

Routine Activities and Involvement in Violence as Actor, Witness, or Target

Richard B. Felson

State University of New York at Albany

This research examines the effects of an active “night life” on involvement in interpersonal violence as either an actor, a witness, or a target. The results show that males with an active night life are more likely to witness as well as participate in violent encounters, whereas an active night life is not a risk factor for females. The fact that night life affects witnessing violence, and engaging in nondomestic but not domestic violence, supports a routine activity approach over other explanations. The results also show that young men, and men without family obligations, are more likely to be involved in nondomestic violence, in part because they go out at night more frequently.

According to the routine activity approach, crime occurs when there is a motivated offender and a suitable target in the absence of capable guardians (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Felson, 1994). Routine activities that bring motivated offenders and suitable targets in contact, isolated from the protection of third parties, lead to criminal activity.

Victimization data have provided key evidence for the routine activity approach. Research based on the National Crime Survey indicates that the risk of victimization for assault is greater if people live near the central city and low-income neighborhoods (Cohen, Kluegel, & Land, 1981). Those who frequently go out for nighttime entertainment are also more likely to be the victim of violent crimes (Clarke, Ekblom, Hough, & Mayhew, 1985; Miethe, Stafford, & Long, 1987). Evidence from the Canadian Urban Victim Survey shows that residents who patronize bars, who work or go to class, or who go out for a walk or drive at night are more likely to be victims of assault than those who do not engage in these activities (Kennedy & Forde, 1990; see also Lasley, 1989).

The assumption in these studies is that nighttime and other activities create opportunities for crime. However, there is an alternative interpretation of the relationship between risk-prone activities and criminal victimization. Perhaps people who go out often are different from people who stay at home. Those who like to take risks, who seek excitement, who are present-oriented, or who use more alcohol may have more active night lives. Such people are also likely to be less inhibited in their social behavior. They may be more likely to engage in aggression, deviance, and other behaviors that others find offensive. Their provocative behavior may lead them to be the target of violence.

Those with active night lives may also be at greater risk for engaging in violence themselves. Potential offenders who have an active night life are likely to be tempted more

often than those who stay at home. However, any correlation observed between having an active night life and engaging in violence could be attributed to the individual differences just mentioned. For example, people who seek excitement may go out at night more frequently, and may commit more crime.

Another problematic issue in the literature on routine activities is the treatment of domestic violence (Miethe, Stafford, & Long, 1987). Some incidents of crime, particularly those involving violent disputes, target family members. The specific routine activities usually associated with domestic violence are not likely to be the same as those associated with street crime. Activities that draw people away from their home are not likely to increase violence in the home. If anything, they would have the opposite effect, because going out at night reduces the frequency of contact between family members. These complications may explain why *daytime* activities, such as working outside the home, predict victimization for property crimes but not for violent crimes (Miethe et al., 1987).

THE PRESENT STUDY

This article applies the routine activity approach to interpersonal violence. We examine whether persons who are involved in nighttime recreational activities outside the home are more likely to be involved in violence as actors and targets, and whether they are more likely to witness such events. To our knowledge, the effects of routine activities on witnessing violence have never been examined.

If routine activities produce opportunities for violence, then they should affect potential actors, targets, and witnesses similarly. Thus we predict that persons who go out at night for recreation are more likely to be involved in nondomestic violent encounters as actors, targets, and witnesses. If we find that routine activities predict violence or being the target of violence but not witnessing violence, it casts doubt on an opportunity explanation. It suggests that respondents who go out at night are getting involved in violent interactions because they are more likely to be provocative or violent themselves. On the other hand, if going out at night predicts all three dependent variables, it suggests that the result is due, at least in part, to differential opportunity.

Personal characteristics may affect witnessing violence as well as offending and victimization. Those who are risk-averse, for example, may witness violence less often if they avoid activities and places where violence occurs. Still, the effects of personal characteristics on witnessing must be mediated by activity patterns. In other words, the impact of night life on witnessing violence must involve some type of opportunity effect, unlike the impact of nightlife on offending and victimization. Therefore, an effect of night life on witnessing violence provides support for the routine activity approach.

Another method of testing whether the relationship between night life and violence is due to differences in opportunity is to examine effects on domestic violence. According to a routine activity approach, night life should have no effect on engaging in domestic violence, because going out does not increase opportunities for domestic conflict, and might even decrease it.¹ A positive relationship between night life and domestic violence cannot be attributed to differences in opportunity. Some personal characteristic associated with violent behavior and going out at night would be implicated.

In contrast to previous research on the effects of routine activities, we include a measure of alcohol consumption. Evidence shows that both criminal offenders and victims are frequently intoxicated (see Fagan, 1993, for a review). Alcohol use is clearly a situational risk

factor for violence. However, the research literature is unclear about whether chronic use of alcohol—which is what is studied here—is associated with how often individuals engage in violence (Collins, 1991; see Fagan, 1993).

Alcohol consumption may mediate the effects of night life on involvement in violent interactions. People often consume alcohol when they go out at night for recreation, and it may be the alcohol and not the night activities that produces risk. Alcohol may increase the propensity to engage in violence or it may lead to behaviors that provoke others (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). In addition, people who are intoxicated may take fewer precautions to avoid victimization, and they may appear more vulnerable to potential offenders. In one sense, drinking alcohol may be considered a type of routine activity because it creates opportunities for violence. However, the mediating process is psychological and behavioral, not spatial.

We also examine the role of routine activities in explaining the effects of family obligations on violence. According to a routine activity approach, people with family responsibilities go out less and therefore have fewer opportunities to be involved in crime. Family obligations keep people at home and reduce the opportunity to be either an offender, a victim, or a witness. In the language of control theory, involvement in conventional activities reduces the time available for criminal activity (Hirschi, 1969).

The routine activity approach may also help explain age effects on violent behavior. As people get older they go out less and have fewer opportunities to engage in violent behavior outside their families. Also, as people enter adulthood, family obligations increase and keep them at home. As they age further, and their children “leave the nest,” family obligations are likely to decline, and the risk of violent behavior may increase. The result of their extra leisure activity could be an increase in the risk of nondomestic violence. Such an effect could suppress a portion of the linear negative effect of age on violence.

METHODS

The analyses are based on interviews in Albany County, New York with persons aged 18 to 65. The data were collected in 1980 as part of a larger study of situational factors in violence. A representative sample of the general population ($N = 245$) was obtained through multistage sampling. Random samples of streets in each census tract and then the dwellings on those streets were randomly sampled. Male and female respondents were then chosen in equal number.

People may go out more or less frequently than they did in 1980, but such a change would affect the likelihood of violence, not the relationship between going out and the likelihood of violence. However, the strength of the effect of night life on the risk of violence is likely to depend on the violent crime rate at a particular time and location. According to data from the National Crime Survey, the assault rate in the early 1990s is similar to what it was in 1980, when these data were collected (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1994). Albany County ranked eighth out of 62 counties in New York State in terms of its violent crime rate, according to statistics obtained from police reports (Criminal Justice Services, 1993). It ranked 23rd in terms of its rate of hospitalizations due to assault in 1992 (New York State Department of Health, 1994). Thus, the risk of going out at night in Albany County is higher than the risk in most counties in New York.

Respondents were asked about various acts against their children, their spouse, other family or relatives, other people they knew, and strangers. The questions were “How many

times in the last year have you pushed or shoved or slapped _____?" and "How many times in the last year have you hit with your fist or an object _____? The response categories were: "never; 1 or 2 times a year; 3 or 4 times a year; twice a month; monthly; weekly." Responses were coded 0 through 5 and summed. Two-item scales were created for violence against children (ranging from 0 to 9) and violence against spouse (ranging from 0 to 5). Nondomestic violence was based on four items, two involving other people they knew, and two involving strangers. For males, the summated scale ranged from 0 to 10. The item could not be analyzed for females, because only three females (out of 115 or 2.6% of the sample) reported engaging in such an attack. Note that minor forms of violence occur with much higher frequency and therefore dominate these scales.

In order to measure being the target of violence, respondents were asked how often in the past year someone "pushed or shoved or slapped you?"; "hit you with a fist or an object?"; "threatened you with or hurt you with a gun or knife?" In order to measure witnessing violence, respondents were asked how many times in the last year they had seen other people "hit each other" or "threaten to use or actually use a knife or gun on each other?" The same response categories were used for these variables as before. The summated scales ranged from 0 to 11, and 0 to 10, respectively.

Unfortunately, information on the respondent's relationship with the antagonist is not available for items involving witnessing and being a target of violence. Some of these incidents could involve domestic violence. To the extent that domestic incidents are counted, the relationships between night life and these variables should be weakened. In other words, measurement error should result in a bias against our hypothesis. This issue will be discussed further later in terms of its relevance for gender differences in effects.

Responses to two items were added together to measure night life. Respondents were asked: "On the average how many evenings a week do you go out at night for fun and recreation?" and "On the average how many times a week do you go to a bar or tavern?" Note that most but not all visits to bars occur at night. Thus, to a large extent, the latter activity is a subcategory of the former activity.

Obviously, some locations are more likely to expose people to risk than others. For example, going to a movie or a bar that caters to an older clientele is likely to entail less risk than going to a hockey game or a bar catering to young people. General activity items—which are typically found in the literature—are rough measures of exposure to risk.

Other variables include alcohol use, education, race, age, marital status, and whether there was a preteen at home. Alcohol use is based on the product of measures of frequency and quantity (measured in ounces). The items involved were "On the average how many times a week do you drink alcoholic beverages?" and "About how much do you drink at a time?"

Age is coded as a continuous variable. Marital status is a dichotomy based on whether respondents are married or not. Respondents who are divorced, widowed, or single are excluded from analyses involving violence against spouses, and the variable is coded as married or separated. Preteen children is a dichotomy based on whether a child under age 13 is living in the respondent's home.

Education and race are included as control variables. Education is measured in terms of years of education. Nonwhite is coded as a dichotomous variable. The nonwhites included seven Puerto Ricans and two persons classified by interviewers as "other." The results were almost identical when these persons were omitted from analyses, and blacks were compared with whites.

RESULTS

Because preliminary analyses revealed gender differences in the effects of night life, analyses are presented separately for males and females. Zero-order correlations, means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 1. Regression coefficients for males are presented in Table 2, and regression coefficients for females in Table 3.² A one-tailed test is used in evaluating the statistical significance of regression coefficients when the relationship was predicted.

Analyses in which night life is the dependent variable are presented in the first column of Tables 2 and 3. In general, the results are similar for males and females. Respondents who are older, who are married, and who have a preteen living in the home, tend to go out less than their counterparts. The results show that older people and those with family obligations are less likely to go out at night for recreation. There is also a tendency for white females to go out more often than nonwhite females.

Effects on measures of violence are presented in the remaining columns. For males, the pattern of findings clearly supports the routine activity approach. Males who go out at night are more likely to witness violence, experience victimization, and engage in violence against people outside their families. On the other hand, males with an active night life are no more likely to engage in violence against family members. In fact, the coefficients for family violence are negative in sign.³

For females, night life does not affect either victimization or witnessing violence (see Table 3). The coefficients are positive, as predicted, but small and statistically insignificant.⁴ Night life is negatively related to violence against children, but the effect is not statistically significant.

One reason night life might not be associated with either witnessing or victimization for females is that the experience of females with violence is primarily within the family. This explanation is supported by evidence that the witness and target variables are influenced by domestic violence for female respondents. First, the correlation between the victimization measure and the measure of violence against spouses is quite strong for females ($r = .69$ for females vs. $r = .17$ for males; see Table 1). The strength of this correlation suggests that attacks and counterattacks by spouses are influencing the target measure for females. Second, evidence from Table 3 shows that females who have preteens living in home are more likely to witness violence and be the target of violence. Although the effects are not quite statistically significant, they suggest that mothers are targeted by their children and that some of the violence they witness is their children fighting with each other. Past research suggests that children frequently fight with their siblings (Felson & Russo, 1988).

Alcohol consumption is also associated with the violence measures. For both males and females, the greater the consumption of alcohol the higher the risk of victimization. Presumably, people who drink a lot are more likely to engage in behaviors that provoke others. Alcohol consumption is also related to engaging in nondomestic violence for males, and witnessing violence for females. It is unrelated to domestic violence for either males or females.⁵

Other results should be mentioned. Age is negatively associated with all measures of violence, although not all effects are statistically significant. Years of education has small negative relationships with most measures of violent behavior; all but one is statistically insignificant. The effects of race are slight and statistically insignificant, with one exception: nonwhite males are more likely to witness violence. Finally, respondents are more likely to engage in violence against children if a child under 13 shares the household.

TABLE 1. Means Standard Deviation, and Zero-Order Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	\bar{X}	<i>SD</i>
1. Marital status	—	.45	.53	.06	-.13	-.27	-.51	-.43	-.16	-.23	.07	.12	.58	.50
2. Preteen children	.18	—	-.07	.09	.01	-.13	-.28	-.14	.07	.03	.00	.59	.27	.45
3. Age	.20	-.51	—	-.28	-.01	-.10	-.42	-.40	-.27	-.29	-.13	-.46	36.30	15.30
4. Education	.16	.06	-.03	—	-.30	-.31	-.01	-.12	-.09	-.10	.05	.17	12.76	3.13
5. Nonwhite	-.23	.18	-.14	-.18	—	-.10	.07	.29	-.11	.02	-.11	.00	.17	.38
6. Alcohol use	-.19	-.03	.02	-.23	-.09	—	.41	.24	.32	.33	-.00	-.08	3.14	4.86
7. Nightlife	-.44	-.13	-.29	.08	-.12	.26	—	.52	.29	.37	-.07	-.11	2.72	2.44
8. Witness	-.15	.22	-.26	-.09	.05	.23	.15	—	.39	.57	-.06	.08	1.82	2.31
9. Target	-.07	.25	-.25	-.16	-.02	.31	.16	.26	—	.71	.17	.24	.69	1.42
10. Nonfamily violence	-.10	.15	-.11	-.09	.04	.08	.06	.04	.03	—	-.08	.17	.72	1.71
11. Violence against spouse	.08	.08	-.16	-.15	-.09	.02	.07	.04	.69	.09	—	.18	.39	1.11
12. Violence against child	.10	.50	-.51	.02	.05	-.08	-.08	.09	.01	.18	.00	—	.91	1.45
\bar{X}	.69	.52	37.92	12.82	.11	1.08	1.62	.88	.50	.04	.47	1.55		
<i>SD</i>	.47	.50	14.60	2.70	.32	2.55	1.66	1.45	1.50	.28	1.31	2.15		

Note. Data for males is above the diagonal, data for females below (decimal points omitted from correlations).

TABLE 2. Regression Coefficients and Standard Errors for Males

	Respondent's Violence Against											
	Nightlife		Witness		Target		Nonfamily		Spouse		Children	
	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta
Marital status	-1.19*	-.24	-.37	-.08	.10	.04	-.00	-.00	.16	.09	-.09	-.02
	(.56)		(.51)		(.36)		(.43)		(.10)		(.54)	
Preteen children	-1.01*	-.19	-.08	-.02	.41	.13	.44	.11	-.10	-.15	1.32*	.45
	(.51)		(.47)		(.33)		(.40)		(.10)		(.40)	
Age	-.05*	-.33	-.05*	-.23	-.02*	0.22	-.02	-.19	-.01*	-.26	-.02	-.22
	(.02)		(.02)		(.01)		(.01)		(.00)		(.02)	
Education	-.05	-.07	-.07	-.09	.07*	-.15	-.05	0.10	-.00	-.04	.01	.02
	(.07)		(.06)		(.05)		(.05)		(.01)		(.05)	
Nonwhite	.10	.02	1.45*	.23	-.57	-.15	-.03	-.01	-.10	-.11	.05	.01
	(.51)		(.49)		(.34)		(.41)		(.12)		(.45)	
Alcohol use	—	—	.02	.05	.06*	.19	.07*	.20	.00	.07	.00	.01
			(.04)		(.03)		(.04)		(.01)		(.03)	
Night life	—	—	.32*	.34	.11*	.18	.16*	.23	-.02	-.13	-.06	-.09
			(.09)		(.06)		(.08)		(.02)		(.09)	
<i>R</i> ²		.32		.40		.17		.22		.06		.38
<i>N</i>		125		125		125		125		76		74

Note. b = unstandardized coefficient with standard error in parentheses; beta = standardized coefficient.

**p* < .05 (one-tailed where predicted).

TABLE 3. Regression Coefficients and Standard Errors for Females

	Respondent's Violence Against									
	Nightlife		Witness		Target		Spouse		Children	
	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta
Marital status	-1.44*	-.41	.04	-.09	.07	.02	.73	.17	.23	.05
	(.32)		(.10)		(.34)		(.50)		(.51)	
Preteen children	-.64*	-.20	.54	.19	.66	.22	.04	.02	1.00	.22
	(.33)		(.34)		(.33)		(.31)		(.78)	
Age	-.04*	-.33	-.01	-.13	-.01	-.13	-.02	-.20	-.06*	-.37
	(.01)		(.01)		(.01)		(.01)		(.03)	
Education	.07	.11	-.03	-.05	.08	-.14	-.08*	-.21	-.03	-.04
	(.05)		(.05)		(.05)		(.04)		(.08)	
Nonwhite	-1.03*	-.20	-.04	-.01	-.33	-.07	-.43	-.11	-.76	-.12
			(.45)		(.45)		(.45)		(.63)	
Alcohol use	—	—	.11*	.19	.15*	.25	.00	-.00	-.02	-.02
			(.06)		(.06)		(.05)		(.08)	
Night life	—	—	.04	.05	.09	.10	.08	.08	-.29	-.17
			(.10)		(.10)		(.11)		(.18)	
<i>R</i> ²		.33		.14		.20		.10		.31
<i>N</i>		115		115		115		84		94

Note. b = unstandardized coefficient with standard error in parentheses; beta = standardized coefficient.

* $p < .05$ (one-tailed where predicted).

DISCUSSION

These results support the hypothesis that an active night life has a causal effect on the opportunity to be involved (as a victim, offender, or witness) in nondomestic violence. Two findings suggest that the relationship between routine activities and violence is due, at least in part, to differential opportunity. First, for males, night life is associated with witnessing violence as well as offending and victimization. The witness variable is more suitable for measuring the spatial and temporal effects of routine activities because it depends on visual contact, not on the behavior of the offender or victim.

Second, the routine activities that lead to violence against persons outside the family do not lead to domestic violence. If the people who go out at night have personal characteristics that cause them to be more provocative or violent, they would also engage in more domestic violence. However, the relationships between night life and the measures of domestic violence are negative and insignificant. These findings are therefore consistent with a routine activities explanation, and inconsistent with the explanation that personal characteristics are affecting behavior, independent of opportunity factors.

Violence Involving Women

There was no evidence that going out at night was a risk factor for women. The failure to find an effect may be due to fact that females are much less likely than men to attack or be attacked by people outside their family. When they are involved in violence (as a witness, offender, or victim), a domestic situation is usually involved. Thus, the witness and target variables for females were dominated by incidents of domestic violence.

There is another reason why an active night life is not likely to be as risky for women as for men. When females go out at night, they are more likely to go to places where the risk of being the target of violence or witnessing violence is low. Evidence shows that females are more risk-averse than males and have a greater fear of crime (Block, 1983; Warr, 1984). They are less likely than men to walk alone at night. They may be more likely than males to avoid rough bars and other dangerous locations. Future research should examine in more detail the types of places men and women frequent when they go out at night.

Social-demographic Factors

This research demonstrates the role of routine activities in explaining social-demographic variation in involvement in violence. It shows that routine activities can help explain why young, single men are at the greatest risk for violent offending and victimization. Thus, the results show that as people get older they have a less active night life. Staying at home reduces the risk of nondomestic violence, at least for males. Family obligations also affect night life. Those who are married and those with pre-teenage children at home are less likely to go out at night. For males, these activities reduce the risk of their involvement in nondomestic violence.⁶

Age and family obligations do not operate independently, however. As people age they are more likely to marry, which leads to a further reduction in night life. Age also has a non-linear effect on whether they are responsible for preteen children. In these data, the presence of preteen children was highest in the late 20s for females and early 30s for males. As children get older, their parents are able to go out more frequently, increasing their risk of involvement in nondomestic violence. This pattern offsets the negative linear effect of age on involvement in violent activity.

The Role of Alcohol

Alcohol consumption was associated with male violence outside the family, but not with domestic violence. It may be that unless individuals are intoxicated, they are unlikely to become embroiled in violent disputes outside the family. Conflicts with strangers and acquaintances are likely to be less frequent, and less intense, and less likely to culminate in violence unless the antagonists are disinhibited due to alcohol. Domestic disputes, on the other hand, are more likely to be more frequent and intense, and therefore less likely to require intoxication to become violent. In addition, many parents use violence routinely to discipline their children; the role of alcohol is likely to be less significant.

Alcohol consumption was also associated with victimization. Those who consumed high levels of alcohol were more likely to be the target of violence. It may be that the disinhibitory effect of alcohol leads people to engage in impolite or otherwise offensive behaviors. The resulting conflict may culminate in violent attacks from others. In other words, alcohol interferes with performance and individuals who perform poorly are more likely to be the target of grievances and violence. A similar argument has been used to explain why the experience of stressful life events is more highly correlated with violent victimization than with engaging in violence (Felson, 1992).

Alcohol consumption may mediate some of the effect of night life on the frequency of nondomestic violence.⁷ People may drink more if they go out at night, particularly if they go to parties or drinking establishments. Drinking may then increase the likelihood of violence outside the home.

Possible Limitations

The results from this study are based on a relatively small sample from one city at one point in time. Because the risks of going out at night are likely to be greater in some cities than in others, estimates of the size of effects are not generalizable across time and space. (In a national sample, these risks are simply averaged out across difference locations.) However, our interest is in whether night life affects witnessing, victimization, and offending inside and outside the family. It is the pattern of effects that allow us to examine the causal process involved.

There are also some measurement problems in this research. As indicated earlier, the target and witness variables may have included some incidents of domestic violence that are not affected by an individual's night life. This measurement problem may explain why we found no effects of night life for women. In addition, the night life measure is only a rough indicator of opportunity. The risk of going out is likely to depend on the places males frequent and the activities they engage in at these locations. For example, a key predictor of the frequency of violence in bars is the age of the clientele (Felson, Baccaglioni, & Gmelch, 1984). Men who frequent bars with a young clientele therefore put themselves at a greater risk of witnessing or being involved in violence than those who go to bars with an older clientele.

These measurement problems are likely to produce random rather than systematic error. The coefficients might have been stronger if only violence outside the family was measured and if a more refined measure of opportunities was used. It is noteworthy that we found substantial effects of night life for males, particularly on witnessing violence, given the limitation of our measures.

Another potential limitation involves the issue of displacement. Perhaps men with a propensity to violence are more likely to attack strangers if they go out, and attack family

members if they stay home. Routine activities affect whom they target but not how often they engage in violence.

We think displacement is likely to have minimal impact on dispute-related violence, which is primarily what is studied in this data set (Felson, 1982). Situational factors are critical in motivating people to commit dispute-related violence. Even individuals with a propensity toward violence are not violent in most situations. In addition, targets are not as substitutable in dispute-related violence as they are in predatory crime. Offenders are usually interested in one target—the person with whom they are in conflict. (Felson, 1993)

In sum, the evidence suggests that the routine activities of males affect their risk of involvement in violence outside the family. When males go out at night for recreation, their chances of observing and becoming involved in violent disputes increase. These opportunities help explain social-demographic differences in nondomestic violent behavior. The tendency to go out at night is one reason for the higher levels of violence among young single men.

NOTES

¹It is possible that going out at night creates conflict with spouses and thus leads to domestic violence.

²The normality assumption of ordinary least squares (OLS) is violated in varying degrees in our dependent variables. To address this issue, we reanalyzed the data using Poisson regression, a technique more appropriate for count variables with non-normal distributions (Beck & Tolnay, 1995). The results were quite similar. We present the OLS results because the technique is more familiar and the results are easier to interpret.

³For males, the measure of violence against spouses is highly skewed, because most respondents did not report engaging in violence against their spouse. We dichotomized this variable, coding respondent "1" if they had engaged in violence against a spouse, and zero otherwise. The pattern of results from logistic regressions using this coding procedure was the same as the pattern of results presented in Table 2.

⁴We reanalyzed the results treating the two measures of night life as separate variables. For males, going out at night was a better predictor of being a witness and engaging in violence than going to bars. Going to bars was a stronger factor in predicting being the target of violence. Neither bar frequency nor going out at night predicted the violence measures for females.

⁵We also examined statistical interactions between night life and alcohol consumption. Significant statistical interactions were observed using OLS for male aggression against nonfamily and female victimization. However, this pattern was not observed when we analyzed the data using Poisson regression. We conclude that the effects of night life and alcohol consumption are probably additive.

⁶Marital status and preteen children have negative but nonsignificant effects on witnessing and engaging in nondomestic violence, when night life is omitted from the equation. Apparently, the indirect effects of family obligations on involvement in violence are not strong enough to be observed in these equations.

⁷Alcohol consumption and night life are correlated for both males ($r = .41$) and females ($r = .21$). We do not know to what extent the relationship is causal or spurious, because those who desire to drink tend to drink more and they tend to go to bars to purchase alcohol.

REFERENCES

- Beck, E. M., & Tolnay, S. E. (1995). Analyzing historical count data: Poisson and negative binomial regression models. *Historical Methods*, 28L, 125-131.
- Black, D. (1983). Crime as social control. *American Sociological Review* 48, 34-35.

- Block, J. (1983). Differential premises arising from differential socialization of the sexes: Some conjectures. *Child Development*, *54*, 1335-1354.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1994). Criminal victimization in the United States: 1973-1992 trends. U.S Department of Justice. Washington, DC: U.S Government Printing Office.
- Clarke, R, Eklblom, P., Hough, M., & Mayhew, P. (1985). Elderly Victims of Crime and Exposure to Risk. *The Howard Journal*, *24*, 1-9.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, *44*, 588-608.
- Cohen, L., Kluegel, J., & Land, K. C. (1981). Social inequality and predatory criminal victimization: An exposition and a test of a formal theory. *American Sociological Review*, *46*, 505-524.
- Collins, J.J. Jr. (1991). Drinking and violations of the criminal law. In D. J. Pittman & H. R. White, (Eds.), *Society, culture and drinking patterns re-examined* (pp. 650-660). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies.
- Criminal Justice Services. (1993). *Crime and justice annual report*. Albany, NY: Division of Criminal Justice Services.
- Fagan, J. (1993). Set and setting revisited: Influences of alcohol and illicit drugs on the social context of violent events. In S. E. Martin (Ed.), *Alcohol-related violence: Fostering interdisciplinary perspectives*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Felson, M. (1994). *Crime and everyday life: Insights and implications for society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
- Felson, M. (1986). Linking criminal choices, routine activities, informal control, and criminal outcomes. In D. B. Cornish & R. V. Clarke (Eds.), *The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspectives on offending* (pp. 119-128). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Felson, M. (1987). Routine activities and crime prevention in the developing metropolis." *Criminology*, *25*, 911-931.
- Felson, R. B. (1982). Impression management and the escalation of aggression and violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *45*, 245-254.
- Felson, R. B. (1992). Kick 'em when they're down: Explanations of the relationship between stress and interpersonal aggression and violence. *Sociological Quarterly*, *33*, 1-16.
- Felson, R. B. (1993). Predatory and dispute-related violence: A social interactionist approach. In R. V. Clarke & M. Felson (Eds.), *Advances in criminological theory*, *5*, 189-235.
- Felson, R. B., Baccaglioni, W. & Gmelch, G. (1986). Bar-room brawls: Aggression and violence in Irish and American bars. In A. Campbell & J. J. Gibbs, *Violent transactions* (pp. 153-166). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Felson, R. B., & Russo, N. (1988). Parental punishment and sibling aggression. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *51*, 11-18.
- Hirschi, T. 1969. *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kennedy, L. W., & D. R. Forde. (1990). Routine activities and crime: An analysis of victimization in Canada. *Criminology*, *28*, 137-152.
- Lasley, J. R. (1989). Drinking routines/lifestyles and predatory victimization: A causal analysis. *Justice Quarterly*, *6*, 529-42.
- Miethe, T. D., Stafford, M. C., & Long, J. S. (1987). Social differentiation in criminal victimization: A test of routine activities/lifestyle theories. *American Sociological Review*, *52*, 184-194.

- New York State Department of Health. (1994). *Injury facts for New York State*. Unpublished.
- Tedeschi, J. T., & Felson, R. B. (1994). *Violence, aggression, and coercive actions*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Warr, M. (1984). Fear of victimization: Why are women and the elderly more afraid. *Social Science Quarterly*, 65, 681-702.

Acknowledgments. I wish to thank Marcus Felson, Marv Krohn, and Steve Messner for their comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

Offprints. Requests for offprints should be directed to Richard B. Felson, State University of New York at Albany, Social Sciences 340, Albany, NY 12222.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.