Published in final edited form as:

J Ethn Crim Justice. 2019 ; 17(4): 339–360. doi:10.1080/15377938.2019.1661058.

Gender, age, and ethnic differences in offending behavior among Hispanic/Latino criminal justice clients

Gladys E. Ibañez, Ph.D.¹, Angel Algarin, MPH¹, Rana Jaber, Ph.D.¹, Disler Vanessa Ayala, MPH¹, Steve S. Martin, M.A.², Daniel J. O'Connell, Ph.D.²

¹Florida International University

²University of Delaware

Abstract

Hispanic/Latinos are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system. Using convenience sampling, the present study examined the lifetime and recent offending behavior of Hispanic/Latinos involved in community corrections in Miami, Florida. Descriptive statistics and multivariable logistic regression analyses were conducted. Participants were mostly male (59.7%), less than 40 years old (84.1%), and almost half were of Cuban descent (48.5%). Women were less likely to manufacture or sell drugs than men (AOR=.42, $p<.03$), and more likely to report recent prostitution (AOR=7.34, $p<.001$) and stealing from houses or shops (AOR=2.68, $p<.01$). Central Americans were less likely to report alcohol and drug related offenses than Cubans. Findings suggest that criminality among Hispanic/Latinos may vary by gender and by sub-groups. Prevention programs should be tailored accordingly.

Keywords

Latinos; Hispanic; Criminal Justice; Gender; Ethnic Difference; Offending Behavior

The United States Office of Management and Budgets (OMB) use the term “Hispanic or Latino” to describe those who are from or descended from people from Latin America (including Brazil), Spain, or any Spanish-Speaking Caribbean countries (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). This would include, for example, people of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central American, and South American origin (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). For the present

Corresponding Author: Gladys E. Ibañez, Assistant Professor, Florida International University, 11200 S.W. 8th Street, AHC-5, Room 478, Miami, Florida 33199, gibanez@fiu.edu, (305) 348-4920. Dr. Ibañez is currently serving as the principal investigator on several research projects on HIV and the elderly, transgender health, and complementary approaches to health. Angel Algarin, MPH, Florida International University 11200 S.W. 8th Street, Miami, Florida 33199, Mr. Algarin is a doctoral student interested in HIV-related stigma. Rana Jaber, Post-doctoral fellow, Florida International University 11200 S.W. 8th Street, Miami, Florida 33199. Dr. Jaber is completing her post-doctoral fellowship in cardiovascular research. Disler Vanessa Ayala, Research Assistant, Florida International University 11200 S.W. 8th Street, Miami, Florida 33199. Ms. Ayala is currently working on a research project examining cognitive functioning among people aging with HIV. Steve S. Martin, Senior Scientist, University of Delaware, 257 E. Main Street, Suite 110, Newark, DE 19716. Steve Martin is a Scientist for the Center for Drug and Health Studies. He has served as the principal investigator on multiple NIH and state-level research projects. He has published over 70 articles on substance abuse, delinquency, attitudes and behavior, and methodology. Daniel J. O'Connell, Senior Scientist, University of Delaware, 257 E. Main St., Suite 110, Newark, DE 19716. Dr. O'Connell is a Scientist at the Center for Drug and Health Studies. His research specialties are research design and methodologies, intervention development and project management.

study, the term “Hispanic/Latino” will be used to denote this population. Hispanic/Latinos are the largest minority group in the United States (United States Census Bureau, 2016) and from 2015–2016 were the only racial/ethnic category to see increased rates of incarceration in both men (1,043 to 1,092 per 100,000) and women (63 to 67 per 100,000) (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016). They are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system, with approximately one in three federal prisoners being Hispanic/Latino (Federal Bureau of Prisons, 2018). They are also more likely to be detained, (Chanin, Rintels, & Drachsler, 2011), disproportionately represented among probation populations (Hill, 2015), and treated unequally within the criminal justice system (Demuth & Steffensmeier, 2004). Of the 4.65 million, or 1 in 53 adults, in community corrections, (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016), Hispanic/Latinos represent 13% of all probationers and 16% of all parolees (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016). Despite these trends, there is limited data on Hispanic/Latinos involved in the criminal justice system. According to the Urban Institute (2016), within the United States, individual states do not consistently collect data on ethnicity with only 38 states reporting data on Hispanic/Latinos in prison, and only 20 and 18 states report data on Hispanic/Latinos in the parole and probation populations, respectively. According to the Florida Department of Corrections (n.d.), the community corrections population in Florida includes 17.3% Hispanic/Latinos. Although there is data on the types of offenses in general within the community corrections population in Florida, there are no data on types of offenses for only Hispanic/Latinos in community corrections in Florida. In general, studies are needed that focus on the disparities experienced by Hispanic/Latinos in the criminal justice system.

Disparities in incarceration are evident by ethnic group and gender. In states with particularly high ethnic incarceration disparities, Hispanic/Latino men are incarcerated at rates between 4.3 and 3.1 times greater than White offenders (Nellis, 2016). Hispanic/Latinos, especially men, have higher arrest rates in states with a large Hispanic/Latino population (Malavé & Giordano, 2015) such as Florida. Although there are more men than women in the criminal justice system in the U.S., female imprisonment has increased at a 50% higher rate than men since 1980; and Hispanic/Latino women are 1.2 times more likely to be incarcerated than white women (The Sentencing Project, 2015). The literature on Hispanic/Latino women involved in the criminal justice system is scant. The present study attempts to address this gap by examining the gender, age, and Hispanic/Latino subgroup differences in offending behavior among this population.

Gender differences in offending behavior

For decades, studies have shown gender differences in criminal activity and delinquency with males reporting more criminogenic behaviors (Mazerolle, Brame, Paternoster, Piquero, & Dean, 2000; Mears, Ploeger, & Warr, 1998; Shekarkhar & Gibson, 2011). Men are more likely to commit violent crimes and public order offenses, whereas women are more likely to be incarcerated for drug and property offenses (The Sentencing Project, 2015). The spike in recent female incarceration rates is attributed to an increase in drug related behavior (The Sentencing Project, 2015). Among all racial/ethnic groups, the largest gender difference in the decision to incarcerate were found for Hispanic/Latinos, with men more likely to be incarcerated than women (Doerner, 2015). Past research has reported on the interaction

between race/ethnicity, gender and age among offenders, and found that Hispanic/Latino male offenders, and especially young Hispanic/Latino males, were more likely to be sentenced to prison as compared to White offenders (Doerner & Demuth, 2010; Franklin, 2018). Another recent study examined gender differences by drug offense and found that drug offenders received longer incarceration sentences than non-drug offenders; and that Hispanic/Latino women were 44% less likely to be incarcerated than Hispanic/Latino men for a drug offense (Doerner, 2015).

However, some studies report no difference in offending behaviors (Mazerolle et al., 2000). Looking at gender differences has become increasingly important as the rate of incarceration of women has increased by 700% between 1980 and 2014 (The Sentencing Project, 2015). Particular attention should be given to Hispanic/Latino women since they are at a higher risk of incarceration than white women (The Sentencing Project, 2015), and only a limited number of studies look at gender differences within Hispanic/Latinos. In fact, most of the research on gender differences among Hispanic/Latinos has focused on teens. For example, one study found that second-generation Hispanic/Latino have higher rates of delinquency in their early teens than males, but this difference converges by around age 15 (Powell, Perreira, & Mullan Harris, 2010). More research is needed on adult Hispanic/Latino women.

Age differences in offending behavior

Age differences in criminal activity has also been reported. Studies on the trajectory of offending behavior shows that as offenders get older, there is a decrease in criminal activity (Bersani, Nieuwbeerta, & Laub, 2009; Doherty & Bersani, 2018). This “age-crime curve” has been shown to be true throughout time and across races (Fabio, Tu, Loeber, & Cohen, 2011). Previous studies also suggest that the earlier the age of onset for criminal activity, the more likely the offending behavior is to continue (Farrington, 1986; Moffitt, 1993). Of arrests made in 2010 for people under 18 years of age, the most frequently reported offenses included: Larceny-theft (281,100 arrests), other (simple) assault (210,200 arrests), drug abuse violation (170,600 arrests), and disorderly conduct (155,900 arrests) (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2014); young adults are more likely to be involved with drug violations, vandalism, assault charges, larceny-theft, prostitution, disorderly conduct, forgery, fraud, drunk driving and domestic abuse than older adults (FBI, 2012). Individuals above thirty years old are more likely to be involved with larceny-theft, crimes against others, burglary and property damage (FBI: UCR, 2012). While there is evidence that the link between criminality and age exists, there is no clear evidence on how this relationship applies to Hispanic/Latinos. Considering that the Hispanic/Latino population is the youngest minority in the US, with one third of Hispanic/Latinos being under eighteen (Patten, 2016), it is important to understand the criminality patterns of Hispanic/Latinos according to age.

Hispanic/Latino subgroup differences and offending behavior

The term Hispanic/Latino encompasses a diverse group of people, who are heterogeneous in terms of nativity, immigration status, language, and acculturation which are important factors to understand when creating culturally tailored interventions (Gonzalez Burchard et al., 2005; Ibañez et al., 2016; Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006). Most studies on

Hispanic/Latino subgroups look at acculturation and compare US born versus foreign-born Hispanic/Latinos. US born Hispanic/Latinos are more likely to report violent offending behaviors (Shekarkhar & Gibson, 2011), to be involved in lifetime and recent crime, to use illicit drugs (Ibañez et al., 2016; Ibañez et al., 2017; Mancini, Salas-Wright, & Vaughn, 2015), and to be arrested for miscellaneous offenses or property crime (Ibañez et al., 2016) compared to foreign-born Hispanic/Latinos.

Fewer studies have examined Hispanic/Latinos by region or country of origin. However, one study found that Central Americans are more likely to be arrested for violent and domestic crimes than other Hispanic/Latino subgroups (Gil-Rivas, Anglin, & Annon, 1997); and another study found that second generation Cubans on government assistance are more likely than second generation Mexicans to engage in crime (Ortiz & Telles, 2012). Increased insight on the differences among Hispanic/Latinos is essential in creating culturally competent services in reaching out to Hispanic/Latino subpopulations that may be criminal justice involved (Ibañez, et al., 2016).

The present study

The present study is an exploratory, descriptive study that examines a variety of specific offenses, both violent and non-violent offenses, and comparing offending behavior by gender, age, and Hispanic/Latino subgroups (i.e., Cuban, Puerto Rican, Central American, South American) among a sample of Hispanic/Latinos involved in community corrections in Miami, Florida. Findings will help in the development of age, gender, and culturally appropriate interventions. The findings in this study will help better target services for the Hispanic/Latino criminal justice population, which is often neglected in prevention interventions (Ibañez et al., 2016). The research questions are the following: 1) what offenses are most common among Hispanic/Latino criminal justice clients by gender, age, and Hispanic/Latino subgroups; and 2) are there any differences in offending behavior by gender, age, or Hispanic/Latino subgroups?

Methods

Participants

Participants were involved in community corrections and were recruited from local jail diversion and court-mandated substance abuse service programs in the Miami-Dade County area. Recruitment was done via flyers posted in waiting rooms, word of mouth, research staff presentations, and through referrals from the community agency staff. Eligibility criteria included the following: must self-identify as Hispanic/Latino, age 18–49, report heterosexual preference or behavior, currently or recently involved in the criminal justice system (within the last 3 months); and current or recent drug use (within the last 3 months). Potential participants were screened for eligibility either by phone or in person at one of the community agencies. During the brief screening process, the research staff would explain the study, emphasize that all information was confidential, and then proceed to ask a few questions to determine eligibility.

Measures

Demographic information was collected on age, gender (male=1, female=2), ‘what is your ethnicity?’ (1=Cuban, 2=Puerto Rican, 3=Central American, 4=South American, 5=Other), country of origin (“where are you from originally?”), education level (e.g., did not attend high school=1 to Professional degree = 8), and income level (“less than \$20,000” = 1 to “over \$100,000 = 7). Crime history data were collected using the Criminal Justice Drug Abuse Treatment Studies (CJ-DATS) assessment tool (Prendergast, n.d.). The crime history tool asks the participants whether they have ever been involved in 24 different types of criminal activity regardless of arrest (e.g., “have you ever been involved in public intoxication”, “have you ever been involved in possession with intent to sell”). Recent criminal activity was assessed by asking participants if they had been involved in these same 24 criminal activities in the last 90 days. Except for the demographic variables, all variables were dichotomous (yes/no).

Procedures

Once deemed eligible, participants were scheduled for a baseline interview. Baseline interviews were conducted at either the research field office, at one of the study community partner agencies, or a private location convenient to the participant. At the interview, trained, bilingual research staff provided participants with a detailed explanation of the study, and an informed consent form to sign. Interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes and were administered using the computer assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) method. At the end of the baseline interview, participants were provided a \$30 monetary incentive for their participation. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) of the University of Delaware and Florida International University.

Data Analysis Plan

Data were analyzed using SAS (v9.4; SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC). Descriptive characteristics were used to report sample characteristics and crime frequencies. Univariate logistic regression models were conducted to assess the odds of each demographic variable on committing different types of crimes. Demographic variables were then analyzed together in a multivariate logistic regression analysis.

Results

Demographics

A total of 200 participants were interviewed in this study. Country of origin varied with 70.0% of the sample from the U.S., 11.0% from Cuba, 5.5% from Puerto Rico, 4.0% from Colombia, 2.0% from Nicaragua, 1.5% from Honduras, 0.5% from Guatemala, 0.5% from the Dominican Republic, and 5% identifying as other. As shown in Table 1., the sample was comprised of a majority male (60.0%), 18–28 year old (49.0%), Cuban (48.5%), Never married (75.0%), white (52.5%), high school educated (33.5%), unemployed (55.0%), and making less than \$20,000 per year (60.5%) participants. Twenty-three participants were not included in yearly income as they did not respond. Descriptive statistics for each lifetime and recent criminal activity is shown in Table 2.

Gender Correlates

In the crude analysis of correlates to drug and alcohol associated crimes, it was found that female sex had lower odds of manufacturing or selling drugs or paraphernalia in comparison to male sex (COR=0.48; $p=0.016$). In the adjusted analysis, female sex remained to have lower odds of involvement with manufacturing or selling drugs or paraphernalia in comparison to male sex (AOR=0.416; $p=0.028$).

In the crude analysis of correlates to non-drug and alcohol associated crimes, we found that female sex had significantly lower odds of illegal gambling and involvement in weapon offenses (COR=0.19; $p=0.033$, COR=0.27; $p=0.046$, respectively), but higher odds of prostitution or pimping and stealing from houses or shops (COR=8.72; $p<0.001$, COR=2.36; $p=0.004$, respectively) in comparison to men. In the adjusted analysis of correlates to non-drug and alcohol associated crimes, we found that female sex remained having lower odds of illegal gambling and involvement in weapon offenses (AOR=0.13; $p=0.040$, AOR=0.16; $p=0.027$, respectively), and higher odds of prostitution or pimping and stealing from houses or shops (AOR=8.72; $p=0.003$, AOR=2.68; $p=0.012$, respectively). Additionally, in the adjusted analysis, we found that females had lower odds of fencing and involvement with vandalism/property damage/tagging (AOR=0.36; $p=0.033$, AOR=0.25; $p=0.040$, respectively).

Hispanic/Latino Sub-group Correlates

In the crude analysis of correlates to drug and alcohol associated crimes, we found that Central American ethnicity had lower odds of involvement in public intoxication from alcohol or drugs (COR=0.37; $p=0.049$) in comparison to Cuban ethnicity. In the adjusted analysis of correlates to drug and alcohol associated crimes, it was found that Central American ethnicity remained to have lower odds of involvement in public intoxication from alcohol or drugs (AOR=0.29; $p=0.034$) in comparison to Cuban ethnicity. Uncovered in the adjusted analysis, Central American ethnicity had lower odds of involvement with manufacturing or selling drugs or paraphernalia and involvement with use or possession of illegal drugs (AOR=0.14; $p=0.015$, AOR=0.10; $p=0.024$, respectively) in comparison to Cuban ethnicity.

In the crude analysis of correlates to non-drug and alcohol associated crimes, we found that Puerto Rican ethnicity had higher odds of involvement in weapon offenses (COR=3.67; $p=0.032$) in comparison to Cuban ethnicity. However, in the adjusted analysis the difference between Puerto Rican and Cuban ethnicity in regard to involvement in weapon offenses became non-significant (AOR=4.61; $p=0.081$).

Age Correlates

There were no significant age group correlates in the analysis of drug and alcohol use crimes; however, in the crude analysis of correlates to non-drug and alcohol associated crimes, we found that participants aged 29–39 had lower odds of involvement in probation/parole violations (COR=0.31; $p=0.024$) in comparison to participants aged 18–28. In the adjusted model, the correlation between age and involvement in probation/parole violations became non-significant (AOR=0.52; $p=0.334$), but being aged 40+ emerged as having

significantly lower odd of involvement with vandalism/property damage/tagging (AOR=0.06; $p=0.020$) in comparison to participants aged 18–28.

Race Correlates

In the crude analysis of correlates to drug and alcohol associated crimes, we found that Black Hispanic/Latinos had lower odds of involvement in public intoxication from alcohol or drugs (COR=0.11; $p=0.007$) in comparison to White Hispanic/Latinos. In the adjusted analysis, it was found that Black Hispanic/Latinos remained to have lower odds of involvement in public intoxication from alcohol or drugs (AOR=0.12; $p=0.019$) in comparison to White Hispanic/Latinos.

In the crude analysis of correlates to non-drug and alcohol associated crimes race was not seen as a significant variable. However, race became statistically significant in the adjusted models where Black Hispanic/Latinos had higher odds of prostitution or pimping and involvement in probation/parole violations (AOR=7.65; $p=0.045$, AOR=10.84; $p=0.033$, respectively) in comparison to White Hispanic/Latinos.

Income Correlates

There were no significant income group correlates in the analysis of drug and alcohol use crimes; however, in the adjusted analysis of correlates to non-drug and alcohol associated crimes, income of \$30–39,000 emerged as having significantly higher odds of illegal gambling (AOR=12.68; $p=0.038$) and lower odds of stealing from houses or shops (AOR=0.09; $p=0.049$).

Education Correlates

There were no significant education group correlates in the analysis of drug and alcohol use crimes; however, in the crude analysis of correlates to non-drug and alcohol associated crimes, we found having an associate's degree or higher education had lower odds of stealing from houses or shops and involvement in probation/parole violations (COR=0.15; $p<0.001$, COR=0.10; $p=0.030$, respectively) in comparison to less than high school education. In the adjusted analysis, associate's degree education level remained having lower odds of stealing from houses or shops (AOR=0.14; $p=0.004$), but lost significance in its relationship with and involvement in probation/parole violations (AOR=0.25; $p=0.236$) in comparison with less than high school education.

Relationship Correlates

Though non-significant in the crude model, in the adjusted analysis of correlates to drug and alcohol associated crimes, divorced marital status had lower odds of involvement with manufacturing or selling drugs or paraphernalia (AOR=0.21; $p=0.030$) in comparison to those never married.

In the crude analysis of correlates to non-drug and alcohol associated crimes, we found being divorced had higher odds of involvement in prostitution or pimping in comparison to those never married (COR=1.57; $p=0.011$). In the adjusted model, being divorced lost its

significance and being separated gained significance in that being separated had higher odds of involvement in prostitution or pimping (AOR=8.29; $p=0.028$).

Discussion

Summary of findings

The present study is one of the few studies to examine specific lifetime and recent offending behavior among criminal justice-involved Hispanic/Latinos by several key demographics including gender, age, and by certain Hispanic/Latino subgroups such as Cuban, Puerto Rican, Central American, and South American. Regarding drug related offenses, women were less likely to sell or manufacture drugs than men. One reason for the difference in selling or manufacturing drugs could be that there may be gender inequality for Hispanic/Latino women in the drug economy. Women may be given opportunities to sell drugs but it is not often nor consistent; and women may not be seen as tough as men, especially African-American and Hispanic/Latino men (Maher & Daly, 1996). Cultural factors such as machismo and traditional gender roles may also prevent Hispanic/Latino women from participating in the drug economy. There is research suggesting that there's a machismo or masculinity that involves dubious activities to earn income as well as an absence of vulnerability (Daley, 2016) particularly with urban neighborhoods (Trimbur, 2011). Cultural criminology, which emphasizes the meaning of interactions within subcultures, and how a person makes sense of their actions and social environment (Ferrell, Hayward, & Young, 2015), may shed light on women's roles within the drug economy subculture. In fact, Naegler & Salman (2016) argue for a "feminist cultural criminology", which suggest that women may find meaning differently than men and deal with oppression in risky defiant actions. In addition to being a source of income, involvement in sex work could be a form of resistance and defiance against the Hispanic/Latino cultural norm of *marianismo*, the notion that women should be chaste, non-sexual, humble, and passive (Castillo & Cano, 2007), and against a male-dominated drug economy subculture. The finding that Hispanic/Latino women reported more prostitution, and less selling and manufacturing of drugs than men, could be reflective of an oppressive patriarchal society within the illicit drug economy subculture. Immigration status is another factor to consider in the power dynamics for Hispanic/Latino women. Women who are undocumented may prefer a less visible offending behavior such as sex work versus a more outwardly visible behavior such as selling drugs. Future ethnographic studies, using a feminist cultural criminology lens, should examine the meaning of these interactions for women.

Regarding non-drug related offenses, women reported less criminal behavior across several types of offenses, as expected. However, as previously mentioned, they were more likely to report prostitution, as well as stealing from houses or shop. This is congruent with previous literature. For example, one study on inner city female drug users found that over 2/3 of the women reported prostitution and stealing for income (M. Miller & Neaigus, 2002), whereas shoplifting has been seen as the best alternative to other income generating activities for drug users (Caputo & King, 2015). This finding complements the finding that women were less likely to sell drugs. Previous studies have shown that women who sell drugs tend to avoid prostitution and other income generating activities (Sommers, Baskin, & Fagan,

1996). In a more recent study, White female offenders were more likely to be arrested for drug offending behavior because of an addiction whereas Hispanic/Latino female offenders commit drug offenses for financial reasons (Caldwell-Gunes, Silver, Smith, & Norton, 2016). Perhaps they are more likely to commit non-drug related offenses for financial reasons as well. Future studies should include more contextual factors when examining incarceration disparities such as reasons for the offenses and neighborhood context, income and gender inequality.

Interestingly, there were several Hispanic/Latino subgroup differences. Central Americans reported less drug-related criminal behavior than Cubans regarding public intoxication, the use and possession of drugs, and the manufacturing or selling of drugs. Differences between Hispanic/Latino sub-groups have been found in previous studies (Gil-Rivas et al., 1997; H. V. Miller, 2012). This finding could be because Central Americans are more likely to be recent or first-generation immigrants than are Cubans in Miami. Previous studies show that those who have been living longer in the U.S or are U.S. born Hispanic/Latinos are more likely to report offending behaviors (Bersani et al., 2009; Ibañez et al., 2017). To the author's knowledge, this is the first study comparing Central Americans with Cubans specifically. Future studies should continue to examine subgroups and include a large enough sample to examine differences by countries instead of by regions as was done in the present study (e.g., Honduran, Guatemalan vs. Central America).

Black Hispanic/Latinos were also more likely to report violating probation or parole. Interestingly, this finding is congruent with several recent studies on colorism; that is, prejudice or discrimination because one's skin tone or color (Burch, 2015; Jones, 2000), among Hispanic/Latinos involved with the criminal justice system. For example, a recent study that found darker skin tones among Hispanic/Latinos was linked to unsuccessful completion of probation (Steinmetz & Koeppel, 2017). Another study found that darker skinned Hispanic/Latinos were stopped and arrested by police more often than lighter skinned Hispanic/Latinos, even after controlling for prior delinquency and other factors (White, 2014). Yet another study found that darker skinned Hispanic/Latinos had higher odds of arrest than lighter skinned Hispanic/Latinos, and this varied by generation status (Alcala & Montoya, 2016). Clearly, more studies are needed to examine the intersectionality of race and ethnicity among Black Hispanic/Latino offenders. Still, the current sample size of Black Hispanic/Latinos was small, and therefore, meaningful inferences should not be made. In addition, no age difference was found in offending behavior, which is not congruent with previous studies that report more criminal activity among younger people (Bersani et al., 2009; Fabio et al., 2011; H. V. Miller, 2012). It is unclear why there was no age difference. However, it could be that the age range was too narrow (18–49) to detect any differences.

Implications

There are several theoretical implications of the study. The findings suggest that future research should examine *intersectional criminology* as a theoretical approach (Potter, 2013). Intersectional criminology is based on the notion of intersectionality; that is, that there is a multiplicative effect of an individual's social identities, including race, gender, age, and

socioeconomic status (Potter, 2013). For example, a recent study utilized an intersectionality approach to examine age, race, and gender effects on sentencing among a diverse sample; and found a gender and ethnicity effect: that Hispanic males, regardless of age, received harsher sentences compared to their White counterparts; whereas younger women received the most lenient sentences (Steffensmeier, Painter-Davis, & Ulmer, 2017). Our findings suggest that even within the same ethnic group, Hispanic/Latinos, there were significant differences by gender and race on offending behavior. There are other identities that were not explored in the present study such as generational status and country of origin, which can be the focus of future studies. Future research should use large enough samples to examine interactions of social identities among Hispanic/Latinos in order to power appropriate analyses and make meaningful comparisons.

Critical race theory suggests that certain forms of oppression such as sexism, can also influence how identities interact (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Traditional gender roles in Hispanic/Latino culture include *machismo* and *marianismo* (Faulkner, 2003). Traditional machismo is the ideal of hyper-masculinity, that men need to have sexual prowess, and that they be providers for their household (Scott, 2018). Marianismo can lead to negative emotions (Nuñez, et al., 2016) such as depression (Cespedes & Huey, 2008); however previous studies show that higher levels of marianismo could also serve as a protective factor for risky behavior, such as substance abuse (Sanchez, et al., 2017). Previous studies have suggested that marianismo can also lead to discriminatory stereotypes that influence how criminal justice professional interact with Hispanic/Latino women (Pasko, 2017; Scott, 2018). Building on this notion, Hispanic/Latino women may be experiencing strain differently, and that a gendered general strain theory would be a fruitful theoretical framework to guide future research with Hispanic/Latino women involved in the criminal justice system (Scott, 2018).

The present study has some practical implications. In Weisburd and colleagues' (2017) assessment of systematic reviews, several types of rehabilitative and diversion programs were listed such as community interventions, sentencing/deterrence programs, correctional interventions, and drug treatment interventions. Correctional interventions refer to programs for offenders within an adult correctional setting and include educational and vocational programs; substance abuse programs, and psychosocial programs (Weisburd, et al., 2017). The present study suggests that community corrections populations may also benefit from correctional interventions especially those that promote economic opportunities for Hispanic/Latino women. Vocational training, job placement, and budgeting/financial planning classes are some examples of correctional interventions that may be helpful in preventing recidivism. However, more research is needed to more fully understand the best rehabilitative programs for Hispanic/Latino offenders.

Limitations

The present study has some limitations worth noting. First, it was a cross-sectional study with a convenience sample of individuals in community corrections; therefore, no causality can be determined, and the findings may not be generalizable to the general population. Second, data was self-report and vulnerable to both social desirability bias as well as recall

bias. However, we attempted to limit bias by having a well-trained bilingual and bicultural research staff; and using CAPI data collection procedures. Third, although we ask about country of origin, the sample was too small to compare offending behaviors by nationality nor generational immigration to the US. Future research studies should also include a large enough sample of Hispanic/Latinos that analysis can be conducted between various nationalities. The strength of the study is the uniqueness of the sample – Hispanic/Latinos involved in community corrections – especially Hispanic/Latino women, who are often neglected in the research literature.

Conclusion

In summary, our findings suggest that the types of offenses reported by Hispanic/Latinos involved in community corrections is full of complexities, including the intersection of gender, race, and income inequality. Further studies are needed to better understand this intersection as well as the role that cultural variables may play such as traditional gender roles. More understanding of the unique needs of this population is warranted before any interventions to prevent recidivism can be implemented successfully.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) under Grant R34DA031063

References

- Alcala HE & Montoya MFL (2016). Association of skin color and generation on arrests among Mexican-origin Latinos. *Race and Justice*, 8, 178–193.
- Bersani BE, Nieuwbeerta P, & Laub JH (2009). Predicting trajectories of offending over the life course: Findings from a dutch conviction cohort. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 46(4), 468–494.
- Burch T (2015). Skin color and the criminal justice system: Beyond Black-White disparities in sentencing. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 12, 395–420.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. Prisoner characteristics (age, sex, race, and offense): 2011–16. Corrections Statistical Analysis Tool (CSAT) - Prisoners, Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=nps>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016). Probation and parole in the United States, 2015. Retrieved from https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus15_sum.pdf
- Caldwell-Gunes RM, Silver NC, Smith KM, & Norton KA (2016). Racial and ethnic differences in factors related to drug use among adult female offenders: Implications for treatment. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 16(1), 39–48.
- Caputo GA, & King A (2015). Shoplifting by male and female drug users: Gender, agency, and work. *Criminal Justice Review*, 40(1), 47–66.
- Castillo LG, & Cano MA (2007). Mexican American psychology: Theory and clinical application. In Negy C (Ed.), *Cross-cultural psychotherapy: Toward a critical understanding of diverse client populations* (2nd ed., pp 85–102). Reno, NV: Bent Tree Press.
- Céspedes YM, & Huey SJ (2008). Depression in Latino adolescents: A cultural discrepancy perspective. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 14, 168–172. [PubMed: 18426290]
- Chanin R, Rintels J, & Drachsler L (2011). Restoring a national consensus: The need to end racial profiling in america. Paper presented at the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights,
- Daley K (2016). *Becoming a man: Working-class masculinity, machismo and substance abuse Youth and substance abuse* (pp. 139–168) Springer.
- Delgado R, & Stefancic J (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (2nd edition). New York: New York.

- Demuth S, & Steffensmeier D (2004). Ethnicity effects on sentence outcomes in large urban courts: Comparisons among white, black, and hispanic defendants. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(4), 994–1011.
- Doerner JK (2015). The joint effects of gender and race/ethnicity on sentencing outcomes in federal courts. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 25(5), 313–338.
- Doerner JK, & Demuth S (2010). The independent and joint effects of race/ethnicity, gender, and age on sentencing outcomes in US federal courts. *Justice Quarterly*, 27(1), 1–27.
- Doherty EE & Bersani BE (2018). Mapping the age of official desistance for adult offenders: Implications for research and policy. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 4, 516–551.
- Eppler-Epstein S (2016). We don't know how many latinos are affected by the criminal justice system. Urban Institute, Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/we-dont-know-how-many-latinos-are-affected-criminal-justice-system>
- Fabio A, Tu L, Loeber R, & Cohen J (2011). Neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and the shape of the age–crime curve. *American Journal of Public Health*, 101(S1), S332.
- Farrington DP (1986). Age and crime. *Crime and Justice*, 7, 189–250.
- Faulkner SL (2003). Good girl or flirt girl: Latinas' definitions of sex and sexual relationships. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 25, 174–200.
- FBI: UCR. (2012). Offenders by age and offense categories. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/nibrs/2012/table-pdfs/offenders-age-by-offense-category-2012>
- Federal Bureau of Prisons. (2018). Inmate ethnicity. Retrieved from https://www.bop.gov/about/statistics/statistics_inmate_ethnicity.jsp
- Ferrell J, Hayward K, & Young J (2015). *Cultural criminology: An invitation* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Florida Department of Corrections. (n.d.). Florida Department of Corrections Annual Report, 2017–2018. Retrieved May 28, 2019 at http://www.dc.state.fl.us/pub/annual/1718/FDC_AR2017-2018.pdf.
- Franklin TW (2018). The state of race and punishment in America: Is justice really blind? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 59, 18–28.
- Gil-Rivas V, Anglin MD, & Annon JJ (1997). Patterns of drug use and criminal activities among latino arrestees in california: Treatment and policy implications. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 19(2), 161–174.
- Gonzalez Burchard E, Borrell LN, Choudhry S, Naqvi M, Tsai H, Rodriguez-Santana JR, ... Rodriguez-Cintron W (2005). Latino populations: A unique opportunity for the study of race, genetics, and social environment in epidemiological research. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95(12), 2161–2168. [PubMed: 16257940]
- Hill J (2015). People of color sent to prison, put on probation far more than whites. *Providence Journal*, Retrieved from <http://www.providencejournal.com/article/99999999/NEWS/151209537>
- Hispanic Network. (2017). The difference between Hispanic and Latino. Retrieved May 28, 2019 at <https://www.hnnmagazine.com/2017/09/difference-hispanic-latino/>
- Ibañez GE, Agudo M, Martin SS, O'Connell DJ, Auf R, & Sheehan DM (2017). Offending behavior, drug use, and mental health among foreign-born versus US born latino criminal justice clients. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 19(3), 674–685. [PubMed: 28035647]
- Ibañez GE, Whitt E, Rosa M. d. l., Martin S, O'Connell D, & Castro J (2016). Developing a culturally appropriate HIV and hepatitis C prevention intervention for latino criminal justice clients. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, 22(3), 206–217. [PubMed: 27302706]
- Jones T (2000). "Shades of Brown: The Law of skin color, *Duke university Law Review*, 49, 1487.
- Maher L, & Daly K (1996). Women in the Street-Level drug economy: Continuity or change? *Criminology*, 34(4), 465–492.
- Malavé I, & Giordano E (2015). Latino populations and crime in america. *UTNE Reader*, Retrieved from <https://www.utne.com/community/latino-populations-ze0z1501zdeh>

- Mancini MA, Salas-Wright CP, & Vaughn MG (2015). Drug use and service utilization among hispanics in the united states. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 50(11), 1679–1689. [PubMed: 26260951]
- Mazerolle P, Brame R, Paternoster R, Piquero A, & Dean C (2000). Onset age, persistence, and offending versatility: Comparisons across gender. *Criminology*, 38(4), 1143–1172.
- Mears DP, Ploeger M, & Warr M (1998). Explaining the gender gap in delinquency: Peer influence and moral evaluations of behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 35(3), 251–266.
- Miller HV (2012). Correlates of delinquency and victimization in a sample of hispanic youth. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 22(2), 153–170.
- Miller M, & Neaigus A (2002). An economy of risk: Resource acquisition strategies of inner city women who use drugs. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 13(5), 409–418.
- Moffitt TE (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, 100(4), 674. [PubMed: 8255953]
- National Center for Juvenile Justice. (2014). Juvenile offenders and victims: 2014 national report. Retrieved from <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/nr2014/downloads/NR2014.pdf>
- Naegler L & Salman S (2016). Cultural criminology and gender consciousness: Moving feminist theory from margin to center. *Feminist Criminology*, 11, 354–374.
- Nellis A (2016). The color of justice: Racial and ethnic disparity in state prisons. The Sentencing Project, Retrieved from <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/color-of-justice-racial-and-ethnic-disparity-in-state-prisons/>
- Núñez A, González P, Talavera GA, Sanchez-Johnsen L, Roesch SC, Davis SM, et al. (2016). Machismo, marianismo, and negative cognitive-emotional factors: Findings from the Hispanic community health study/study of Latinos sociocultural ancillary study. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*, 4, 202–217. [PubMed: 27840779]
- Ortiz V, & Telles E (2012). Racial identity and racial treatment of mexican americans. *Race and Social Problems*, 4(1), 41–56.
- Pasko L (2017). Beyond confinement: The regulation of girl offenders' bodies, sexual choices, and behavior. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 27, 4–20.
- Patten E (2016). The nation's latino population is defined by its youth. Pew Research Center, Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/04/20/the-nations-latino-population-is-defined-by-its-youth/>
- Potter H (2013). Intersectional criminology: Interrogating identity and power in criminological research and theory. *Critical Criminology*, 21, 305–318.
- Powell D, Perreira KM, & Mullan Harris K (2010). Trajectories of delinquency from adolescence to adulthood. *Youth & Society*, 41(4), 475–502.
- Prendergast M Criminal justice drug abusetreatment studies (CJ-DATS; no date): ICPSR 31621 transitional care management (TCM), increasing aftercare participation for parolees, 2004–2008 [united states]. Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Retrieved from https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/cgi-bin/file?comp=none&study=31621&ds=12&file_id=1147248&path=
- Sanchez D, Vanderwater E, A, & Hamilton ER (2017). Examining marianismo, gender role attitudes, ethnic identity, mental health, and substance use in Mexican American early adolescent girls. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse*. 10.1080/15332640.2017.1356785.
- Schwartz SJ, Montgomery MJ, & Briones E (2006). The role of identity in acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, empirical questions, and applied recommendations. *Human Development*, 49(1), 1–30.
- Scott DI (2018). Latina fortitude in the face of disadvantage: Exploring the conditioning effects of ethnic identity and gendered ethnic identity on Latina offending. *Critical Criminology*, 26, 49–73. 10.1007/s10612-017-9380-9.
- Shekarkhar Z, & Gibson CL (2011). Gender, self-control, and offending behaviors among latino youth. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 63–80.
- Sommers I, Baskin D, & Fagan J (1996). The structural relationship between drug use, drug dealing, and other income support activities among women drug sellers. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 26(4), 975–1006.

- Steffensmeier D, Painter-Davis N, & Ulmer J (2017). Intersectionality of race, ethnicity, gender, and age on criminal punishment. *Sociological Perspectives*, 60(4), 810–833.
- Steinmetz KF, & Koeppl MD (2017). Under the skin of probation: A statewide analysis. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 15(3), 227–250.
- The Sentencing Project. (2015). Incarcerated women and girls. Retrieved from <https://www.sentencingproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Incarcerated-Women-and-Girls.pdf>
- Trimbur L (2011). ‘Tough love’: Mediation and articulation in the urban boxing gym. *Ethnography*, 12(3), 334–355.
- United States Census Bureau. (2018). Hispanic Origin. Retrieved July 2, 2019 at <https://www.census.gov/topics/population/hispanic-origin/about.html>.
- United States Census Bureau. (2016). Facts for features: Hispanic heritage month 2016. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2016/cb16-ff16.html>
- Urban Institute. (2016). The alarming lack of data on latinos in the criminal justice system Retrieved from <http://apps.urban.org/features/latino-criminal-justice-data/>
- Weisburd D, Farrington DP, Gill C, et al. (2017). What works in crime prevention and rehabilitation.: An assessment of systematic reviews. *American Society of Criminology*, 16, 415–449.
- White K (2014). The salience of skin tone: effects on the exercise of police enforcement authority. *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38, 993–1010.

Table 1.

Baseline characteristics of the sample (N=201)

	N	%
Gender		
Male	120	60.0
Female	80	40.0
Age		
18–28	98	49.0
29–39	69	34.5
40	33	16.5
Latino Sub-group		
Cuban	97	48.5
Puerto Rican	27	13.5
Central American	19	9.5
South American	18	9.0
Other	39	19.5
Marital Status		
Never married	150	75.0
Legally married or living as married	12	6.0
Separated	13	6.5
Divorced	24	12.0
Widowed	1	0.01
Race		
White	105	52.5
Black/African American	11	5.5
Other	84	42.0
Level of education		
<high school	45	22.5
High school (GED)	67	33.5
some college	51	25.5
Associates Degree	37	18.5
Employment status in the last 90 days		
Employed full time (35+ hours per week)	52	26.0
Employed part time	28	14.0
Unemployed	110	55.0
Other	10	5.0
Yearly Income *		
Less than 20,000	107	60.5
20,000– 29,999	26	14.7

	N	%
30,000–39,999	9	5.0
40,000–49,999	8	4.5
50,000	27	15.3

*
Note: 23 Missing Data

Table 2.

The overall life time (ever) and the last 90 days (current) involvement in crimes by type of crime among Latino community corrections clients in Miami, Florida, 2014–2015 (N = 201)

Crime type	Response	<u>Ever involved</u>		<u>Currently involved</u>	
		n	%	n	%
Public intoxication from alcohol or drugs	No	50	25.0	68	34.0
	Yes	150	75.0	132	66.0
Driving under influence of alcohol or drugs	No	56	28.0	89	44.5
	Yes	144	72.0	111	55.5
Use or possession of illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia	No	7	3.5	12	6.0
	Yes	193	96.5	188	94.0
Manufacturing or selling drugs or paraphernalia	No	86	43.0	122	61.0
	Yes	114	57.0	78	39.0
Forgery/Fraud(bad checks, credit card fraud)	No	148	74.0	166	83.0
	Yes	52	26.0	34	17.0
Fencing (buying or selling stolen property)	No	142	71.0	157	78.5
	Yes	58	29.0	43	21.5
Illegal gambling (running numbers)	No	170	85.0	184	92.0
	Yes	30	15.0	16	8.0
Prostitution or pimping	No	165	82.5	173	86.5
	Yes	35	17.5	27	13.5
Stealing	No	63	31.5	122	61.0
	Yes	137	68.5	78	39.0
Assault/aggravated assault/battery ^a	No	140	70.0	168	84.0
	Yes	60	30.0	32	16.0
Weapons offenses	No	166	83.0	182	91.0
	Yes	34	17.0	18	9.0
Vandalism/property damage/tagging	No	154	77.0	177	88.5
	Yes	46	23.0	23	11.5
Probation/parole violations	No	127	63.5	170	85.0
	Yes	73	36.5	30	15.0

Table 3.

Univariate analysis of recent alcohol and drug use criminal activity and demographic variables

Demographic Variables	Involved in public intoxication from alcohol or drugs		Driving under influence		Use or possession of illegal drugs		Manufacturing or selling drugs or paraphernalia	
	COR	p	COR	p	COR	p	COR	p
Sex								
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	0.71	0.248	1.05	0.862	0.65	0.469	0.48	0.016
Age								
18–28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29–39	0.73	0.341	1.00	0.997	1.18	0.822	0.77	0.430
40	0.77	0.541	1.11	0.805	0.39	0.181	1.07	0.871
Ethnicity								
Cuban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puerto Rican	0.81	0.654	0.90	0.807	*	*	0.96	0.933
Central American	0.37	0.049	0.56	0.243	0.23	0.069	0.23	0.025
South American	1.06	0.925	0.49	0.173	0.73	0.785	0.96	0.943
Other	0.58	0.173	0.53	0.096	0.38	0.183	0.47	0.068
Marital Status								
Never Married	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Living as Married	1.09	0.889	1.19	0.772	0.54	0.578	0.99	0.982
Separated	0.87	0.821	2.84	0.124	0.59	0.632	1.18	0.771
Divorced	1.64	0.324	1.01	0.988	0.34	0.142	0.20	0.011
Widowed	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Race								
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	0.11	0.007	0.70	0.578	0.40	0.428	0.16	0.082
Other	1.25	0.483	1.18	0.578	0.44	0.198	1.17	0.597
Education								
<High school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
High school (GED)	0.66	0.292	1.08	0.844	1.21	0.786	0.95	0.899
Some College	1.82	0.198	0.91	0.818	4.88	0.164	1.33	0.487
Associates Degree	0.92	0.864	1.62	0.293	1.71	0.551	0.56	0.220
Income								
Less than 20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20,000–29,999	0.88	0.779	1.25	0.614	*	*	1.14	0.778
30,000–39,999	1.10	0.896	0.63	0.504	*	*	0.77	0.727
40,000–49,999	3.85	0.215	0.47	0.318	0.64	0.694	1.55	0.552
50,000	1.10	0.832	1.86	0.181	2.39	0.419	0.77	0.572

Table 4.

Multivariate analysis of recent alcohol and drug criminal activity and demographic variables.

Demographic Variables	Involved in public intoxication from alcohol or drugs		Driving under influence		Use or possession of illegal drugs		Manufacturing or selling drugs or paraphernalia	
	AOR	p	AOR	p	AOR	p	AOR	p
Sex								
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	0.80	0.565	1.25	0.548	0.92	0.924	0.416	0.028
Age								
18–28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29–39	0.78	0.564	1.17	0.709	0.59	0.593	0.93	0.875
40	0.49	0.184	1.03	0.961	0.28	0.216	1.14	0.802
Ethnicity								
Cuban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puerto Rican	0.64	0.400	0.77	0.596	*	*	0.90	0.837
Central American	0.29	0.034	0.55	0.290	0.10	0.024	0.14	0.015
South American	0.64	0.512	0.40	0.138	1.07	0.976	1.63	0.450
Other	0.73	0.517	0.53	0.174	0.22	0.154	0.72	0.514
Marital Status								
Never Married	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Living as Married	1.40	0.642	1.00	0.997	1.22	0.879	1.01	0.992
Separated	1.44	0.611	2.20	0.295	0.76	0.842	1.81	0.399
Divorced	2.64	0.116	0.93	0.897	0.33	0.305	0.21	0.030
Widowed	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Race								
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	0.12	0.019	0.87	0.865	0.31	0.436	0.20	0.169
Other	1.22	0.592	1.26	0.505	0.34	0.184	0.98	0.965
Education								
<High school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
High school (GED)	0.65	0.384	1.31	0.556	1.01	0.996	0.72	0.504
Some College	1.56	0.426	1.21	0.703	4.17	0.300	1.06	0.911
Associates Degree	0.79	0.695	2.11	0.181	2.14	0.605	0.33	0.068
Income								
Less than 20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20,000–29,999	0.76	0.601	1.28	0.616	*	*	0.89	0.826
30,000–39,999	2.30	0.372	0.53	0.420	*	*	0.86	0.863
40,000–49,999	2.65	0.411	0.54	0.453	0.09	0.277	0.64	0.604
50,000	0.77	0.627	1.94	0.205	1.98	0.645	0.68	0.468

Table 5.

Univariate analysis of recent non-alcohol/drug criminal activities and demographic variables.

Demographic Variables	5 Forgery/ Fraud (bad checks, credit card fraud)		6 Fencing (buying or selling stolen property)		7 Illegal gambling (running numbers)		8 Prostitution or pimping		9 Stealing from houses or shops		10 Assault/ aggravated assault/battery ^a		11 Involved in weapon offenses		12 Involved in vandalism/ property damage/ tagging?		13 Involved in probation/ parole violations?	
	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P
Sex																		
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1.23	0.591	0.58	0.143	0.19	0.033	8.72	<.001	2.36	0.004	0.88	0.753	0.273	0.046	0.38	0.065	0.50	0.111
Age																		
18–28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29–39	1.14	0.768	1.02	0.962	0.54	0.318	1.50	0.377	0.73	0.323	0.79	0.568	0.44	0.173	0.63	0.335	0.31	0.024
40	2.25	0.095	0.99	0.979	0.57	0.480	1.41	0.553	0.56	0.172	0.27	0.089	0.46	0.330	0.17	0.096	0.70	0.508
Ethnicity																		
Cuban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puerto Rican	1.10	0.856	0.34	0.100	1.22	0.776	0.21	0.140	1.30	0.554	1.15	0.804	3.67	0.032	1.78	0.330	1.56	0.410
Central American	0.45	0.315	0.51	0.318	*	*	*	*	0.95	0.915	0.28	0.232	*	*	0.92	0.918	1.03	0.971
South American	0.48	0.355	0.34	0.171	0.58	0.611	0.68	0.635	0.81	0.699	0.63	0.567	0.76	0.800	1.56	0.528	*	*
Other	0.44	0.160	0.82	0.653	0.82	0.768	1.64	0.295	1.13	0.755	1.31	0.579	1.47	0.558	0.42	0.278	0.99	0.991
Marital Status																		
Never Married	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Living as Married	0.91	0.908	1.84	0.342	0.96	0.969	0.71	0.754	0.53	0.354	0.48	0.489	*	*	1.57	0.583	0.46	0.460
Separated	0.83	0.813	0.31	0.266	0.88	0.904	3.48	0.057	1.85	0.290	1.58	0.513	1.77	0.487	0.65	0.690	0.91	0.905
Divorced	0.65	0.511	0.97	0.956	0.46	0.462	1.57	0.011	0.95	0.913	1.05	0.934	0.88	0.875	1.12	0.868	0.46	0.306
Widowed	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Race																		
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	1.15	0.865	0.34	0.312	1.65	0.658	3.71	0.057	0.86	0.815	0.56	0.588	1.40	0.764	*	*	3.21	0.120

Demographic Variables	5Forgery/ Fraud (bad checks, credit card fraud)		6Fencing (buying or selling stolen property)		7Illegal gambling (running numbers)		8Prostitution or pimping		9Stealing from houses or shops		10Assault/ aggravated assault/battery ^a		11Involved in weapon offenses		12Involved in vandalism/ property damage/ tagging?		13Involved in probation/ parole violations?	
	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P	COR	P
Other	1.13	0.762	0.92	0.814	1.98	0.213	0.78	0.585	0.92	0.790	1.21	0.629	1.89	0.217	1.74	0.218	2.01	0.099
Education																		
<High school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
High school (GED)	0.87	0.781	0.71	0.437	0.64	0.465	0.42	0.090	0.82	0.615	1.57	0.375	0.93	0.911	1.09	0.893	0.61	0.326
Some College	1.10	0.850	0.76	0.551	0.55	0.385	0.34	0.062	0.57	0.174	1.01	0.986	1.07	0.920	1.49	0.515	0.75	0.575
Associates Degree	0.23	0.071	0.22	0.026	*	*	0.27	0.062	0.15	<.001	0.31	0.161	*	*	0.46	0.367	0.10	0.030
Income																		
Less than 20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20,000–29,999	0.48	0.259	0.45	0.166	3.06	0.104	0.51	0.394	0.83	0.675	0.69	0.580	1.27	0.736	0.55	0.454	1.12	0.858
30,000–39,999	1.04	0.959	*	*	4.81	0.083	0.77	0.809	0.47	0.096	*	*	*	*	0.83	0.866	*	*
40,000–49,999	0.52	0.552	0.35	0.336	5.61	0.060	0.88	0.905	0.44	0.331	0.76	0.800	1.39	0.771	0.95	0.962	2.04	0.407
50,000	0.64	0.442	0.43	0.143	*	*	0.77	0.693	0.91	0.833	1.85	0.229	0.78	0.753	0.83	0.783	0.77	0.693

Table 6.

Multivariate analysis of recent non-alcohol/drug criminal activities and demographic variables

Demographic Variables	5Forgery/ Fraud (bad checks, credit card fraud)		6Fencing (buying or selling stolen property)		7Illegal gambling (running numbers)		8Prostitution or pimping		9Stealing from houses or shops		10Assault/ aggravated assault/battery ^a		11Involved in weapon offenses		12Involved in vandalism/ property damage/ tagging?		13Involved in probation/ parole violations?	
	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P
Sex																		
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1.50	0.375	0.36	0.033	0.13	0.040	7.34	0.003	2.68	0.012	0.97	0.951	0.16	0.027	0.25	0.040	0.38	0.116
Age																		
18–28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29–39	1.54	0.416	0.97	0.945	0.52	0.471	0.62	0.536	0.87	0.750	1.20	0.757	0.46	0.350	0.60	0.436	0.52	0.334
40	2.93	0.074	0.45	0.213	0.57	0.576	1.31	0.755	0.48	0.176	0.18	0.059	0.16	0.097	0.06	0.020	0.80	0.745
Ethnicity																		
Cuban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puerto Rican	1.04	0.941	0.36	0.151	0.46	0.431	0.23	0.192	1.75	0.296	1.75	0.397	4.16	0.081	2.10	0.290	1.39	0.644
Central American	0.23	0.174	0.14	0.069	*	*	*	*	0.60	0.441	*	*	*	*	0.34	0.342	0.80	0.797
South American	0.91	0.915	0.43	0.341	0.40	0.504	1.66	0.652	1.68	0.467	1.11	0.911	0.96	0.972	0.84	0.858	*	*
Other	0.60	0.437	0.86	0.790	0.67	0.699	0.88	0.856	1.15	0.776	1.37	0.600	1.97	0.393	0.54	0.486	0.98	0.976
Marital Status																		
Never Married	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Living as Married	0.56	0.507	2.47	0.238	1.38	0.818	0.47	0.591	0.46	0.315	0.56	0.607	*	*	2.68	0.329	0.38	0.405
Separated	0.58	0.548	0.63	0.696	1.73	0.709	8.29	0.028	2.18	0.317	2.74	0.280	6.29	0.165	1.72	0.676	1.90	0.531
Divorced	0.39	0.198	1.46	0.568	1.82	0.645	0.58	0.523	0.78	0.659	1.05	0.950	2.37	0.392	2.53	0.331	0.34	0.338
Widowed	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Race																		
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	1.14	0.895	0.24	0.252	1.53	0.765	7.65	0.045	1.05	0.959	1.30	0.839	2.22	0.586	*	*	10.84	0.033

Demographic Variables	5Forgery/ Fraud (bad checks, credit card fraud)		6Fencing (buying or selling stolen property)		7Illegal gambling (running numbers)		8Prostitution or pimping		9Stealing from houses or shops		10Assault/ aggravated assault/battery ^a		11Involved in weapon offenses		12Involved in vandalism/ property damage/ tagging?		13Involved in probation/ parole violations?	
	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P	AOR	P
Other	1.20	0.674	0.78	0.566	1.05	0.946	0.95	0.936	0.76	0.460	1.63	0.313	1.20	0.775	1.96	0.212	1.87	0.246
Education																		
<High school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
High school (GED)	1.10	0.867	0.72	0.555	0.36	0.222	0.80	0.762	1.06	0.898	2.24	0.216	0.89	0.889	1.27	0.755	0.93	0.916
Some College	1.67	0.387	0.84	0.764	0.33	0.287	0.59	0.519	0.58	0.285	1.08	0.914	1.23	0.802	1.84	0.439	1.33	0.684
Associates Degree	0.27	0.142	0.19	0.038	*	*	0.53	0.532	0.14	0.004	0.31	0.217	*	*	0.22	0.212	0.25	0.236
Income																		
Less than 20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20,000–29,999	0.56	0.417	0.29	0.082	4.52	0.081	0.17	0.172	0.78	0.638	0.45	0.317	0.865	0.870	0.32	0.206	0.99	0.994
30,000–39,999	1.10	0.920	*	*	12.68	0.038	0.32	0.463	0.09	0.049	*	*	*	*	0.62	0.690	*	*
40,000–49,999	0.47	0.524	0.19	0.185	5.01	0.185	1.33	0.856	0.76	0.771	1.05	0.966	0.60	0.694	0.33	0.368	2.23	0.475
50,000	0.98	0.971	0.30	0.075	*	*	1.79	0.503	1.47	0.478	2.13	0.241	0.35	0.293	0.44	0.338	0.71	0.661