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Assessing the intersectionality of ethnicity, socio-economic status, parental connectedness, child abuse, and gender attitudes in juvenile violent delinquency
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A B S T R A C T
Researchers have not yet reached agreement about the validity of several competing explanations that seek to explain ethnic differences in juvenile violent offending. Ethnicity cannot solely explain why boys with an ethnic minority background commit more (violent) crimes. By assessing the intersectionality of structural, cultural and individual considerations, both the independent effects as well as the interplay between different factors can be examined. This study shows that aforementioned factors cumulatively play a role in severe violent offending, with parental connectedness and child abuse having the strongest associations. However, since most variables interact and ethnicity is associated with those specific factors, a conclusion to be drawn is that ethnicity may be relevant as an additional variable predicting severe violent offending although indirectly.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Ethnic differences in juvenile violent crime have been repeatedly observed in different countries across the world. For instance, in the USA, official crime statistics (e.g., Engen, Steen, & Bridges, 2002; McCarter, 2009; Rossiter & Rossiter, 2009; Stahl, Finnegan, & Kang, 2007) as well as surveys on juvenile violent delinquency (e.g., Flores, 2002; Pope & Snyder, 2003) show that the rates of involvement in serious violence are much higher for blacks than for whites. In most European countries, ethnic minority boys with a non-Western background are overrepresented among juvenile offenders, such as Turks in Germany, Algerians in France, and Moroccans in Belgium (Esterle-Hedibel, 2001; Costomski, 2003; Put & Walgrave, 2006). This overrepresentation of ethnic minority boys among juvenile offenders can also be found in the Netherlands. Research on reported and unreported crime shows that, compared to native Dutch adolescents, non-native Dutch youngsters are more likely to commit criminal acts, especially violent offenses (De Jong, 2007; Jennissen, Blom, & Oosterwaal, 2009; Komen, 2002;
Van der Laan & Blom, 2011). This is particularly true for Moroccan-Dutch boys, who are disproportionately represented among juvenile offenders (Lahlah, Lens, Van der Knaap, & Bogaerts, 2013a; Veen, Stevens, Doreleijers, & Vollebergh, 2011). In fact, the proportion of criminal offenses committed by Moroccan-Dutch boys is nearly four times the proportion of this group in the total population (Broekhuizen & Driessen, 2006). These ethnic differences in juvenile violent crime remain constant in temporal, regional, and gender-specific terms (Baier & Pfeiffer, 2008). Therefore, the academic and public debate has been concentrating on causes of ethnic differences in juvenile violent crime.

**Theoretical framework**

Attempts to explain ethnic differences in juvenile violent offending can be classified into three general categories (for a review see Lahlah et al., 2013a). First, sociological theories suggest that relative deprivation or a socially imposed general strain can contribute to violent behavior among some adolescents (Agnew, 1992; Demuth & Brown, 2004; Gould, Weinberg, & Mustard, 2002; Pratt, 2001). Structural approaches explore relationships between social conditions and levels of juvenile crime in a given place or situation and suggest that harsh economic, political, and social conditions facing a population account for the disparate rates of criminality (Demuth & Brown, 2004; Gould et al., 2002; Pratt, 2001). The social disadvantages arising from greater exposure to poverty and lower school education of ethnic minorities in general and Moroccan–Dutch families in particular is well documented (Boom, Weltevrede, Wensveen, San, & Hermus, 2010; CBS, 2012). Second, cultural explanations focus on the existence and maintenance of specific orientations (Baier & Pfeiffer, 2008) and assert that value systems for minority groups might be qualitatively different from those of natives (Berry, 1997). Youth who are involved in two cultures can experience problems when these two cultures have partly different value systems and/or prescribe different behavior in particular situations (Ait Ouarasse & van de Vijver, 2005). A different, yet related approach would be to see violence among ethnic minority youths as associated with a *cultural of honor*, an important characteristic of some ethnic minority groups with a non-Western background. The culture of honor, which is said to be a strong motivation of violence (Enzmann & Yetzel, 2003; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996), may not be uniformly distributed among different ethnic groups. Lahlah, Van der Knaap, Bogaerts and Lens (2013b) provide evidence that Moroccan–Dutch boys hold more conventional gender attitudes in comparison with their Dutch peers and show that after controlling for these norms in multivariate models, Moroccan-Dutch boys do not turn out to be more violent than Dutch boys. Third, individual-oriented psychological explanations focus on the importance of family functioning (Stouthamer-Loober, Wei, Homisch, & Loeber, 2002). It is likely that family functioning could help explain violent offending among ethnic minority youth. Family risk factors, particularly those associated with parental behavior and the family environment are key to understanding why some youth are at greater risk of violence. Studies have convincingly shown that youth who are safely attached to and subjected to sufficient monitoring by their parents are less likely to be involved in delinquency (Palmer & Hollin, 2001; Reid, Patterson, & Snyder, 2002), whereas parental rejection has been shown to be positively related to juvenile violent offending (Bogaerts, Vanheule, & Desmet, 2006; Hoeve et al., 2008; Low & Stocker, 2005; Vazsonyi & Pickering, 2003). Lahlah, Van der Knaap, Bogaerts and Lens (2013c) have shown ethnic differences in the degree to which Dutch and Moroccan–Dutch boys perceive their parents’ upbringing, with Moroccan–Dutch boys reporting lower levels of parental emotional warmth in comparison with their Dutch peers. In addition, Lahlah et al. (2013c) have shown the significance of parental warmth in self-reported violent delinquency, supporting a vast body of research that identifies the importance of this variable (Davalos, Chavez, & Guardiola, 2005; Eichelsheim et al., 2010). However, some of the key family functioning factors believed to be associated with violent offending include child abuse, partner violence and a family sphere of conflict or hostility (e.g., Fagan, Van Horn, Hawkins, & Arthur, 2007; Stouthamer-Loober et al., 2002; Swanson et al., 2003; Widom, 1989a, 1989b). Child abuse and domestic violence seem to be more prevalent among some ethnic groups (Alink et al., 2011; Finkelhor, Turner, Omod, & Hamby, 2005), albeit research is mixed whether ethnicity alone counts for these disparities, or whether other factors may play more explanatory roles (Dettiaff et al., 2011; Ferrari, 2002). If minority adolescents experience violence at home, they may learn to see violence as an appropriate way of dealing with conflicts. Lahlah, Van der Knaap, and Bogaerts (2013) show that Moroccan–Dutch boys are much more frequently victim of parental violence than Dutch boys are. This frequent confrontation with parental violence might results in more frequent imitation too (Widom, 1989a, 1989b).

In sum, although there is considerable agreement about the statistical fact of minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system, researchers have not yet reached agreement about the validity of several competing explanations for that disparity. Ethnicity cannot solely explain why boys commit violent crimes, and neither can structural, cultural, or individual factors. These studies have been undertaken as if the effects of ethnicity, structural, cultural, or individual explanations can be separated and examined independently. As a result, most studies lack the possible interplay between different sets of factors and as such the possible combination of influences on juvenile violent delinquency, or include ethnicity as a control variable only (Lahlah et al., 2013a). As opposed to examining them as separate systems, *intersectionality* explores how these systems mutually construct one another. ‘Intersectionality’ originally refers to the interaction between gender, race/ethnicity, and other categories of difference in individual lives, social practices, and cultural ideologies and the outcomes of these interactions in terms of power (McCall, 2005). While the theory began as an exploration of the oppression of women within society (Crenshaw, 1989), current research incorporating intersectionality strives to apply it to many different intersections of group membership as certain ideas and practices emerge repeatedly across multiple systems of oppression and serve as mediators for these intersecting systems (Anthias & Yuval-Davis, 1992; Andrew, Russo, Sommer, & Yaeger, 1992).
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