

Young Adult Offending: Intersectionality of Gender and Race

Kerryn E. Bell

Published online: 24 November 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2012

Abstract It is an accepted criminological fact that gender and race affect involvement in crime. What has been examined less frequently is the effect of intersectionality of gender and race across the early life course. This research uses Delinquency in a Birth Cohort II: Philadelphia, 1958 to examine the longer term effects on crime of intersectionality during the adolescent and young adult portions of the life course. Findings indicate that intersectionality of gender and race is fundamental for young adults. It is argued that multiracial feminism can best explain why intersectionality must be taken into consideration when looking at offending across the early life course.

Introduction

It is an accepted fact that there are gender and race differences in criminal offending and that on aggregate, men commit more crime than women and Blacks commit more crime than Whites (Belknap 2007). However, scholars know less about the effects of intersectionality of gender and race (Hill-Collins 1998a; Pyke and Johnson 2003; West and Fenstermaker 1995; Zinn and Dill 1996) and, specifically, how intersectionality of gender and race affect criminal offending across the wider dimension of the early life course (Block et al. 2007).

Feminist scholars of color have argued for years that much feminist research is about White women and has ignored other race/ethnicities (Davis 1981; Hooks 1984; Joseph 1981). As a result, the need for intersectional analysis is now recognized among feminists (Acker 2006; Crenshaw 1995; Hill-Collins 1995; Fenstermaker and West 2002; Weber 2001). In fact, Burgess-Proctor (2006) argues that the future of feminist criminology necessitates embracing a theoretical framework that considers intersectionality. However, scholars have not followed up on this as little research has been conducted on the aspect of intersectionality. This research is directed towards intersectionality. It briefly reviews the

K. E. Bell (✉)
Department of Sociology and Justice Studies, Eastern Washington University,
013 Hargreaves Hall, Cheney, WA 99004, USA
e-mail: kbell@ewu.edu

long-known linkages between gender and criminal offending, including race and criminal offending. It continues by establishing the importance of examining intersectionality of gender and race, including their effects during the adolescent and young adult portions of the life course. The research lends support to multiracial feminism when looking at intersectionality of gender and race and criminal offending.

Literature Review

Intersectionality in Criminal Offending

Previous research suggests that rather than simply considering gender or race alone with criminal offending, we should consider intersectionality of gender, race, and criminal offending (Hill-Collins 1998a; Pyke and Johnson 2003; West and Fenstermaker 1995; Zinn and Dill 1996). Specifically, the authors point out that it is difficult to disentangle gender and race. While much social science research defines gender and race as purely descriptive variables, intersectional research suggests that gender inequalities and institutional racism actually influence our actions (Hill-Collins 1998b). Gender and race are not just descriptive variables, but are constantly changing social constructs that must be considered together (Weber 1998). Intersectionality thus considers the relational and reinforcing process of gender and race (Andersen 2005). McCall (2005) specifically argues that intersectional relationships can be studied using a categorical approach as does this research. In fact, McCall (2005) calls for this categorical approach to be one of the primary ways to study intersectionality.

A smaller body of literature looks at intersectionality of gender and race on offending. Daly and Tonry (1997) explicitly argued that intersectionality was necessary to consider in the criminal justice system because gender and race relations structured criminal justice system practices. Katz (2000) compared White and Black adolescent females and found that adolescent White females who engaged in delinquency were more likely to be depressed and act under the influence of their peers. Black adolescent females, on the other hand, were more likely to engage in delinquency if they felt alienated.

Haynie and Armstrong (2006) also argued the importance of intersectionality of gender and race with offending. They examined the city-level correlates of homicide offending by gender and race. Haynie and Armstrong (2006) discussed not only how homicide rates were vastly different by gender, but the target of homicide offending was different by gender as well. Findings also show that structural disadvantage and inequality have a stronger effect on White than Black homicide rates (Krivo and Peterson 2000; Messner and Golden 1992; Ousey 1999; Parker and McCall 1997; Shihadeh and Ousey 1998). Further, Black women have higher rates of violence than White women, but less than their male counterparts in the same communities (Simpson 1991). These differences by gender and race in homicide and other violent crime indicate the importance of considering intersectionality of gender and race with offending.

Most studies on intersectionality of gender and race with offending have been limited to two racial groups: Blacks and Whites (Haynie and Armstrong 2006). They argue that it would be important to evaluate their findings on city-level correlates of homicide offending on other racial populations such as Latinos. Lee et al. (2000) consider Latinos in homicide research and conclude that ethnic variations in homicide patterns challenge existing theories of criminal violence and demonstrate the need to consider Latinos and offending. A handful of other studies suggest the same (see Feldmeyer and Steffensmeier 2009;

Martinez 2010, 2002; Phillips 2002). However, these studies do not consider intersectionality of gender and race with offending in the Latino population which this study does.

Gender and Criminal Offending

Previous studies have shown that there are gender differences in criminal offending. In aggregate men commit more crime than women in every category except prostitution (Belknap 2007; Steffensmeier and Allan 1996). Specific information from the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) shows that males offend four times more than women overall and five times more than women when considering violent crime (UCR 2007). A similar breakdown in crime by gender can be found using self-report data. However, there is little work on intersectionality of gender and race with crime.

Race and Criminal Offending

Gans (2001) argues that we have increasingly moved toward a dual Black, Non-Black society with a third “residual” category for those who do not fit in. This hierarchy may not just be based on color, but on distinctions such as deserving or undeserving and stigmatized or respectable (Wilson 1987). The centerpiece of such systems is the exploitation of one group by another for greater access to society’s resources (Weber 1998).

In addition to the above, we consistently see differences by race among those involved in criminal offending and those in the criminal justice system, with Blacks overrepresented in comparison to Whites, while Latino rates of violence fall between those for Blacks and Whites (Haynie et al. 2008). Arrests reported in the UCR show that Blacks only make up 12.3 % of the general US population (US Census 2010), yet represent 38 % of all violent crime arrests and 30 % of property crime arrests (UCR 2007). Such official arrest data also shows that Blacks are responsible for a disproportionate number of non-index arrests. Self report studies also show that Blacks disproportionately offend more than Whites, but by much smaller margins (Piquero and Brame 2008).¹ A question is whether this overrepresentation of Blacks in the criminal justice system is actually due to greater offending or simply targeting by police.

Theoretical Background

In the 1970s and 1980s, women of color were particularly vehement in opposing theories of social reality that only focused on single dimensions such as gender or race. This was argued by Hill-Collins (1998a) who challenged feminism’s standpoint theory that a group’s position in a hierarchy produced shared challenges. She argued that, for example, the plight of Black women was different to White women, thus researchers needed to consider gender and race together. West and Fenstermaker (1995) continued with the article “Doing Difference” and argued that, like Hill-Collins (1998a), it was not just gender roles, but the intersection of gender and race that produced difference (i.e., inequality). Pyke and Johnson (2003) empirically tested this idea and found support for it. Specifically, they interviewed Asian-American women who identified themselves by their gender and race and saw differences between themselves and White women. Zinn and Dill (1996) suggested a multiracial view of studying gender and race which understands that individuals

¹ Self-report studies have, however, shown that Blacks reported lower rates of substance abuse than Whites (Johnston et al. 2009; Lee et al. 2010; Wallace and Murdoff 2002).

are in multiple systems of domination (not just gender but also race) and can encompass all.

Thus, feminist scholars have inspired fundamental change in how scholars view social processes, groups, and institutions (Hill-Collins 2006; Roth 2004). However, no one strand of feminism can adequately address all women's issues. Early feminist theory has been critiqued by many Black feminists who argue that the nature of oppression is not just explaining elements of gender or racial oppression separately, but a consideration of the links between these systems (Hill-Collins 1999). Feminists are alone in embracing intersectionality as a central category of analysis (McCall 2005). However, others have also argued that a feminist perspective is the best way to address intersectionality (Acker 2008).

Attention to the interlocking nature of gender and race oppression is a recurring theme among the work of many Black feminists. For example, Hill-Collins (1999) looked at the "outsider-within" status given to many Black women regarding the self, family, and society. Specifically, many Black women have lived and worked within White families, yet are still not considered part of the family. This research argues that such a link should be extended to intersectionality of gender and race not just in the context of an institution such as the family, but also to the social process of crime. This, in turn, would push multiracial feminism to the fore and show its relevance to criminal offending.

The focus on intersectionality of gender and race as begun by Black feminists is the precursor to today's consideration of multiracial feminism (Burgess-Proctor 2006). Multiracial feminism argues that a power hierarchy exists in which people are socially situated to each other through interlocking systems of gender and race (Hill-Collins 2000). A key element to this concept is that social relations are based on gender and race as interactive terms and not just additive (Andersen and Hill-Collins 2004; Daly 1993).

Building on the criticisms of Black feminists, contemporary third-wave feminism argues for an intersectional model that is informed by multiracial feminism (Burgess-Proctor 2006). The intersectional approach recognizes that gender and race are dynamic socially constructed power relationships that operate at both a micro and macro level (Andersen and Hill-Collins 2004; Weber 2001; Weber and Parra-Medina 2003). Burgess-Proctor (2006) argues that multiracial feminism and an intersectionality approach give feminist criminologists the opportunity to turn theory into action. This research does so by applying the concept of criminal offending to empirically show the importance of considering intersectionality of gender and race with offending over the life course.

Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that an intersectionality approach will be shown to be significant and the best theoretical basis for assessing criminal offending among juveniles and young adults. Further, it will be shown that deference to multiracial feminism is warranted. Such findings would enhance future evaluation of criminality in juveniles and young adults and in any future gender and race studies.

Methods

Data and Cases

The current study uses data and cases from the 1958 Philadelphia Delinquency in a Birth Cohort study collected by Robert Figlio, Paul Tracy, and Marvin Wolfgang. The 1958

Table 1 1958 Philadelphia birth cohort (N = 27,160)

	N	Percentage
Gender		
Female	14,000	51.55
Male	13,160	48.45
Race		
Black	13,529	49.81
Latino	725	2.67
Other	53	0.20
White	12,853	47.32
Intersections		
Black females	6,968	25.66
Black male	6,561	24.16
Female Latina	370	1.36
Male Latino	355	1.31
Female other	25	0.09
Male other	28	0.10
White female	6,637	24.44
White male	6,216	22.89
Control variable		
SES low	13,362	49.20
SES high	13,798	50.80

study focuses on individuals born in Philadelphia in 1958 and most notably considers both males and females which the initial 1945 study did not. The 1958 Philadelphia Delinquency in a Birth Cohort sample includes 13,160 males and 14,000 females (See Table 1).

Data collected includes demographic information such as gender, race, date of birth, church membership, age, SES, and juvenile and adult offense data. Juvenile delinquency came from police contact for those under age 18. This police contact includes both police arrest and simple police contact only (i.e., status offenses that did not result in an arrest).

The 1958 Philadelphia birth cohort study then followed the delinquent activities of those interviewed into young adulthood through age 26. Data from municipal courts gave young adult offense information including the seriousness of the offense, police disposition, location of the crime, reason for police response, complainant's gender, age, and race, the type of victimization, the date of the offense, the number of victims, the average age of victims, the number of victims injured, property loss, weapon involvement, and final court disposition.²

Dependent Measures

Six dependent measures are analyzed to assess both juvenile and young adult offending as well as the seriousness of the offense in each category. The initial three dependent measures use official report data for the entire cohort (N = 27,160) to look at juvenile

² Offenses committed outside Philadelphia are not included. The measure of police contact data for juvenile offenses and municipal court data for adult offenses is comparable because in both stages guilt has not yet been established and therefore advantageous in identifying similar levels of crime (Kempf 1990).

offending.³ The juvenile data includes all police contact in the Philadelphia SMSA. The dependent measures are categorical in the assessment of the seriousness and frequency of criminal offending for both juveniles and young adults. The first dependent measure compares those who never offended as juveniles to those who offended once as index person (homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault), two to four times as index person, and five or more times as index person offenders as defined by the accepted FBI's Uniform Crime Report (see UCR 2007). The second dependent measure compares those who never offended as juveniles compared to those who offended once as index property (burglary, larceny, auto theft, arson), two to four times as index property and five or more times as index property offenders. The third dependent measure compares those who never offended as juveniles to those who offended once as non-index, two to four times as non-index, and five or more times as non-index offenders once again using the same UCR categories.⁴ The final three dependent measures use official report data from Philadelphia municipal courts to assess the same seriousness and frequency of criminal offending for young adults.

Independent Measures

Gender

Gender is a dummy variable with male as the reference category.

Race

Race is measured with three dummy variables for Black, Latino, and White with Whites as the reference category.⁵

Intersectionality of Gender and Race

The two variables of gender and race are combined to create the following intersectionality: Black females, Latina females, White females, Black males, Latino males, and White males. White male is the reference category to which both juvenile and young adult offenders are compared.

Control Variables

Control variables include juvenile record (0 = no juvenile charge, 1 = juvenile charge). All analyses conducted control for SES (high and low with low SES as the omitted

³ Some may criticize just the use of official versus self-report data. However, using data from the National Youth Interview, Elliott and Ageton (1980) found that official and self-report delinquency information came to very similar conclusions. Research using the 1945 Philadelphia birth cohort using both official and self report data reinforces the above. Specifically, Tracy (1987) found that groups with the highest arrest rates were also more likely to self-report the highest frequency of delinquency.

⁴ The coding for those who offended 2–4 times or 5 or more times considers the most serious offense as the category they fit (i.e., an individual who offended 2–4 times where one offense was index person is considered to be a 2–4 time index person offender) with those offending 5 or more times as chronic offenders.

⁵ Due to the small sample size, Asians and Native Americans are not shown in this analysis.

reference category). This constructed measure of SES was created by and discussed in Tracy et al. (1990). Specifically, using the 1970 Census files for Philadelphia, 10 census tract variables were selected as indicators of social status which were normally distributed across census tracts. Using factor scores which were then assigned to each census tract, the factor scores were separated above and below the mean to produce an SES construct with two levels: low SES and high SES.⁶

Analytical Strategy

Initial bivariate analysis was conducted before regressions were run. This initial analysis considered frequency and percentage of offending for the juveniles and young adults. Multinomial logistic regression was then used to consider the significance of gender, race, and intersectionality of gender and race on juvenile and young adult offending due to the categorical nature of the dependent measures.⁷

Analysis

Bivariate Analysis for Juvenile Criminal Offending

Bivariate percentage results of gender and juvenile offending indicates that the majority of both males and females are non-offenders with juvenile males offending more than juvenile females. Among juvenile male and female offenders, most are one time offenders with the fewest being five or more time chronic offenders. Among both males and females the number of offenders increases from more serious index person to index property to less serious non-index offenses.

Bivariate percentage results for race and juvenile offending indicate the majority are non-offenders with juvenile Blacks offending more than both juvenile Latinos and Whites. As with the gender analysis, of those juvenile Black, Latino, and White offenders, most are one time offenders with the fewest being five or more time chronic offenders. Among Blacks, Latinos, and Whites the number of offenders increases from more serious index person to index property to less serious non-index offenses.

Assessment of bivariate percentage results for intersectionality of gender and race with juvenile offending shows that the majority of the intersection groups are non-offenders with juvenile Black males offending most often. However, as with the gender and race analyses (above), most are one time offenders with the fewest being five or more time chronic offenders. Finally, among juvenile Black male, Latino male, White male, Black female, Latina female, and White females, the number of offenders' increases from more serious index person to index property to the less serious non-index offenses.

⁶ In creating this measure of SES, Tracy et al. (1990) acknowledge creating a variable based on aggregate rather than individual level data. Thus, they understand the possibility of measurement error in these assignments, but state that individual level data such as income could not be obtained.

⁷ Multinomial logistic regression is used when the dependent measure is not dichotomous and is comprised of more than two cases. Multinomial logistic regression then transforms nonlinear relationships between a dependent and independent measures into linear relationships to be analyzed (See Pampel 2000).

Multivariate Analysis for Juvenile Criminal Offending

Analysis from multinomial logistic regression indicates that juvenile males offend more than juvenile females. However, both juvenile males and females are less likely to offend than to not offend (See Tables 2, 3, and 4). The analysis also shows that juvenile Blacks offend more than both juvenile Latinos and Whites. Finally, juvenile Blacks, Latinos, and Whites are less likely to offend than to not offend.

The multivariate results for intersectionality of gender and race also support the bivariate results. Compared to White males, Black and Latino males are more likely to be juvenile index person and index property offenders than non-offenders, while compared to White males, only Black males are more likely to be juvenile non-index offenders than to be non-offenders. When compared to White males, Black, Latina, and White females are less likely to be juvenile offenders than to be non-offenders. Consequently, when comparing juvenile offending through intersectionality of gender and race, we observe Black males committing the greatest number of offenses and White females committing the least.

Juvenile Interactional Analysis

To further test the significance of juvenile intersectionality of gender, race, and criminal offending, Chi square tests are calculated comparing model 1 (main effects model) and model 2 (intersectionality model) for each of the juvenile findings. The results indicate that for juvenile offenders, the effects of the interactions model are additive and no evidence for intersectionality is found. This is contrary to what was hypothesized and will be discussed later. As the intersection analyses for juvenile offenders are not significant, the main effects model for each of the above is the best fit. This indicates that evaluation of gender and race individually is optimal for juveniles.

Bivariate Analysis for Young Adult Criminal Offending

Evaluation of bivariate percentage results for gender and young adult offending shows that the majority of both males and females are non-offenders with young adult males offending more than young adult females. Among young adult male and female offenders, most are one time offenders with the fewest being five or more time chronic offenders. In summary, among both males and females the number of offenders increases from more serious index person to index property to less serious non-index offenses.

Bivariate percentage results for race and young adult offending indicate that the majority are non-offenders with young adult Blacks offending more than both young adult Latinos and Whites. As with the gender analysis, most of the young adult Black, Latino, and White offenders, are one time offenders with the fewest being five or more time chronic offenders. Among Blacks, Latinos, and Whites the number of offenders increases from more serious index person to index property to less serious non-index offenses.

Bivariate percentage results for intersectionality of gender and race with young adult offending show that the majority of the intersection groups are non-offenders with young adult Black males offending the most. As with gender and race evaluated individually, most are one time offenders with the fewest being five or more time chronic offenders. Among young adult Black male, Latina male, White male, Black female, Latina female, and White females, the number of offenders' increases from the more serious index person to index property to the less serious non-index offenses.

Table 2 Multinomial logistic regression of gender, race, and SES on juvenile index person offending (standard errors in parentheses) N = 27,160

	One time		Two–four times		Five or more times	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B		B		B	
Female ^a	-1.45*** (0.14)		-2.21*** (0.15)		-3.48*** (0.23)	
Race ^b						
Black	1.36*** (0.17)		1.46*** (0.15)		1.69*** (0.15)	
Latino	0.24 (0.48)		1.01** (0.30)		0.27 (0.41)	
Intersections ^c						
Black females		-0.07 (0.22)		-0.71** (0.20)		-1.87*** (0.30)
Black male		1.37*** (0.19)		1.42*** (0.15)		1.73*** (0.15)
Female Latina		e		e		e
Male Latino		0.49 (0.49)		1.11*** (0.30)		0.35 (0.41)
White female		-1.40*** (0.34)		-2.59*** (0.47)		-2.81*** (0.52)
Control variable ^d						
High SES	-0.54*** (0.14)		-0.68*** (0.12)		-0.67*** (0.12)	
Intercept	-4.59*** (0.17)		-4.15*** (0.15)		-4.09*** (0.15)	
	Category N = 308		Category N = 452		Category N = 526	

Non offender reference category

*** $p < .01$, **** $p < .001$

^a Male reference category

^b White reference category

^c White male reference category

^d Low SES reference category

^e N is too small

Table 3 Multinomial logistic regression of gender, race, and SES on juvenile index property offending (standard errors in parentheses) N = 27,160

	one time		Two-four times		Five or more times	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B		B		B	
Female ^a	-1.05*** (0.08)		-1.64*** (0.09)		-2.95*** (0.16)	
Race ^b						
Black	0.72*** (0.09)		0.86*** (0.09)		0.91*** (0.11)	
Latino	0.60** (0.21)		0.52* (0.22)		0.28 (0.28)	
Intersections ^c						
Black females		-0.34** (0.11)		-0.75*** (0.13)		-2.08*** (0.21)
Black male		0.67*** (0.10)		0.81*** (0.10)		0.93*** (0.11)
Female Latina		-0.47 (0.35)		-1.67** (0.59)		-2.58* (1.01)
Male Latino		0.56* (0.24)		0.58* (0.23)		0.30 (0.29)
White female		-1.20*** (0.15)		-1.84*** (0.20)		-2.72*** (0.33)
Control variable ^d						
High SES	-0.34*** (0.08)		-0.70*** (0.09)		-0.83*** (0.10)	
Intercept	-3.20*** (0.09)		-3.04*** (0.09)		-3.17*** (0.11)	
	Category N = 864		Category N = 857		Category N = 644	

Non offender reference category

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^a Male reference category

^b White reference category

^c White male reference category

^d Low SES reference category

Table 4 Multinomial logistic regression of gender, race, and SES on juvenile non-index offending (standard errors in parentheses) N = 27,160

	One time		Two-four times		Five or more times	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B		B		B	
Female ^a	-0.70*** (0.04)		-1.17*** (0.05)		-2.09*** (0.10)	
Race ^b						
Black	0.31*** (0.05)		0.57*** (0.06)		0.94*** (0.09)	
Latino	0.28* (0.13)		0.08 (0.16)		0.29 (0.23)	
Intersections ^c						
Black females		-0.39*** (0.07)		-0.61*** (0.08)		-1.16*** (0.13)
Black male		0.24*** (0.06)		0.60*** (0.07)		0.97*** (0.10)
Female Latina		-0.37* (0.19)		-0.77*** (0.25)		-2.20** (0.72)
Male Latino		0.17 (0.17)		-0.06 (0.20)		0.35 (0.25)
White female		-0.81*** (0.07)		-1.11*** (0.09)		-1.94*** (0.19)
Control variable ^d						
High SES	-0.40*** (0.05)		-0.61*** (0.06)		-0.79*** (0.09)	
Intercept	-1.80*** (0.05)		-1.98*** (0.06)		-2.73*** (0.09)	
	Category N = 2,520		Category N = 1,928		Category N = 925	

Non offender reference category

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^a Male reference category

^b White reference category

^c White male reference category

^d Low SES reference category

Multivariate Analysis for Young Adult Criminal Offending

The multinomial logistic regression analysis shows that young adult males offend more than young adult females. However, both young adult males and females are less likely to commit an offense than to not offend (See Tables 5, 6, and 7). The analysis also shows that young adult Blacks offend more than both young adult Latinos and Whites. However, young adult Blacks, Latinos, and Whites are less likely to commit an offense than to not offend.

The multivariate results evaluating intersectionality of gender and race and young adult criminal offending support the bivariate outcomes. Compared to White males, Black males are more likely to be young adult offenders than to be non-offenders, while Latino males are more likely to be young adult index property offenders than to be non-offenders. As with juvenile criminal offending, it was determined that compared to White males, Black, Latina, and White females are less likely to be young adult offenders than to be non-offenders.

Young Adult Interactional Analysis

To further test the significance of young adult intersectionality of gender, race, and criminal offending, Chi square tests are calculated comparing model 1 (main effects model) and model 2 (intersectionality model) for each of the young adult results. The results show support for intersectionality when considering young adult offending and that the interactions model is a better fit. Consequently, the model of intersections of gender and race with offending best correlates with young adult offending rather than gender and race individually.

Discussion

Overall, the importance of this research is a consideration of intersectionality of gender and race on criminal offending across the early life course. The results of the young adult interactional analysis conducted through Chi square tests support the hypothesis that intersectionality of gender and race is significant when considering young adult offending. Previous research has suggested that we should consider intersectionality of gender and race with criminal offending (Hill-Collins 1998a; Pyke and Johnson 2003; West and Fenstermaker 1995; Zinn and Dill 1996). Potter's (2013) forthcoming book argues specifically that with the overrepresentation of men and people of color in the criminal justice system, a great need exists for research on intersectionality of gender and race with criminal offending.

The question remains why intersectionality of gender and race with criminal offending is only the best fit for young adults and not juveniles. Perhaps this finding provides proof for the argument that gender and race are constantly undergoing change at the institutional and personal level (see argument by Weber 1998). Such change might not be seen among juveniles, but could be observed among young adults.

Theoretical Implications

This study finds that intersectionality of gender and race best explains young adult offending. It shows that the effect of gender and race is accumulative over time and at the

Table 5 Multinomial logistic regression of gender, race, SES, and juvenile record on young adult index person offending (standard errors in parentheses) N = 27,160

	One time		Two-four times		Five or more times	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B	B	B	B	B	B
Female ^a	-1.46*** (0.11)		-2.52*** (0.17)		-3.37*** (0.39)	
Race ^b						
Black	0.79*** (0.11)		0.88*** (0.12)		0.74*** (0.17)	
Latino	0.21 (0.28)		0.02 (0.33)		0.09 (0.45)	
Intersections ^c						
Black females		-0.65*** (0.14)		-1.75*** (0.23)		-2.54*** (0.44)
Black male		0.69*** (0.11)		0.91*** (0.12)		0.73*** (0.18)
Female Latina		-0.87 (0.51)		-1.35 (0.72)		e
Male Latino		0.01 (0.33)		-0.11 (0.36)		0.09 (0.45)
White female		-2.01*** (0.26)		-2.20*** (0.33)		-3.67*** (1.01)
Control variable ^d						
High SES	-0.35*** (0.10)		-0.46*** (0.11)		-0.67*** (0.16)	
Juvenile offense	1.14*** (0.08)		1.69*** (0.10)		2.03*** (0.15)	
Intercept	-3.95*** (0.09)		-4.12*** (0.10)		-5.00*** (0.15)	
	Category N = 636		Category N = 592		Category N = 261	

Non offender reference category

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^a Male reference category

^b White reference category

^c White male reference category

^d Low SES reference category

^e N is too small

Table 6 Multinomial logistic regression of gender, race, SES, and juvenile record on young adult index property offending (standard errors in parentheses) N = 27,160

	One time		Two-four times		Five or more times	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B	B	B	B	B	B
Female ^a	-1.82*** (0.12)		-2.18*** (0.16)		-2.71*** (0.28)	
Race ^b						
Black	0.53*** (0.11)		0.71*** (0.12)		0.39* (0.15)	
Latino	0.61* (0.24)		0.42 (0.29)		0.23 (0.37)	
Intersections ^c						
Black females		-1.14*** (0.16)		-1.40*** (0.20)		-2.23*** (0.33)
Black male		0.42*** (0.11)		0.68*** (0.12)		0.37* (0.16)
Female Latina		-2.38* (1.01)		e		e
Male Latino		0.66** (0.25)		0.52 (0.29)		0.30 (0.37)
White female		-2.54*** (0.30)		-2.34*** (0.33)		-2.89*** (0.59)
Control variable ^d						
High SES	-0.25* (0.10)	-0.25* (0.10)	-0.19 (0.10)	-0.19 (0.11)	-0.58*** (0.15)	-0.58*** (0.15)
Juvenile offense	1.00*** (0.09)	1.01*** (0.09)	1.65*** (0.10)	1.65*** (0.10)	2.09*** (0.15)	2.09*** (0.15)
Intercept	-3.81*** (0.12)	-3.74*** (0.12)	-4.35*** (0.13)	-4.34*** (0.13)	-4.93*** (0.19)	-4.92*** (0.19)
	Category N = 576		Category N = 544		Category N = 289	

Non offender reference category

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^a Male reference category

^b White reference category

^c White male reference category

^d Low SES reference category

^e N is too small

Table 7 Multinomial logistic regression of gender, race, SES, and juvenile record on young adult non-index offending (standard errors in parentheses) N = 27,160

	One time		Two-four times		Five or more times	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B		B		B	
Female ^a	-1.41*** (0.07)		-2.26*** (0.12)		-2.68*** (0.27)	
Race ^b						
Black	0.12 (0.07)		0.21* (0.09)		0.29 (0.16)	
Latino	-0.36 (0.22)		0.02 (0.23)		-0.11 (0.41)	
Intersections ^c						
Black females		-1.16*** (0.10)		-1.95*** (0.16)		-2.26*** (0.32)
Black male		-0.02 (0.08)		0.16 (0.09)		0.25 (0.16)
Female Latina		-2.01*** (0.51)		-3.03** (1.01)		e
Male Latino		-0.39 (0.24)		0.05 (0.23)		-0.06 (0.41)
White female		-1.83*** (0.13)		-2.50*** (0.23)		-3.05*** (0.59)
Control variable ^d						
High SES	-0.16* (0.07)		-0.34*** (0.09)		-0.54*** (0.15)	
Juvenile offense	0.97*** (0.06)		1.52*** (0.08)		2.03*** (0.15)	
Intercept	-2.78*** (0.08)		-3.30*** (0.10)		-4.76*** (0.18)	
	Category N = 1,227		Category N = 875		Category N = 277	

Non offender reference category

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^a Male reference category

^b White reference category

^c White male reference category

^d Low SES reference category

^e N is too small

macro and micro level as posited by previous theoretical literature (See Andersen and Hill-Collins 2004; Weber 2001; Weber and Parra-Medina 2003). Evaluation of gender and race separately misses the social connections between them and the ways that gender and race together affect group experience (Rose 1997; Taylor and Nanney 2011). In support of the above literature, this research shows that as individuals move across the early life course to young adulthood, the effects of intersectionality of gender and race become significant in their influence on criminal offending.

Multiracial feminism argues that a power hierarchy exists in which people are socially situated to each other through interlocking systems of gender and race (Hill-Collins 2000). A key element to this concept is that social relations are based on gender and race as interactive terms (Andersen and Hill-Collins 2004; Daly 1993). These results provide support for multiracial feminism's claim that social relations are based on gender and race as interactive terms and not just additive. Previous research has also argued that multiracial feminism and intersectionality can be tested and that theory can be turned into action (Burgess-Proctor 2006). This research supports such a claim using young adult criminal offending.

Limitations

It is recognized that there are some limitations with this study. This analysis comes only from one birth cohort. Thus, it is possible that the findings could change for other more recent birth cohorts and this study would be non-generalizable. This is especially true when taking into account specific period effects, such as the social climate and the race and gender breakdown of a city. Nonetheless, the limitations of the research design are counterbalanced by the advantages of having a longitudinal data base (Piper 1985). Further, the cohort has a very well balanced distribution by gender, race, and social class (Tracy and Kempf-Leonard 1996).

In addition, the archival data used were obtained from local school, police, and court records which allowed officially undetected offenders to remain unknown. Thus, it is possible that the offense measure reflected police practices more than actual criminal behavior. Although problems with sample selection, composition, and size were avoided because a large population was included, analyses were affected by the minimal baseline offending differences among females even in this large population. Finally, analysis of the entire Philadelphia Birth Cohort does not allow for anything other than a theoretical consideration of what explains the differences between subgroups.

Future Research

Results showing differences by gender and race in offending are suggestive of the influence of social background and potentially a more macro neighborhood perspective on offending as an explanation. Future research should consider intersectionality of gender and race with a macro approach to include the influence of neighborhood SES on offending, especially to see if this can explain the influence of intersectionality of gender and race on young adult but not juvenile criminal offending. Previous macro research has shown the influence of neighborhood SES on race and offending (Krivo and Peterson 2000; Land et al. 1990; Peterson and Krivo 1993). It is hypothesized that neighborhood SES would also show a difference when considering intersectionality of gender and race.

Future research should also consider intersectionality of gender and race on the specific correlates of young adult offending. Much previous research has shown a "marriage

effect” in that being married is followed by a decrease in offending (Blokland and Nieuwebeerta 2005; Farrington and West 1995; Horney et al. 1995; Piquero et al. 2002; Sampson and Laub 1990, 1993; Theobald and Farrington 2009, 2011). Other research suggests that marriage has no effect on offending or can potentially have a negative effect for women (Giordano et al. 2002; King et al. 2007; Thornberry et al. 1985). It is hypothesized that research on marriage and intersectionality of gender and race would show different effects. This would not only be groundbreaking research in considering differences by gender and offending across the life course, but also intersectionality of gender and race with offending across the life course. To date such research is deficient. However, forthcoming publications such as Potter (2013) show how important it is to consider intersectionality in criminological research.

References

- Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society, 20*, 441–464.
- Acker, J. (2008). Feminist theory’s unfinished business. *Gender & Society, 22*, 104–108.
- Andersen, M. (2005). Thinking about women: A quarter century view. *Gender & Society, 19*, 437–455.
- Andersen, M., & Hill-Collins, P. (2004). *Race, class, and gender* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Belknap, J. (2007). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime, and justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Block, C. R., Blokland, A. A. J., Nieuwebeerta, P., & van der Werff, C. (2007). *Long-term patterns of offending in adult women*. Paper presented at ASC conference in Atlanta, GA.
- Blokland, A., & Nieuwebeerta, P. (2005). The effects of life circumstances on longitudinal trajectories of offending. *Criminology, 43*, 1203–1240.
- Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersectionality of race, class, gender, and crime. *Feminist Criminology, 1*, 27–47.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1995). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In K. Crenshaw, et al. (Eds.), *Critical race theory*. New York: New Press.
- Daly, K. (1993). Class-race-gender: Sloganeering in search of meaning. *Social Justice, 20*, 56–71.
- Daly, K., & Tonry, M. (1997). Gender, race, and sentencing. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Davis, A. Y. (1981). *Women, race, & class*. New York: Vintage.
- Elliott, D. S., & Ageton, S. S. (1980). Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 45*, 95–110.
- Farrington, D., & West, D. (1995). Effects of marriage, separation and children on offending by adult males. In J. Hagan (Ed.), *Current perspectives on aging and the life cycle* (Vol. 4). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Feldmeyer, B., & Steffensmeier, D. (2009). Immigration effects on homicide offending for total and race/ethnicity-disaggregated populations (White, Black, and Latino). *Homicide Studies, 13*(3), 211–226.
- Fenstermaker, S., & West, C. (2002). *Doing gender, doing difference: Inequality, power, and institutional change*. New York: Routledge.
- Gans, H. J. (2001). The possibility of a new racial hierarchy in the twenty-first-century United States. In D. B. Grusky (Ed.), *Social stratification: Class, race, and gender*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., & Rudolph, J. L. (2002). Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology, 107*(4), 990–1064.
- Haynie, D., & Armstrong, D. (2006). Race- and gender-disaggregated homicide offending rates. *Homicide Studies, 10*, 3–32.
- Haynie, D., Weiss, H., & Piquero, A. (2008). Race, the economic maturity gap, and criminal offending in young adulthood. *Justice Quarterly, 25*, 595.
- Hill-Collins, P. (1995). Comment on West and Fenstermaker. *Gender & Society, 9*, 491–494.
- Hill-Collins, P. (1998a). *Fighting words: Black women and the search for justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hill-Collins, P. (1998b). Intersectionality of race, class, gender, and nation: Some implications for Black family studies. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 29*, 27–36.
- Hill-Collins, P. (1999). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought in feminist approaches to theory and methodology. In S. Hesse-Biber, C. Gilmartin & R. Lydenberg (Eds.), New York: Oxford University Press.

- Hill-Collins, P. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hill-Collins, P. (2006). Review of separate roads to feminism: Black, Chicana, and White feminist movements in America's second wave. *Acta Sociologica*, 49, 231–233.
- Hooks, B. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Boston: South End.
- Horney, J., Osgood, D., & Marshall, I. (1995). Criminal careers in the short term: Intra-individual variability in crime and its relation to local life circumstances. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 655–673.
- Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2009). *Monitoring the future national survey results on drug use, 1975–2008: vol. 1, secondary school students* (No. 09-7402). Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Joseph, G. (1981). The incompatible menage a trois: Marxism, feminism, and racism. In L. Sargent (Ed.), *Women and revolution: The unhappy marriage of marxism and feminism*. Boston: South End.
- Katz, R. S. (2000). Explaining girls' and women's crime and desistance in the context of their victimization experiences. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 633–660.
- Kempf, K. L. (1990). Career criminals in the 1958 Philadelphia birth cohort: A follow-up of the early adult years. *Criminal Justice Review*, 15, 151–172.
- King, D., Michael, M., & MacMillan, R. (2007). The context of marriage and crime: Gender, the propensity to marry, and offending in early adulthood. *Criminology*, 45, 33–66.
- Krivo, L. J., & Peterson, R. D. (2000). The structural context of homicide: Accounting for racial differences in process. *American Sociological Review*, 65, 547–559.
- Land, K. C., McCall, P. L., & Cohen, L. E. (1990). Structural covariates of homicide rates: Are there any invariances across time and social space? *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 922–963.
- Lee, M. T., Martinez, R., Jr, & Fernando Rodriguez, S. (2000). Contrasting Latinos in homicide research: The Victim and offender relationship in El Paso and Miami. *Social Science Quarterly*, 81(1), 375–388.
- Lee, C., Mun, E. Y., White, H. R., & Simon, P. (2010). Substance use trajectories of Black and White young men from adolescence to emerging adulthood: A two-part growth curve analysis. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse*, 9, 301–319.
- Martinez, R., Jr. (2010). Economic conditions and racial/ethnic variations in violence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 9(4), 707–713.
- Martinez, R., Jr. (2002). *Latino homicide: Immigration, violence, and community*. New York: Routledge.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs*, 30, 1771–1800.
- Messner, S., & Golden, R. (1992). Racial inequality and racially disaggregated homicide rates: An assessment of alternative theoretical explanations. *Criminology*, 30, 421–447.
- Ousey, G. C. (1999). Homicide, structural factors, and the racial invariance assumption. *Criminology*, 37, 405–426.
- Pampel, F. C. (2000). *Logistic regression: A primer, quantitative applications in the social sciences series* (No. 07:132), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Parker, K., & McCall, P. (1997). Adding another piece to the inequality-homicide puzzle: The impact of structural inequality on racially disaggregated homicide rates. *Homicide Studies*, 1, 35–60.
- Peterson, R. D., & Krivo, L. J. (1993). Racial segregation and Black urban homicide. *Social Forces*, 71, 1001–1026.
- Phillips, J. A. (2002). White, Black, and Latino homicide rates: Why the difference? *Social Problems*, 49(3), 349–373.
- Piper, E. (1985). Violent recidivism and chronicity in the 1958 Philadelphia cohort. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 1, 319–344.
- Piquero, A. R., & Brame, R. W. (2008). Assessing the race-crime and ethnicity-crime relationship in a sample of serious adolescent delinquents. *Crime & Delinquency*, 54, 390–422.
- Piquero, A. R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Haapanen, R. (2002). Crime in emerging adulthood. *Criminology*, 40, 137–169.
- Potter, H. (2013). *Intersectionality and criminology: Gender, race*. Class and Crime: Routledge.
- Pyke, K. D., & Johnson, D. L. (2003). Asian American women and racialized femininities: “Doing” gender across cultural worlds. *Gender & Society*, 17(1), 33–53.
- Rose, P. I. (1997). *They and we: Racial and ethnic relations in the United States*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Roth, B. (2004). *Separate roads to feminism: Black, Chicana, and White feminist movements in America's second wave*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609–627.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Shihadeh, E., & Ousey, G. (1998). Industrial restructuring and violence: The link between entry-level jobs and economic deprivation, and Black and White homicide. *Social Forces*, 77, 185–206.
- Simpson, S. (1991). Caste, class, and violent crime: Explaining differences in female offending. *Criminology*, 29, 115–135.
- Steffensmeier, D., & Allan, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of offending. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 459–488.
- Taylor, M. J., & Nanney, J. T. (2011). An existential gaze at multiracial self-concept: Implications for psychotherapy. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 51, 195–215.
- Theobald, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2009). Effects of getting married on offending: Results from a perspective longitudinal survey of males. *European Journal of Criminology*, 6, 496–516.
- Theobald, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Why do the crime-reducing effects of marriage vary with age? *British Journal of Criminology*, 51, 136–158.
- Thornberry, T., Moore, M., & Christenson, R. (1985). The effect of dropping out of high school on subsequent criminal behavior. *Criminology*, 23, 3–18.
- Tracy, P. E. (1987). Race and class differences in official and self-reported delinquency. In T. P. Thornberry, M. E. Wolfgang, & R. M. Figlio (Eds.), *From boy to man, from delinquency to crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tracy, P. E., & Kempf-Leonard, K. (1996). *Continuity and discontinuity in criminal careers*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Tracy, P. E., Wolfgang, M. E., & Figlio, R. M. (1990). *Delinquency careers in two birth cohorts*. New York: Plenum Press.
- UCR. (2007). <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2007/arrests/index.html>.
- US Census. (2010). <http://www.2010census.gov>.
- Wallace, J. M., Jr, & Murdoff, J. R. (2002). Preventing substance abuse among African American children and youth: Race differences in risk factor exposure and vulnerability. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 22, 235–261.
- Weber, Lynn. (1998). A conceptual framework for understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 13–32.
- Weber, Lynn. (2001). *Understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Weber, L., & Parra-Medina, D. (2003). Intersectionality and women's health: Charting a path to eliminating health disparities. In M. Segal, et al. (Eds.), *Gender perspectives on health and medicine: Key themes*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender & Society*, 9(1), 8.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zinn, M. B., & Dill, B. T. (1996). Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism. *Feminist Studies*, 22(2), 321–331.