott, D. S., Ageton, S. S., & Canter, R. (1979). An integrated theoretical perspective on delinquent behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 16(1), 3-27.
- Elliott, D. S., Huizinga, D., & Ageton S. S. (1985). *Delinquency and drug use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Felson, M. (1986). Linking criminal choices, routine activities, informal control, and criminal outcomes. In D. B. Cornish & R. V. Clark (Eds.), *The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspectives on offending* (pp. 119-128). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Felson, M. (1994). *Crime and everyday life: Insights and implications for society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

- Felson, M., & Gottfredson, M. (1984). Social indicators of adolescent activities near peers and parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46(3), 709-714.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1994). *Talking about crime and criminals: Problems and issues in theory development in criminology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gibbons, D. C., & Krohn, M. (1991). *Delinquent behavior* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Goode, E. (1989). *Drugs in American society* (3rd ed.). New York: Knopf.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hagan, J. (1991). Destiny and drift: Subcultural preferences, status attainments, and the risks and rewards of youth. *American Sociological Review*, 56(5), 567-582.
- Hawdon, J. E. (1996). Deviant lifestyles: The social control of daily routines. *Youth and Society*, 28(2), 162-188.
- Hindelang, M. J. (1973). Causes of delinquency: A partial replication and extension. *Social Problems*, 20(4), 471-487.
- Hindelang, M. J. (1976). *Criminal victimization in eight American cities: A descriptive analysis of common theft and assault*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Hindelang, M. J., Gottfredson, M., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jessor, R. (1979). Marihuana: A review of recent psychological research. In *Handbook on drug abuse* (pp. 337-355). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. L. (1980). A social-psychological framework for studying drug use: Longitudinal studies of high school and college youth. In *Theories on drug abuse: Selected contemporary issues* (pp. 102-109). Rockville, MD: National Institute of Drug Abuse.
- Johnston, L. D., Bachman, J. G., & O'Malley, P. M. (1987). *Monitoring the future: The continuous study of lifestyles and values of youth*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Kempf, K. L. (1993). The empirical status of Hirschi's control theory. In F. Adler & W. S. Laufer (Eds.), *New directions in criminological theory* (Vol. 4, pp. 143-185). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Lauderdale, P. (1984). Experiments in social control. In *Toward a general theory of social control: Selected problems* (Vol. 2, pp. 261-283). New York: Academic Press.
- LeBlanc, M. L., & Caplan, A. (1993). Theoretical formalization, a necessity: The example of Hirschi's bonding theory. In F. Adler & W. S. Laufer (Eds.), *New directions in criminological theory* (Vol. 4, pp. 186-215). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Liska, A. E., & Reed, M. D. (1985). Ties to conventional institutions and delinquency: Estimating reciprocal effects. *American Sociological Review*, 50(4), 547-560.
- Marcos, A. C., Bahr, S. J., & Johnson, R. E. (1986). Test of a bonding/association theory of adolescent drug use. *Social Forces*, 65(1), 135-161.
- Massey, J. L., & Krohn, M. D. (1986). A longitudinal examination of an integrated social process model of deviant behavior. *Social Forces*, 65(1), 106-134.
- Matza, D., & Sykes, G. M. (1961). Juvenile delinquency and subterranean values. *American Sociological Review*, 26(5), 712-720.
- McBroom, J. R. (1994). Correlates of alcohol and marijuana use among junior high school students: Family peers, school problems, and psychological concerns. *Youth and Society*, 26(1), 54-67.
- McClendon, M. J. (1994). *Multiple regression and causal analysis*. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.
- Messner, S. F., & Tardiff, K. (1985). The social ecology of urban homicide: An application of the routine activities approach. *Criminology*, 23(4), 241-267.

- Miethe, T. D., & Meier, R. F. (1994). *Crime and its social context: Toward an integrated theory of offenders, victims, and situations*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Miethe, T. D., Stafford, M. C., & Long, J. S. (1987). Social differentiation in criminal victimization: A test of routine activities/lifestyle theories. *American Sociological Review*, 52(2), 184-194.
- Norusis, M. J. (1985). *SPSS: Advanced Statistics Guide*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nye, F. I. (1958). *Family relationships and delinquent behavior*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Osgood, D. W., Wilson, J. K., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Johnston, L. D. (1996). Routine activities and individual deviant behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 61(4), 635-655.
- Partridge, W. L. (1973). *The hippie ghetto: The natural history of a subculture*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Patterson, G. R., & Dishion, T. J. (1985). Contributions of families and peers to delinquency. *Criminology*, 23(2), 63-79.
- Pfuhl, E. H., Jr. (1986). *The deviance process* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Pope, H., Jr. (1971). *Voices from the drug culture*. Boston: Beacon.
- Riley, D. (1987). Time and crime: The link between teenager lifestyle and delinquency. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 3(4), 339-354.
- Sutherland, E. H., Cressey, D. R., & Luckenbill, D. F. (1992). *Principles of criminology* (11th ed.). Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.
- Wallace, J. M., Jr., & Bachman, J. G. (1991). Explaining racial/ethnic differences in adolescent drug use: The impact of background and lifestyle. *Social Problems*, 38(3), 333-357.
- White, H. (1980). A heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica*, 48(4), 817-838.
- Wiatrowski, M. D., Griswold, D. B., & Roberts, M. K. (1981). Social control theory and delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 46(5), 525-541.

James E. Hawdon received his Ph.D. from the University of Virginia in 1992 and joined the faculty at Clemson University. He is currently an associate professor and director of graduate studies in the Department of Sociology. In addition to his articles on crime and deviance, Hawdon has published articles and a book on the growth of intergovernmental organizations. His current work is applying his theory of institutional co-evolution to the community and modern nation-state to explain historic and cross-national trends in criminal behavior.