

Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Volume 37 | Issue 2

Article 5

1946

Intelligence, Race, and Age as Selective Factors in Crime

Vernon Fox

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vernon Fox, Intelligence, Race, and Age as Selective Factors in Crime, 37 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 141 (1946-1947)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

INTELLIGENCE, RACE, AND AGE AS SELECTIVE FACTORS IN CRIME

Vernon Fox

"Psychological, or psycho-biological, factors in crime have not been overlooked in these days when the trend of penal thought has emphasized the environmental influences. Vernon Fox, the psychologist at the State Prison of Southern Michigan, has presented with mathematical certainty the types of criminal behavior which tend to be selected by men of varying degrees of intelligence, by whites and Negroes, and by men of different age levels."—EDITOR.

Intelligence, race, and age of offenders have almost always been considered important factors in crime. There have been scattered reports published concerning each of them. These reports have not been kept up-to-date, and have seldom considered these three factors together. At any rate, some of the reports have shown impressionistic differences between the types of crimes perpetrated by men of different age groups, race groups, and intelligence levels. These impressions may or may not represent reliable differences. The purpose of this study is to show whether or not age, race, and intelligence are statistically significant factors in the determination of varying types of criminal behavior.

Literature in the Field

Intelligence of offenders was first considered by H. H. Goddard in the Vineland Training School in New Jersey. His first report was published in 1911.¹ Testing of offenders in reformatories and prisons was first undertaken in 1913.² These early testing programs were merely to detect the incidence of feeble-mindedness. Administrative use of psychological services was not considered seriously until the work of Doll and Ellis in 1921.³ In 1920, a short article appeared in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* dealing with the comparative intelligence of offenders.⁴

The research on the intelligence of prisoners has netted varying results. In 1926, Henry H. Goddard reported that "at least fifty per cent of all criminals are mentally defective."⁵ In the same year, Carl Murchison wrote that he had found rather conclusive evidence that intelligence was a negligible factor

¹ G. I. Giardini, Ed.D.; "The Place of Psychology in Penal and Correctional Institutions", *Federal Probation*, Vol. VI, April-June, 1942, p. 29.

² E. Rowland; "Report of Experiments at the State Reformatory for Women at Bedford, N. Y.", *Psychological Review*, 1913, pp. 245-249.

³ J. D. Jackson; "The Work of a Psychologist in a Penal Institution—A Symposium", *Psychological Exchange*, 1934, pp. 53-55.

⁴ Edgar A. Doll, "The Comparative Intelligence of Prisoners," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, August, 1920, pp. 191-197.

⁵ Henry H. Goddard, *Feeble-mindedness: Its Causes and Consequences*, New York, 1926, p. 9.

in crime causation.⁶ Zeleny indicated that the estimate of the incidence of feeble-mindedness in prisons was somewhat higher than the estimated feeble-minded ratio in the general population.⁷ It is noted that Zeleny made wide use of estimation, and further, that his estimates between prison and civilian populations were not sufficiently different to give concern that feeble-mindedness is an important factor in crime.

Root discovered evidence in 1928 that some types of criminal behavior tended to be associated with various levels of intelligence.⁸ His results were as follows:

<i>Criminal Group</i>	<i>Median Intelligence Quotient</i>
Embezzlers	103.75
Robbers	84.3
Forgers	83.75
Burglars	81.75
Larceny	78.3
Panderers	75.0
Arson	75.0
Rape	72.8
Sodomy	72.1
Homicide	70.9
Felonious Assault	68.3
All sex offenders	72.8
All violence offenders	70.2

These figures may represent reliable relative differences, but no statistical measures of significance were shown to have been employed. Consequently, any differences may be impressionistic, and not proved. The median intelligence quotients found by Root in 1928 are considerably lower than those found in the present study in 1943. There has been a general trend toward finding higher intelligence quotients in prisons in the past two decades. These differences seem to have been due to improved methods of measurement, rather than improved performance on the tests.

Ackerson found that in a study of 5,000 problem and delinquent children, some behavior problems increased with graduated classification from lower to higher intelligence, some types of behavior decreased with similar graduation, and some neither increased or decreased.⁹ Actual statistical measurement, however, indicated that the correlations were very low, and therefore could not be considered significant. Tulchin has probably made the most complete study to date of the types of criminal behavior selected by men from the various intelligence

⁶ Carl Murchison, *Criminal Intelligence*, Worcester, Massachusetts, 1926, p. 43.

⁷ Leslie Day Zeleny, "Feeble-mindedness and Criminal Conduct," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 38, January, 1933, p. 574.

⁸ W. T. Root, Jr., *A Survey of 1916 Prisoners in Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania*, 1928, p. 52.

⁹ Luton Ackerson, *Children's Behavior Problems*, Chicago, 1931.

levels.¹⁰ He studied 10,000 inmates of the penal institutions of the State of Illinois. Tulchin pointed out that a variation between the types of criminal behavior selected by men of varying intelligence did exist, and that differences were probably significant. Berg indicated that sex offenders tend to average lower in intelligence than other felons.¹¹ His sample of 480 cases from the State Prison of Southern Michigan was relatively small when compared with the 5,104 cases from the same prison used in the present investigation. Again, tests of statistical significance were lacking.

Goring pointed out that age is a selective factor, in that the post-adolescent, or young adult, constitutes a far greater risk than any other age range of equal duration.¹² This condition has continued until the present time.¹³ It is accepted that organic growth and maturation influence the behavior of offenders.¹⁴

Lunden suggests that homicide is a mature man's crime, and auto theft is a young man's offense.¹⁵ The *Uniform Crime Reports* indicate that in the United States younger and older men tend to be drawn toward the commission of crimes as indicated below.¹⁶

<i>Young Men</i>	<i>Older Men</i>
1. Auto theft	1. Driving while intoxicated
2. Burglary	2. Offenses against family and children
3. Robbery	3. Gambling
4. Rape	4. Violation of liquor laws
5. Road and driving laws	5. Embezzlement and fraud
	6. Violation of drug laws
	7. Arson

These differences, though probably reliable, have not yet been shown in the literature to be statistically significant.

There has been considerable material written concerning the racial differences in criminal participation. In general, it has been found that the Japanese in America have manifested negligible criminality.¹⁷ The immigrant Mexican group varies by localities, but probably has a proportionately higher crime

¹⁰ Simon H. Tulchin, *Intelligence and Crime*, Chicago, 1939.

¹¹ Irwin August Berg, "Mental Deterioration Among Sex Offenders," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, September-October, 1943, p. 184.

¹² Charles Goring, *The English Convict*, London, 1913, p. 173.

¹³ Walter C. Reckless, *Criminal Behavior*, New York, 1940, p. 104.

¹⁴ Gustav Aschaffenburg, translated by Adalbert Albrecht, *Crime and Its Repression*, Boston, 1913, pp. 139-157. Also Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, *Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up*, 1940, p. 264.

¹⁵ Walter A. Lunden, *Statistics On Crime and Criminality*, Pittsburgh, 1942.

¹⁶ U. S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Reports*, Vol. 8, Washington, D. C., 1938, pp. 219-224.

¹⁷ William Carlson Smith, *Americans in Process*, Ann Arbor, 1937, p. 218.

rate than the native white.¹⁸ No reliable data was found as to the types of offenses these groups tended to commit.

The Negro group is of major importance in crime in Michigan. The *Uniform Crime Reports* indicate that the Negro tends toward the commission of assault and larceny offenses with more proportional frequency than the native white group.¹⁸ Reckless is of the opinion that the Negro leads the whites in the United States in all crimes except driving while intoxicated, forgery, and counterfeiting.²⁰ It is noted that though the differences suspected may be reliable, there have been no reliable statistical measures of significance.

Procedure of Study

In order to obtain a fairly representative sample of offenders for this study, the inmates in the State Prison of Southern Michigan on one day, selected at random, were considered. The day selected was July 13, 1943, on which there were 5,104 men in the prison. A few of these men were sentenced on two or more charges. As a result, a total of 5,328 crimes were represented.

The race, age, and intelligence quotient of each offender at the time of his commitment was tabulated under his respective crime or crimes. The crimes were then classified under major headings, such as homicide, burglary, larceny, etc., according to that classification used by the Department of Corrections of the State of Michigan.²¹ After these tabulations and classifications were completed, the data were statistically treated to determine whether or not differences in the types of criminal behavior selected by men from the varying age groups, racial groups, and/or intelligence levels were significant.

Intelligence

In determining the significance of intelligence as a selective factor in crime, the prison population on July 13, 1943 was used as a control group. The intelligence quotients of these 5,104 men were tabulated. The intelligence quotients of each crime group were then compared with the prison's population as a whole. Resulting critical ratios demonstrated the degree of significance of the differences. The mean intelligence quotients, the critical ratios between each crime group and the control group, and the significance of the differences are indicated in Table I.

¹⁸ Paul S. Taylor, "Crime and the Foreign Born, The Problem of the Mexican," National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement; *Report in Crime and the Foreign Born*, No. 10, Washington, D. C., 1931, p. 235-243.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 236.

²⁰ Walter C. Reckless, *Criminal Behavior*, New York, 1940, p. 115.

²¹ Department of Corrections; Penal Statistics, Form 1, State of Michigan.

TABLE I
SIGNIFICANCE OF INTELLIGENCE AS A SELECTIVE FACTOR

<i>Crime Group</i>	<i>Mean Intelligence Quotient</i>	<i>Critical Ratio</i>	<i>Significant Differences</i>
Bribery	110.2	1.4	No difference
Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice, or to commit crime	106.5	6.4	Higher
Violation of "Blue Sky" or State Securities Law	106.0	5.7	Higher
Breaking Quarantine	100.0	0.0	No difference
Forgery	96.1	8.6	Higher
Bombing and malicious destruction of property	95.4	1.3	No difference
Aiding Escape	94.5	0.0	No difference
Embezzlement and Fraud	94.2	1.4	No difference
Possession of Burglar's tools	94.1	0.6	No difference
Property	92.8	1.5	No difference
Robbery	91.7	6.8	Higher
Liquor Laws	91.5	0.6	No difference
Auto Theft	91.4	3.7	Higher
Offenses Against Family	90.7	1.3	No difference
Drug Laws	89.6	0.1	No difference
Escaping jail or prison, or attempts	89.5	0.9	No difference
Marriage Laws	89.2	0.6	No difference
Burglary	89.0	0.8	No difference
<i>Prison Population</i>	87.7	0.0	<i>Same Dist'n</i>
Kidnapping	87.6	0.0	No difference
Traffic Law Violations	87.3	0.2	No difference
Drunken and Disorderly	87.2	0.3	No difference
Sex Offenses (other than rape)	87.2	0.6	No difference
Abortion	87.0	0.0	No difference
Larceny	86.8	1.3	No difference
Gambling	86.8	1.3	No difference
Arson	84.7	0.8	No difference
Code (Commitments under Habitual Criminal Act)	84.6	1.2	No difference
Homicide	84.5	5.3	Lower
Rape	84.2	4.9	Lower
Weapons	83.1	3.4	Lower
Aggravated Assault	82.8	5.2	Lower
Perjury	78.5	2.5	Lower
Other Assault	78.2	2.5	Lower
Extortion	73.5	2.8	Lower
Exposing Poison to Kill Animals	73.0	0.0	No difference
Violation of Gaming Law	71.0	0.0	No difference

Table I indicates that intelligence does serve as a selective factor in crime. It is noted that there are mean intelligence quotients of some crime groups that seem extremely low or high, but are labelled "no difference" because the size of the group represented may not be large enough to permit valid conclusions to be drawn. Perhaps if there were more cases in these groups, the difference might prove to be significant. The

crimes known to be selected by men of significantly higher and lower intelligence are listed as follows:

<i>Significantly Higher Intelligence</i>	<i>Significantly Lower Intelligence</i>
1. Violation of "Blue Sky" or State Securities Law	1. Homicide
2. Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice, or to commit crime	2. Rape
3. Forgery	3. Weapons
4. Robbery	4. Aggravated Assault
5. Auto Theft	5. Perjury
	6. Other Assault
	7. Extortion

It is noted that with the exception of Robbery and Auto Theft, all the crimes listed under the significantly higher intelligence heading are related to business transaction. The group sentenced for Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice in Michigan were politicians and police officers who allowed a gambling racket to exist in Detroit in return for financial considerations

It is further noted that all of the assaultive crimes, including sexual assault, are listed under the heading of significantly lower intelligence. The cases of Extortion for which men were sentenced to the State Prison of Southern Michigan involved threats of physical violence. Perjury was the only crime selected by the group of lower intelligence that was not directly related to violence.

Race

Tabulation of races of the inmates showed that the Caucasians and the Negroes constituted 99.1 per cent of the prison population. The distribution was as follows:

<i>Race or Nationality</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Caucasian	3,632	71.2
Negro	1,428	27.9
Mexican	22	0.4
Indian	20	0.4
Oriental	2	0.1
Total	5,104	100.0

Since the incidence of Mexican, Indian, and Oriental races and nationality represent less than 1 per cent of all the cases, and since their distribution among the crime classifications is so wide as to make statistical measurement of doubtful validity, they were not considered for the purposes of this study.

Statistical comparisons were made on the basis of the Caucasian-Negro groups. The incidence of Negroes, expressed in percentage of the total Caucasian-Negro group, were tabulated for each crime. The significance of the varying proportions of Negro and Caucasian representatives in each crime was determined by the Chi-square tests. The results of this statistical treatment are shown in Table II.

TABLE II
SIGNIFICANCE OF RACE AS A SELECTIVE FACTOR

<i>Crime Group</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Chi-square</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Significant Variations</i>
	<i>Negro</i>	<i>Value</i>		
Abortion	0.0	0.000	.99	No difference
Breaking Quarantine	0.0	0.000	.99	No difference
Exposing Poison to Kill Animals	0.0	0.000	.99	No difference
Aiding Escape	0.0	0.000	.99	No difference
Bribery	0.0	3.361	.07	No difference
Violation of "Blue Sky" or State Securities Law	0.0	1.646	.19	No difference
Perjury	0.0	0.980	.47	No difference
Drunken and Disorderly	1.6	22.932	.01	Caucasian
Marriage Laws	2.1	17.547	.01	Caucasian
Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice, or to Commit Crime	5.3	9.304	.01	Caucasian
Kidnapping	5.6	4.403	.04	Caucasian
Escaping jail or prison, or attempts	7.6	12.289	.01	Caucasian
Arson	9.4	5.588	.02	Caucasian
Forgery	9.5	47.188	.01	Caucasian
Bombing and Malicious destruction of property	11.1	0.618	.34	No difference
Offenses against Family	11.8	5.256	.02	Caucasian
Embezzlement and Fraud	12.3	14.355	.01	Caucasian
Property	12.5	3.306	.07	No difference
Code (Habitual Criminal)	13.7	2.072	.14	No difference
Possession of burglar's tools	14.3	0.706	.44	No difference
Auto Theft	16.3	21.344	.01	Caucasian
Sex Offenses (except rape)	17.7	25.901	.01	Caucasian
Rape	21.5	11.526	.01	Caucasian
Other Assault	21.4	0.381	.55	No difference
<i>Prison Population</i>	27.9	0.000	1.00	<i>Same Dist'n</i>
Burglary	30.7	3.675	.06	No difference
Robbery	31.1	4.025	.05	Negro
Gambling	33.3	0.000	.99	No difference
Homicide	36.9	26.460	.01	Negro
Larceny	37.4	26.646	.01	Negro
Traffic Law Violations	37.5	0.618	.34	No difference
Liquor Laws	40.0	0.980	.47	No difference
Drug Laws	47.1	7.118	.01	Negro
Aggravated Assault	47.1	44.778	.01	Negro
Extortion	50.0	0.000	.99	No difference
Weapons	62.4	81.729	.01	Negro
Violation Gaming Law	100.0	0.000	.99	No difference

The differences between the theoretical incidence of Negroes and Caucasians and the incidence actually observed is probably a much more visual, and therefore more adequate, manner of demonstrating the significance of the differences. This information is given in Table III.

TABLE III
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED
RACIAL FREQUENCIES IN CRIME SELECTION

<i>Crime Group</i>	<i>Caucasian</i>		<i>Negro</i>		<i>Significance</i>
	<i>Expected</i>	<i>Observed</i>	<i>Expected</i>	<i>Observed</i>	
Abortion	1	1	0	0	No difference
Breaking Quarantine	1	1	0	0	No difference
Exposing Poison to kill Animals	1	1	0	0	No difference
Aiding Escape	1	2	1	0	No difference
Bribery	5	7	2	0	No difference
Violation of "Blue Sky" or State Se- curities Law	3	4	1	0	No difference
Perjury	4	5	1	0	No difference
Drunken and Disor- derly	45	62	18	1	Caucasian
Marriage Laws	35	48	14	1	Caucasian
Conspiracy to Ob- struct Justice, or to commit crime	13	18	6	1	Caucasian
Kidnapping	13	17	5	1	Caucasian
Escaping jail or pris- on, or attempts	51	64	18	6	Caucasian
Arson	23	29	9	3	Caucasian
Forgery	182	230	72	24	Caucasian
Bombing and Mali- cious destruction of property	7	8	2	1	No difference
Offenses against Family	24	30	10	4	Caucasian
Embezzlement and Fraud	82	100	32	14	Caucasian
Property Code (Habitual Criminal)	17	21	7	3	No difference
Possession of Burg- lar's tools	16	19	6	3	No difference
Auto Theft	5	6	2	1	No difference
Sex (except rape)	203	237	80	46	Caucasian
Rape	304	349	120	75	Caucasian
Other Assault	324	355	128	97	Caucasian
Prison Population	10	11	4	3	No difference
Burglary	3,632	3,632	1,428	1,428	Same
Robbery	673	649	264	288	No difference
Gambling	609	585	240	264	Negro
Homicide	2	2	1	1	No difference
Larceny	445	391	175	229	Negro
Traffic Law Violations	406	354	159	211	Negro
Liquor Laws	6	5	2	3	No difference
Drug Laws	4	3	1	2	No difference
Aggravated Assault	26	18	9	16	Negro
Extortion	171	126	67	112	Negro
Weapons	1	1	1	1	No difference
Violating Gaming Law	92	44	36	84	Negro
	1	0	0	1	No difference

The crimes for which significantly greater proportions of Caucasians and Negroes are imprisoned are as follows:

<i>Caucasian</i>	<i>Negro</i>
1. Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice, or to commit crime	1. Weapons
2. Drunken and Disorderly	2. Aggravated Assault
3. Marriage Laws	3. Drug Laws
4. Kidnapping	4. Larceny
5. Escaping Jail or Prison	5. Homicide
6. Arson	6. Robbery
7. Forgery	
8. Offenses against Family	
9. Embezzlement and Fraud	
10. Auto Theft	
11. Sex (except rape)	
12. Rape	

It is noted that, with the exception of kidnapping and the sexual offenses, the Negro group presents the greater risk so far as violence against persons is concerned. The Caucasian seems to have greater difficulty with alcohol, but the Negro has been convicted on drug charges more readily. Social factors enter into the greater proportion of Caucasians involved in offenses against Family and the Marriage Laws. The greater proportion of common-law marital relationships among the Negro group makes any conclusion as to the respective acceptance of familial responsibility uncertain. The more lax moral code among many Negro groups injects a question also into the discovery that the Caucasian is convicted for sex charges more frequently than the Negro. These differences seem to be social ones. Nevertheless, from the standpoint of the law-enforcing agencies, the Caucasian group presents the greater risk for the commission of sex crimes in the structure of our society. The Caucasian group is shown also to be the greater risk in crimes involving business and political interaction. This difference is also a social one. The greater proportion of Caucasians in the escape group may be partially due to the placement of men under different outside work assignments. The Negro trusties usually work in groups to a greater extent than do the Caucasian trusties, though this is not uniformly true. Because of this tendency, the finding that Caucasians tend to escape more frequently may not truly represent any psycho-biological difference between the Caucasian and Negro groups.

Age

Age seems to be one of the most important selective factors in crime. Organic growth and maturation have long been recognized as influential in human behavior. The manner in which age influences the selection of crime among the inmates of the State Prison of Southern Michigan is indicated in Table IV.

TABLE IV

AGE AS A SELECTIVE FACTOR IN CRIME

<i>Crime Group</i>	<i>Mean Age</i>	<i>Critical Ratio</i>	<i>Significant Differences</i>
Abortion	62.0	0.0	No difference
Violation of "Blue Sky" or State Securities Law	58.8	10.4	Older men
Violation Gaming Law	54.0	0.0	No difference
Bribery	51.2	1.8	No difference
Exposing Poison to Kill Animals	51.0	0.0	No difference
Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice, or to commit crime	49.5	11.6	Older men
Drunken and Disorderly	45.7	7.9	Older men
Lifers under Habitual Criminal Act	43.2	1.2	No difference
Marriage Laws	42.0	4.8	Older men
Sex (Other than rape)	41.8	12.6	Older men
Arson	41.4	2.7	Older men
Perjury	39.5	1.2	No difference
Gambling	38.8	0.8	No difference
Aiding Escape	38.5	0.0	No difference
Forgery	37.8	5.4	Older men
Bombing and Malicious destruction of property	37.2	0.9	No difference
Drug Laws	37.1	2.1	Older men
Aggravated Assault	36.8	3.7	Older men
Traffic Law Violation	36.7	0.6	No difference
Embezzlement and Fraud	36.1	2.1	Older men
Homicide	35.8	4.0	Older men
Rape	35.5	3.3	Older men
Possession of Burglar's tools	34.6	0.2	No difference
Offenses against Family	34.5	0.5	No difference
Other Assault	34.4	0.2	No difference
<i>Prison Population</i>	33.7	0.0	<i>Same Dist'n</i>
Larceny	33.6	0.5	No difference
Weapons	31.9	2.1	Younger men
Escape	30.8	2.5	Younger men
Violation State Liquor Laws	30.7	0.7	No difference
Burglary	30.5	3.3	Younger men
Extortion	30.5	0.7	No difference
Property	30.2	1.0	No difference
Robbery	28.7	14.6	Younger men
Kidnapping	28.4	2.7	Younger men
Breaking Quarantine	27.0	0.0	No difference
Auto Theft	26.8	15.2	Younger men

The statistical treatment indicates that some types of criminal behavior are selected by the older group, other types by the younger group, and that significant differences exist between the two. The crimes selected by the older and younger groups are listed as follows:

Younger Men

1. Auto Theft
2. Kidnapping
3. Robbery
4. Burglary
5. Escaping Jail or Prison or attempts
6. Weapons

Older Men

1. Violation of "Blue Sky" or State Securities Law
2. Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice, or to commit crime
3. Drunken and Disorderly
4. Marriage Laws
5. Sex (other than rape)
6. Arson
7. Forgery
8. Drug Laws
9. Aggravated Assault
10. Embezzlement and Fraud
11. Homicide
12. Rape

The younger men tend to select the cruder methods of stealing. The older men's thefts are involved in business and politics. Crimes of dissipation, such as those involving sex, alcohol, and drugs, appear to be more frequent among the older group.

Summary

Table V shows the summarized differences within the intelligence, race, and age categories. The crime groups that were too inadequate in number of cases to allow valid conclusions to be drawn were eliminated.

TABLE V
SUMMARY OF INTELLIGENCE, RACE AND AGE AS SELECTIVE
FACTORS IN CRIME

<i>Crime Group</i>	<i>Intelligence</i>	<i>Race</i>	<i>Age</i>
Aggravated Assault	Lower	Negro	Older
Arson	No diff.	Caucasian	Older
Auto Theft	Higher	Caucasian	Younger
Bombing and Malicious destruction of property	No diff.	No diff.	No diff.
Burglary	No diff.	No diff.	Younger
Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice, or to commit crime	Higher	Caucasian	Older
Drug Laws	No diff.	Negro	Older
Drunken and Disorderly	No diff.	Caucasian	Older
Embezzlement and Fraud	No diff.	Caucasian	Older
Drug Laws	No diff.	Negro	Older
Escape	No diff.	Caucasian	Younger
Forgery	Higher	Caucasian	Older
Homicide	Lower	Negro	Older
Kidnapping	No diff.	Caucasian	Younger
Larceny	No diff.	Negro	No diff.
Lifer under Habitual Criminal Act	No diff.	No diff.	No diff.
Marriage Laws	No diff.	Caucasian	Older
Offenses Against Family	No diff.	Caucasian	No diff.
Other Assault	Lower	No diff.	No diff.
Property	No diff.	No diff.	No diff.
Rape	Lower	Caucasian	Older
Robbery	Higher	Negro	Younger
Sex (other than rape)	No diff.	Caucasian	Older
Traffic Law Violations	No diff.	No diff.	No diff.
Weapons	Lower	Negro	Younger

Intelligence, race, and age are without doubt selective factors in crime and behavior. The causes and forces in their complex and interacting effect upon human anti-social behavior offer a wide opportunity for research through case study. The social and psychological reasons for the differences shown are beyond the scope of a purely statistical study. As was noted previously, innumerable social forces are at work in determining the types of crime for which Caucasians and Negroes have been imprisoned in differential proportions. The reasons for the assaultive crimes being committed by older men of lower intelligence may be psychological in that poorer inhibition is associated with lower intelligence. Further, violence is a result of frustration, which, in turn, may result more often in the social interaction of men of lesser intelligence and adaptability. Age and maturation has always been considered an important factor in human behavior.

This study has not materially altered the previous knowledge in the field. The purpose was merely to determine whether the different types of criminal behavior selected by varying age groups, race groups, and intelligence levels represented reliable or impressionistic differences. The results of this investigation have shown that intelligence, race, and age are statistically significant selective factors in crime.