



1983

Middle-Class Delinquency: A Study of White Suburban Boys

Kenneth B. Ehrensaft
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ehrensaft, Kenneth B., "Middle-Class Delinquency: A Study of White Suburban Boys" (1983). *Dissertations*. 2191.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2191

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1983 Kenneth B. Ehrensaft

MIDDLE-CLASS DELINQUENCY: A STUDY OF
WHITE SUBURBAN BOYS

by

Kenneth B. Ehrensaft

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

April

1983

Copyright ©1983 by Kenneth B. Ehrensaft

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is made to the many people who made this study possible. I wish to express deep gratitude to Richard Block, committee chairperson, for his guidance, support, patience and constructive criticism. I wish to thank the other committee members, William Bates, A. S. Berger and Fr. Thomas M. Gannon, S.J., for their input. Fr. Gannon has also been instrumental in my academic and personal development. Recognition is given to Barbara Bardes of the Political Science Department of Loyola University. I also wish to thank the Sociology Department for making this educational opportunity possible.

This study was supported through a grant (73-NI-99-1010) from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, United States Department of Justice.

Information was provided by the Institute for Juvenile Research, Illinois Department of Mental Health. I express gratitude to the late Joseph Puntil who assisted me in many ways and to Gary Schwartz.

I am also grateful to the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Illinois, for the provision of information. I am thankful to the Hon. William Sylvester White, former Presiding Judge; the late Edward J. Nerad, director of Court Services, and Robert Walavich, assistant to the Chief Probation Officer.

I wish to thank Judy Brandon and Mary Clare Cunniff who assisted in the coding process and information gathering and Mary Kloris Taradash who

assisted with editing. A special thank you to Lucille McGill for her support and assistance when times were difficult.

Finally, I appreciate the support of my wife, Fern, and my parents.

VITA

The author, Kenneth B. Ehrensaft, is the son of Harry Ehrensaft and Evelyn (Eglit) Ehrensaft. He was born on August 27, 1942 in Chicago, Illinois

His elementary education was obtained in the public schools of Chicago and Skokie, Illinois. He graduated from Niles Township High School, Skokie, Illinois in 1961.

Mr. Ehrensaft entered Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa in 1961. He graduated in 1965 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in art and sociology.

In September 1965, Mr. Ehrensaft began his graduate study at DePaul University. He was initiated into Pi Gamma Mu, a national social science honor society. In January 1970, he received a Master of Arts in sociology.

In September 1974, Mr. Ehrensaft was granted a fellowship from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice. He received his Doctor of Philosophy in sociology at Loyola University of Chicago in May 1983.

Mr. Ehrensaft began a career in juvenile corrections as a probation officer for the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Illinois in 1965. From 1967 to 1973 he implemented and administered the Outreach (delinquency prevention) Program for the Evanston, Illinois Police Department. He was a major author of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Act of 1974 for the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission from 1975 to 1976. From 1976 to 1981, he was a unit director and administrator for the Chicago Department of Human Services.

He taught part-time at Loyola University from 1973 to 1975. Mr. Ehrensaft has been a part-time instructor in sociology at Barat College, Lake Forest, Illinois since 1975. He presently operates a management consulting business.

He is also married to Fern (Valfer) Ehrensaft and has one son, Jacob.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
Chapter	
I. THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	1
Introduction	
Suburban Population Growth	
Official and Self-Reported Accounts of Delinquency	
Specific Offense	
Class Based Theories	
Leisure Framework of Middle-Class Delinquency	
Control Theory	
The Family	
The School	
The Peer Group	
Containment Theory	
Conclusion	
II. THE SAMPLE AND METHODOLOGY	51
III. INVOLVEMENT OF MIDDLE-CLASS, SUBURBAN BOYS IN DELINQUENT ACTIVITIES	75
IV. THE FAMILY	102
Father-Son Relationships	
Mother-Son Relationships	
Conclusion	
V. THE SCHOOL	121
VI. THE PEER GROUP	138
VII. CONTAINMENT THEORY	151
VIII. COMBINED EFFECTS OF PARENTAL RELATIONSHIPS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, PEER ASSOCIATIONS AND SELF-CONCEPTS ON DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR	161

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Chapter	Page
IX. OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS	177
Summary	
Research Recommendations	
Policy Recommendations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	190
APPENDIX A	203
APPENDIX B	223
APPENDIX C	230
APPENDIX D	235

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2-1. Inventory of the Scoring of Questionnaire Items of a Single Case by Two Coders	60
2-2. Agreement and Disagreement in Scoring by Two Coders	63
2-3. Agreements, Disagreements, and Compromises Reached by Two Coders on Questionnaire Items for 27 Juvenile Court Cases	66
3-1. Positive Responses to Hedonistic Offenses	81
3-2. Positive Responses to Non-Hedonistic Offenses	82
3-3. Self Reports of Participation in Hedonistic Offenses by Controls	85
3-4. Self Reports of Participation in Non- Hedonistic Offenses by Controls	89
3-5. Official Account of Juvenile Court Petitions for Delinquent Youth Categorized by Specific Hedonistic and Non-Hedonistic Offenses	92
3-6. Community Adjustments for Delinquent Youth Categorized by Specific Hedonistic and Non-Hedonistic Offenses	94
3-7. Comparison of Participation in Hedonistic, Non-Hedonistic and Status Offenses by Delinquents and Controls	96
4-1. How Well the Boys Get Along with Their Fathers	104
4-2. The Ability of The Boys to Talk Freely to Their Fathers	107
4-3. Indications from The Boys That Their Fathers Understand Them, That They Take Their Fathers Advice, and Identify with Their Fathers	109

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

Table	Page
4-4. How Well the Boys Get Along with Their Mothers	113
4-5. The Ability of The Boys To Talk Freeley to Their Mothers	115
4-6. Indications From the Boys that Their Mothers Understand Them, that They Take Their Mothers Advice, and Identify With Their Mothers	117
5-1. Aspirations by Parents of Controls for Their Sons Future Educational Goals and The Aspirations of the Boys in The Control Group	123
5-2. Expectations of Grade Rank by Parents and Teachers: Actual Grade Rank by Control	124
5-3. Academic Achievement Levels for Delinquents and Controls	127
5-4. Summary Table of Negative School Dispositions For Delinquents and Controls	131
6-1. Peer Involvement with the Police and the Drug Scene for Delinquents and Controls	141
6-2. Involvement by the Peers of the Control Group in Selected Deviant Activities	143
7-1. Scale of Self Image Indices for the Boys of the Control Group	154
7-2. Self Concepts of Delinquents and Controls	158

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure	
2-1. Limitations of the Two Data Sources	54
8-1. Individual Discriminant Classifications	166
8-2. All Groups Stacked Histogram: Canonical Discriminant Function 1	170
8-3. Standardized Canonical Discriminant Coefficients	172

CHAPTER I

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

It is curious that there are so few studies of middle-class suburban youth within the imposing volume of works related to juvenile delinquency. Perhaps this underrepresentation results from official sources which have revealed that middle-class suburban areas have relatively low delinquency rates. Youth from lower socioeconomic backgrounds residing in inner-city neighborhoods, on the other hand, have had relatively high delinquency rates, and have been the focus of delinquency studies. However, self-reported accounts of delinquent behavior and more recent official statistics reveal that the occurrence of delinquency among middle-class suburban youth is greater than previously reported by official sources. This factor coupled with the rapid growth of suburban communities and their middle-class populations provide a stimulus to further investigate the phenomenon of middle-class suburban delinquency.

The purpose of this study is to better understand the causes of serious delinquent behavior among white middle-class boys residing in suburban communities. Our emphasis on serious delinquency is one not commonly encountered in previous studies of middle-class delinquency. For example, works regarding specific offense analysis (Shulman, 1949; Cohen and Short, 1958; England, 1960; Scott and Vaz, 1963; Meyerhoff and Meyerhoff, 1964; Vaz, 1967; Chilton, 1967; Allen and Shandhu, 1967; and

Tobias, 1970) conclude that middle-class delinquent acts are hedonistic in style. They would not expect middle-class youth to commit offenses involving serious theft or violence. The group of delinquent boys selected for our experimental group have been involved in serious acts of property and personal offenses.

Studies which attempt to explain middle-class delinquency may be generally divided into those which are based on social class and those which are not. For example, some theories or assumptions concerning the causes of middle-class delinquency are closely related to theories which explain lower-class delinquency. For example, Bohlke (1961), Kvaraceus and Miller (1967), and Cohen (1967) state that middle-class delinquency is the result of the rejection of middle-class values or the acceptance of lower-class life styles by middle-class youth.

Richards, Berk and Forster (1979) have developed a leisure framework which attempts to explain middle-class delinquency based on a micro-economic model. They state that youth select delinquent or non-delinquent activities on the basis of benefits and costs. Their theory is not class based.

Finally, there are three theories, control (Hirschi, 1969), differential association (Sutherland, 1947), and containment (Reckless, 1961, 1967, 1970) which we have selected for empirical test. These theories are not class based, and account for the major groups, i.e., family, school and peers, which comprise the adolescent social environment. There are some interrelationships between these theories and they are amenable to an empirical test of our available data. We are also able to test the assumption that middle-class youth are more likely to

commit hedonistic offenses. However, we do not have sufficient information to test the above mentioned class based theory or the leisure framework.

Suburban Population Growth

During the twentieth century, the United States has experienced dramatic demographic changes, especially in suburban growth. From 1900 to 1970 the metropolitan population increased from less than a third to more than two-thirds of the total population of the United States. During this time span, the suburban population increased its proportion of the metropolitan population from less than one-third to more than one-half. Also, a portion of the central cities growth, and some of suburbia's loss of population, is accounted for through the central cities annexation of suburbs on their peripheries (Kasarda and Redfearn, 1975). Thus, about one-third of the population of the United States resides in suburban communities.

A large proportion of the suburban population growth since the Second World War is the result of white migration from the central city. Although white migration goes both ways, from city to suburb and from suburb to city, the former is by far the greatest. Also, whites of higher socioeconomic status tend to migrate toward the suburbs (Farley, 1976). By 1970, wives and mothers in the labor force, and single adults increased as a proportion of the suburban population. At the same time the proportion of married couples decreased. Suburban family patterns are becoming more heterogeneous but not to the same extent as they exist in the central city (Long and Glick, 1976). These dramatic social changes in suburbia along with increased population growth manifest

scientific curiosity.

Official and Self-Reported Accounts of Delinquency

Official delinquency statistics (police, courts and correctional institutions) provide a plausible explanation as to the disproportionate volume of delinquency studies which center on deteriorating neighborhoods within central cities. According to the official data, the relative rates of delinquency are significantly higher for inner city neighborhoods than for peripheral areas of the central city and suburban communities. Since the official rates indicate (as exemplified by the classic study by Shaw and McKay, 1942) a tendency toward a direct relationship between increased socioeconomic status and increased distance from inner city, relatively high delinquency rates are attributed to the lower classes. On the other hand, the peripheral area of the central city and suburbia are commonly designated as middle-class or at least as of higher social economic status, and are attributed with relatively low rates of delinquency. However, this relationship between social class and delinquency is not without considerable flaw. First, individual census tracts are seldom homogeneous relative to their composition of socioeconomic status (Tittle, Villemez and Smith, 1978:644-645). Second, the majority of youth apprehended by the police are adjusted at the station rather than referred to the juvenile court. Unfortunately, for research purposes, police data does not contain information regarding socioeconomic status, i.e., parents' occupation, education and income. Thus, youth processed by the police may or may not hold membership within the predominant social class of his neighborhood. In other words we are confronted with an ecological fallacy, the attribution of a predominant characteristic(s)

to all residents of a specific geographical area. Thus, some delinquency studies which focus on predominately lower socioeconomic communities, for example, may fall in error by applying a specific social class to all individuals processed by the juvenile justice system, although some of those processed may not be members of the predominate class. Our study will try to eliminate this error while investigating delinquency among a specific class.

Another method of measuring the scope of delinquency (in an effort to counter-act the flaws of official data) is that of self-reported delinquency. This method generally involves the employment of an instrument, usually a questionnaire completed by a sample of youth (often within a school setting). The questionnaire contains selected information pertaining to acts of deviance, including delinquency, committed by the respondent. In order to obtain an accurate account of the respondent's participation in deviant behavior, the youth is guaranteed anonymity. The major purpose of this method is to gain information about delinquent acts which are not reported by the police. Ideally this method reduces flaws which seem to taint the official data. First, it counters the possibility of differential treatment of youth by the juvenile justice system in relationship to race, class and residence. Second, it accounts for acts of delinquency unreported to the authorities. For example, Ennis (1970) found a significant proportion of crime is not reported to the police. Third, indices of socioeconomic status are included in the instrument.

Results from self-reported research create a different image than that of the official data on the differences in delinquency rates

between the socioeconomic classes. Where as official data indicates a wide disparity in the rates of delinquency among the classes, i.e., relatively high rates for the lower-class and low rates for the middle-class; self-reported data does not support such wide differences in the rates. Various self-reported research studies (Nye, et al., 1958; Akers, 1964; Vaz, 1965; Voss, 1966; Hirschi, 1969; Gold, 1970; Doleschal, 1970; Box and Ford, 1971; Tittle and Villemez, 1977) reach conclusions which range from less class differences in delinquency rates (as compared to the official rates) to little or no class differences. Furthermore, Tittle, Villemez and Smith (1978) in their comprehensive study of crime and social class, state that both self-reported research and studies of official data since 1970 reveal no difference between social class and crime. These studies raise serious doubts about the reliability of official data especially as it relates to hidden crime and prompts a reconsideration about socioeconomic status and its relationship to the cause of delinquency.

However, self-reported data is not without limitations. For example, a rejoinder to Box and Ford (1971) with reference to other self-reported studies by Bytheway and May (1971) raises serious questions. They question sampling and research methods, the idea of a "real crime rate" which is built upon non-exacting indicies of delinquency, and the failure of clarifying the separate issues of, first, the reasons for an individual's behavior and, second, the cultural definitions of what is and what is not considered a crime. Braithwaite's (1981) review of 47 self-report studies reveals that 22 of them reach the conclusion that there is no significant difference in delinquency rates between the

classes. But, most of the studies which indicate that there is no significant difference were conducted in rural areas, where social class difference may be less as compared to metropolitan areas. Elliot and Ageton (1980) also agree that self-reports often rely on small unrepresentative samples. They also claim that respondents sometimes provide false answers which under- or over-report their involvement in deviant activities.

Another important criticism of self-reported studies lies in their measures of delinquent behavior. Clelland and Carter (1980) and Hindelang, Hirschi and Weis (1979) state that the majority of offenses which are measured by self-reports are trivial or petty. On the other hand, more serious offenses, i.e., armed robbery, burglary, rape and aggravated assault are most often excluded from self-report instruments. For example, the most often self-reported offense in a study by Richards, Berk and Forster (1979:168) is cheating on an exam. Another consideration in this respect, according to Clelland and Carter (1980), is that the self-reported measures often do not distinguish between petty and serious infractions. Richards, Berk and Forster (1979:148) illustrate this problem in their discussion on self-reported measures of interpersonal violence: "However, it is difficult to know whether such items measure predatory assault or mundane forms of playground conflict." Thus, Hindelang, Hirschi and Weis (1979) conclude that the differences in findings between official data and self-reports reflect the differences in what they measure. Official data is more likely to measure more serious offenses and self-reports often measure trivial ones.

It is not our intention to become immersed in differences regarding

the validity of self-reported delinquency studies. Rather, self-reported data is important to our study because it reveals that middle-class delinquency is worthy of scientific investigation. In the next section there is a review of specific offense analysis. The literature suggests that middle-class youth are more likely to participate in a specific style of delinquent activities.

Specific Offense

If there is one aspect of middle-class delinquency where considerable consensus exists in the literature, it is on specific offense. Specific offense does not relate to a theoretical perspective, but rather to an examination of stylistic differences of offenses committed by, in this case, a specific social class. As stated by Chilton, (1967) socioeconomic status is an important determinate of the specific offense committed. Lower-class youth are more likely to commit offenses against property such as theft. Offenses committed by middle-class youth are more likely to include traffic offenses, joy riding and drinking parties. Scott and Vaz (1963:329), and Vaz (1967:147) related middle-class deviance among youth to dating activities and the automobile which reflect the middle-class life style. They claim that middle-class delinquency is generally not in the form of serious theft or violence. The teen culture, according to England (1960), emulates adult behavior in the form of hedonism, i.e., auto offenses, sex, alcohol, and competitive games such as vandalism and auto chases. Meyerhoff and Meyerhoff (1964) view middle-class delinquency as non-violent and more related to thrills, kicks and mischief. Observations of delinquent middle-class subcultures by the Meyerhoffs coincide with Matza and Sykes' (1961) view that the values

held by the delinquent subculture are similar to those held by the general society. The Meyerhoffs conclude that the delinquent subcultures among the middle-class tend to adopt adult leisure time activities (subterranean values), i.e., liquor, autos and sex as their dominant activities.

Research by Tobias (1970) also resulted in a finding that middle- and upper-middle class delinquency is in the form of less serious, hedonistic acts which parallel their affluent life style.

Class Based Theories

Cohen and Short (1958:34) also concur that middle-class delinquency is in the form of hedonism and emphasize the importance of the playboy role within the middle-class subculture. A research study by Allen and Shandhu (1967:268) concluded that white delinquents were (significantly) more likely to engage in hedonistic behavior than white controls.

Finally, Shulman (1949: 30-31) speculated that middle-class delinquency would be in the form of malicious mischief resulting from peer pressure and sex offenses. However, Shulman also states that the middle-class are more likely to be involved in crime as adults (white collar crimes) with relatively little delinquency as juveniles. The above studies indicate that delinquent acts among middle-class adolescents generally fall under specific offenses which are hedonistic and often reflect behavior restricted to adults, rather than violent and theft types of felonies.

A few of the theories on the etiology of middle-class delinquency closely parallel some of the classic theories related to delinquency among youth of lower, socioeconomic status. These latter theories tend to concur that the etiology of lower- and working-class delinquency is inherent in the very nature of our social class structure. A few

examples are Shaw and McKay's (1942) cultural transmission theory, Merton's (1957) anomie theory, Cloward and Ohlin's (1966) differential opportunity theory, Cohen's (1955) theory of delinquent subcultures, and Miller's (1970) theory related to the lower-class subculture. The intention is not to suggest that middle-class theories merely replicate those which attempt to explain lower- and working-class delinquency. Rather, many of these theories view the middle-class delinquent as adapting life styles and cultural attributes of the lower- or working-classes. The following views on the causes of middle-class delinquency are not as well developed nor as thorough as those on the lower-class.

Kvaraceus and Miller (1967) maintain that middle-class delinquency is the result of an "upward diffusion" of some aspects of lower-class culture which are gaining acceptance by middle-class youth. For example, middle-class delinquents may identify with certain lower-class life styles, i.e., music, clothing and slang, which symbolize rebellion against adult society. The adaptation of lower-class life styles and poor school dispositions provide perfect weapons for middle-class youth against their parents since they form the antithesis of middle-class standards and goals.

According to Bohlke (1961), middle-class delinquency results from the inability or lack of desire by upwardly mobile working-class families to gain acceptance or status within the middle-class culture. Although a family may have moved upwardly by achieving a middle-class income, they may be placed in a situation of marginal social status if not accepted at a social level by the predominant middle-class community. Also, youth from families with long term middle-class backgrounds may be more prone to delinquency if they become socially rejected by the middle-class. In

effect, Bohlke states, middle-class delinquents do not identify with middle-class values. Similarly, all members of an upper middle-class gang observed by Greeley and Casey (1963: 67) were from families which made a rapid economic transition from lower-class to upper-middle-class.

Cohen (1967) views the increase of middle-class delinquency as a result of a breakdown in the barriers which stressed deferred gratification (which formally insulated middle-class youth from hedonistic behavior). An important example in the breakdown of these barriers is a product of social change, especially that which had occurred in the middle-class school system. The schools, according to Cohen, have decreased their emphasis on academic achievement as a requirement for promotion and have promoted youth on considerations of chronological age. By the lowering of academic standards, deferred gratification is giving way to immediate gratification and, hence, hedonistic behavior and establishment of a youth subculture, formally a phenomena found only in the working- and lower-classes. Thus, the subculture, which is not always delinquent, allows middle-class youth to break traditional barriers and engage in hedonistic behavior. Similar to the working-class youth in Cohen's Delinquent Boys, the middle-class adolescent subculture in effect is in conflict with middle-class values.

Leisure Framework of Middle-Class Delinquency

Richards, Berk and Forster (1979) have developed a "microeconomic principal of decision making," (which they do not consider to be a formal theory) to further the understanding of delinquent behavior. They developed a leisure framework which focuses on the potential delinquent

environment. They also conducted an empirical test of their model among students attending public schools in a predominately white, middle-class community. However, they believe that their model may be applied across social class boundaries.

In their explanation of the leisure framework they hypothesize, postulate and assume the following: (1) the process of decision making by delinquents and non-delinquents is similar. Also, delinquents are not likely to have pathological disorders nor are they "more hedonistic, impulsive or neurotic than non-delinquents;" (2) adolescents weigh the utility, i.e., benefits and costs, of engaging in legal and illegal activities; (3) adolescents try to gain the maximum investment from their legal or illegal activities; (4) some activities, legal and illegal, are selected for experimentation rather than for their returns from an investment. This becomes essentially a learning process of the costs and benefits from engaging in new types of activities. (5) Experimentation may serve as a source of information and to develop new skills for future encounters in complex social situations.

The following family related variables: broken homes, working mothers, permissive rule structures and permissive rule enforcement, do not correlate with delinquency, according to Richards, Berk and Forster (1979). This would be expected within the leisure framework since delinquent behavior usually takes place outside of the home. However, their family conflict variable had a greater correlation with minor offenses than with serious acts of delinquency. They also found that school performance and satisfaction have little relationship to delinquency. The authors do not view delinquency as abnormal. They suggest that

delinquent and non-delinquent activities are evaluated according to their risks and returns. Delinquent or non-delinquent activities may be selected according to which has the greatest utility. Richards, Berk and Forster (p. 184) state:

Leisure time can be invested in delinquent activity for several reasons. Direct consumption, production of goods for future investment or future consumption, and the development of non-market human capital are all potential outcomes of these investments.

Unfortunately, our available data does not contain sufficient measures to test this leisure framework.

Control Theory

Control theory, according to Hirschi (1969), explains delinquent behavior on the basis of the strength or weakness of an individual's bond to conventional society. Persons with weak bonds to society are more likely to engage in deviant behavior, such as delinquency, than persons with strong bonds. Hirschi further states that the societal bond is comprised of four elements: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief.

"Attachments" are essentially the affective ties which an individual maintains with important others, i.e., family, peers and school personnel. The attachment between parent and child is central to control theory, as Hirschi (1969: 85) states:

Although denied in some theories and ignored in others, the fact that delinquents are less likely than non-delinquent to be closely tied to their parents is one of the best documented findings of delinquency research.

Children with strong attachments to their parents are less likely to be delinquent, since they feel a greater obligation to obey societal norms.

violation of the norms may present a threat to the parent-child bond, a risk which the child may weigh as being too great to take. Thus, the social bond serves as a control mechanism over the child with a strong parental attachment. The child with weak parental bonds, on the other hand, has less to lose by engaging in delinquent activities. Hirschi also states that youth with strong attachments to their parents are more likely to maintain strong attachments to their peers and the school. Attachment is the one element of the social bond which we are able to operationalize through our data.

The second element of the social bond is "commitment." Youth committed to the conventional goals of society, i.e., occupational success, are more likely to follow the means which are acceptable to society. Thus, youth who are committed are more likely to forego immediate gratification (adult types of hedonistic behavior) for deferred gratification (school) during their transition to adulthood.

"Involvement," the third element, refers to the conventional or non-conventional use of time. The conventional use of time generally centers around structured activities associated with the family or school. Involvement in conventional activities restricts participation in deviant activities. Youth with limited parental supervision and participation in school activities are not as likely to be bound by conventional norms. Therefore, involvement in non-conventional activities is more likely to limit the effects of the social bond and increase the possibility of delinquency.

The final element of the social bond is "belief." Belief in conformity or non-conformity is related to the quality of an individual's

attachment to others. People who have weak ties to conventional society are less likely to feel that they have an obligation to conform to it.

Since control theory, as stipulated by Hirschi (1969), is based on the quality of the social bond, and not on socioeconomic status, it holds promise in explaining middle-class delinquency. Hirschi also provides empirical support for his theory. A replication of this study by Hindelang (1973) lends further empirical support to the theory. Hirschi's presentation of control theory highlights the three major groups which comprise an adolescent's social world in our society, i.e., the family, peer group and school. Our review of the literature, which follows, related to the social bond is also presented in three segments: the family, peer group and school.

The Family

As stated above, the quality of the attachment between parent and child is central to control theory. The relative strength or weakness of the social bond which a child develops with his parents is indicative of his degree of attachment to peers and the school. Hirschi states that the social bond between parent and child may be examined in different contexts, e.g., socialization and intimacy of communication.

The relationship between broken homes and delinquency is a topic of many studies. Control theorists argue that it is the quality of the social bond between parent and child, and not factors of a one- or two-parent family, which determines whether or not a youth is likely to engage in delinquent behavior. As revealed by the studies mentioned below, many tend to be supportive of control theory, but there is no agreement.

Toby (1957) found that delinquent youth are more likely to be products of a broken home. He states, however, that the intact two parent home is a more positive influence against delinquency for pre-adolescents and females than for adolescent males. A research study of youth referred to juvenile and county courts in Florida by Chilton and Markle (1972) is supportive of Toby. They discovered a higher percent of youth referred to a court and a higher percent of youth who committed serious crimes were from broken homes than found in the general population. The differences in the percentage of youth referred to court who were not from husband-wife homes was more dramatic for white than black youth. Chilton and Markle state that the effect of family seems to be greater for white youth than for black youth. Another study with complimentary findings is Willie's (1967) research on Washington, D.C. youth. He discovered the differential in rates between delinquent youth from broken homes than from two parent homes was greater for affluent whites than for poor whites, affluent non-whites and poor non-whites. Willie suggests that the family may serve as a greater deterrence to delinquency for white youth than for non-whites.

However, there is no consensus on the importance of the relationship between broken homes and delinquency. Studies by Hennessey, Richards and Berk (1978), Richards, Berk and Forster (1979), and Grinnell and Chambers (1979) do not conclude that there are meaningful relationships between delinquency and broken homes.

Wilkinson (1975: 736-37) cautions that future studies concerning delinquency and the broken home should determine the cause of the broken home, and stresses differences in families broken by desertion

and by death. Results from two British studies support Wilkinson's concern. First, Douglas, Ross, Hammond and Mulligan (1966: 300) studied a birth cohort of delinquent males from England, Scotland and Wales. They found that 23 percent of children from divorced or separated parents and only 12 percent of children from families broken by a death of a parent had a high incidence of delinquency. Second, Farrington and West (1971: 353-54) discovered a significant association between delinquency and youth from homes with parental separations, except when the separation was due to death or medical reasons. Death of a parent had little effect on delinquency.

Another caution concerning the broken home is suggested by Wilkinson (1974: 736-37). He states that youth from broken homes may be more likely to receive harsher treatment within the juvenile justice system than do youth from intact homes. Authorities in the juvenile justice system may feel that youth from broken homes are in need of additional care and are more likely to process them through the system. A study of all youth charged within Philadelphia from 1949-54 by Monahan (1957) revealed that a higher percent of recidivists than first offenders were from broken homes. However, youth from broken homes were more likely to be referred to court, and youth from intact homes were more likely to be diverted at the point of court intake. Chilton and Markle (1972) contend that a higher proportion of youth from disrupted families are processed by police and court agencies.

A broken home itself may not be a direct cause of delinquency, according to Peterson and Becker (1965: 93). They suggest that it is the quality of the relationships among the family members which are

important, since poor relationships tend to be common in the homes of delinquents. For example, Neumeier (1961: 162) states that a two parent home may be disorganized through "conflict," "tension" or "dissention," which may result in a social crisis. Disorganized families are unable to work as relatively smooth functioning units, and previous difficulties prove to be obstacles when adjustments must be made. McCord, McCord and Thurber (1962) concluded from their study that youth from two parent conflict homes and from broken homes were almost twice as likely to have a conviction for a felony than youth from tranquil homes. Stability of the family, one or two parent, was found to be more important than parental absence.

Parental absence may also exist in the form of occupational and social activities. Johnson and Silverman (1975: 6-7) state that detrimental effects may occur with middle-class children in situations where the father is often absent due to preoccupation with his profession and where the mother is absent from the home due to employment or over-involvement with community organizations.

The make up of the family, one or two parent, does not seem to be as important a factor in delinquency as the quality of interfamilial relationships and the effectiveness of the parental role in child-rearing. Numerous examples contained in this section indicate that delinquency is related to poor quality of one or more of the family's major functions, i.e., the mother's and father's roles as parents, marital adjustment, consistency in discipline and the degree of attachment between child and parent. These functions share a common element

in that they are tied to interpersonal relationships, and seem to be the basis for the degree of stability or instability of family organization. Families which experience a serious breakdown in one or more of those functions may be classified as disorganized. It is our assumption that the disorganized family is more likely to produce delinquency than an organized one.

Quality of the parents marital relationship may provide a clue to the disorganization of a family unit. The Gluecks (1950: 111) observed greater marital disharmony among the parents of delinquents than among non-delinquent controls. In a somewhat related area of deviance Robins (1966: 172-73) found sociopathic personality formation related to disharmony among the subject's parents. Robins did not find the sociopathic personality associated with the broken home.

A fair body of evidence suggests that the father's role as a parent and economic provider has considerable influence over his son(s). According to Parsons (1970: 97-99), the father plays an important role in the socialization of his children. Since the father's occupation places him in the world outside of the family for much of the day, he serves as the vital link between the family and the larger society. The influence of the father on male youth is demonstrated by Hunt and Hunt's (1975) study. Results indicated greater conventional achievement orientation and self-identity scores among boys with the father present in the home than among boys with an absent father. Middle-class whites with the father present in the home also achieved higher school grades, held higher educational aspirations and had greater self-esteem. Gold (1963: 135) measured the attraction of a boy to his

father by inquiring about the boy's opinion of his father as an economic provider. The more pretigious the occupation, the greater the attraction.

A father's rejection of his son may provide a most negative influence. McCord, McCord and Zola (1959: 90-91) revealed that fathers who rejected the emotional needs of their sons had the most negative effect on their sons criminality. Another example is from the McCords (1970: 205-13) study of fathers with criminal records. The McCords' research indicated that a boy whose father has a criminal record is not likely to become a criminal himself if the father and son have maintained an "affectionate bond" with each other. But sons who are rejected by their criminal fathers are more likely to engage in criminal activities. A matched study of white adolescent males with behavior problems (and in psychotherapeutic contact) and "normal" adolescents was conducted by Vogal and Lauterbach (1963). They observed that "normals" perceived similarity in the beliefs and behavior of both parents. However, problem youth perceived fathers as hard and rejecting and perceived mothers in a more favorable light. While under clinical care, the problem boys and their mothers often held negative attitudes toward the father/husband image. Also, problem boys were often caught between the marital difficulties of their parents.

A few final observations regarding the relationship between the father's role as a parent and delinquency are presented below. Greeley and Casey (1963: 37-38) concluded that the fathers of an upper-middle-class deviant gang were either absent or not involved in family life. Andry's (1971: 129) study of British delinquency found that delinquent

boys perceived their fathers as playing an inadequate role as a parent. Non-delinquent boys, on the other hand, perceived both their parents as playing adequate roles. Silverman and Johnson (1975: 8-9) suggest that delinquency may result from lack of an adult male role model through which male children may identify. Finally, Biller (1970) surveyed the literature on father absence and its effect on male children. He states that there is some evidence that father's absence or an ineffective father may affect their son's achievement, sex role identity, masculinity, behavior problems, and increased the likelihood to opt for immediate gratification. Biller (1970: 189) in this respect warns against a single casual approach:

. . .If a relationship does hold between father absence and certain types of cognitive functioning it must be remembered that father absence per se is only one of many variables responsible for such a relationship. The values of the mother and the peer group are extremely important.

Delinquency may also be influenced through inadequacy of the mother's role as a parent. Domination, inconsistency and rejection by the mother have been tied to anti-social behavior in their children. Walter B. Miller (1970) views female dominated homes within the lower-class culture as a variable related to delinquency. Johnson and Silverman (1975: 8) contend that both lower- and middle-class delinquents may be from female dominated homes. Data from an Institute for Juvenile Research study on youth revealed that over one-third of 450 cases from two parent homes had inconsistent mothers, according to Rosenthal (1962: 637). The inconsistent mother seldom imposes the same disciplinary measure more than once. She tends to vary from lax to strict discipline methods from one situation to the next. The

children of an inconsistent mother tend to test and exploit her weakness. McCord, McCord and Zola (1959: 108) state that families which have both a rejecting mother and father are much more likely to have a criminal son than if one or neither parent is rejecting. However, the McCords and Zola (1959: 112) add that loving mothers tend to rear non-criminal sons whether or not the father is rejecting. Winch (1962: 39) states that if the father is absent from the house:

. . .there is usually some consequent modification in the behavior of the mother. Indeed, we have seen that if the father is absent, the mother tends to stress obedience in her children and to over-protect them, and, of course, the probability is increased that she will go out of the home to work. The children, moreover, tend to develop an idealized and feminized conception of the paternal role and a more work-orientated conception of the maternal role.

From a secondary analysis of nearly 19,000 questionnaires completed by white students of broken homes, in the seventh through twelfth grades, Bowerman and Bahr (1973) conclude:

When one parent is perceived as having less influence than the other, we find that not only is identification of the adolescent lower with both parents, but that the relationship is different for the father than for the mother. Identification with mothers differs little, on the average, whether she is more influential; however, identification with father is considerably lower when he is perceived as the less influential of the two parents.

There is some evidence which ties aggressive behavior in children to the attitude and role model played by parents. According to Bandura and Walters (1959: 29) the denial of affectionate nurturance plus a punitive attitude by one or both parents tends to be related to anti-social aggression among adolescents. Two cross-cultural studies lend further support to a general middle-class style of discipline. Lynn and Gordon (1962) observed that middle-class mothers in England and

the United States are not as punitive as working-class mothers, and are more permissive toward aggressive behavior by their children. Rapp (1961: 669-77) reports similar results in a study conducted in Germany and the United States. He concluded that middle-class parents in both countries are less controlling and display less authoritarian attitudes toward their children than do the lower-class.

Anti-social behavior may also serve in a functional capacity. According to Albert Cohen (1966: 10), deviant behavior may serve as a warning signal which calls attention to a defect in a social system. Although Cohen only touches on this point, it may very well be that this factor deserves added attention, especially within the family setting. Numerous incidents of serious misbehavior by a child within the home may function as an "attention getting" mechanism which communicates a defect in the parent-child relationship. If these repeated warning signals are constantly ignored or misinterpreted by parents who also apply inadequate discipline, the child may carry his anti-social behavior to the school and community. The child's misbehavior may thus begin to reflect a rebellion against his parents and later against other authority figures. Larson (1972) discloses that youth who are closely attached to their parents are less likely to react against them.

A fair amount of evidence has been accumulated which relates the type and consistency of discipline to behavior. Peterson and Becker (1965: 94) and the President's Commission (1967: 198-99) found that the parents of delinquent youth apply very strict-lax inconsistent forms of discipline. McCord, McCord and Zola's (1959: 103-04) study

revealed that inconsistent discipline, rejecting mothers and deviant mothers will tend to have criminal sons; where non-deviant mothers, loving mothers and consistency in discipline will tend to produce non-criminal sons. Rosenthal (1962: 639) found that the child of a mother who applies an inconsistent form of punishment encounters difficulty in withholding anti-social impulses. Thus, the child may impose his anti-social behavior upon others in order to seek limits upon his behavior. Greeley and Casey (1963: 38) conclude that the lack of discipline at home is related to the rejection of authority at school. Finally, Gold (1973: 128) states:

The type of discipline a father employs may have some effect on the father's attractiveness to his son, and it may also serve as a lesson to the boy on how he should behave when he himself is angry at someone.

A body of research lends support to the relationship of delinquency to the quality of the social bond between parent(s) and child. Gold (1963: 129-37) states that delinquents are less attached to their parents than non-delinquents, and engage in fewer activities with their parents regardless of socio-economic status. Delinquents are also less likely to accept their parents' standard of behavior, especially that of their fathers. Jensen's (1972: 562-74) study found that non-attachment to parents is related to delinquency in community areas of both high and low rates of crime. Allen and Sandhu (1967: 263-69) conducted a study of delinquency and its causes related to religion, income and family relationships. Their research reveals that the quality of a youth's relationship with his parents is the most important factor contributing to delinquency in high and low income groups. According

to McCord, McCord and Zola (1959: 81-83) cohesive families, where a good relationship exists between parent and child, produce the least amount of delinquency, and quarrelsome but affectionate homes produce little delinquency. A comparative study of children with conduct problems (aggression) and those without conduct problems was conducted by Schulman, Shoemaker, and Moelis (1962: 109-14). The results indicate that the parents of conduct problem children are more hostile toward their children and are also more likely to reject them. Although the following type of situation was not observed in the experiment, the authors (p. 113) speculate:

. . . While both parents may in their own interaction present a model of aggressive and hostile behavior for the child, when they interact with the child they direct this hostility towards the child. In one sense, the child serves as a scape goat.

A number of studies have been reviewed which assess the quality and quantity of the mother's and father's participation in family life and its effect on their children's behavior. One of the most important roles of parenthood, in respect to behavior outcomes of children, is that of the disciplinarian. It is through discipline that the child forms moral boundaries and learns to adapt his behavior according to the standards of the home, school and community. The parents may play the most influential role in the molding of their children's behavior. For example, Jensen (1972) found parental control, direct or indirect, has an effect on their son's involvement or non-involvement in delinquent behavior. Jensen (1972: 570) also states that parental control is a more important factor than availability of delinquent peers.

Middle-class families impose upon their children a general style

of behavioral expectations and disciplinary sanctions for infractions of the rules. According to Kohn (1973: 101-01, 352), middle-class mothers tend to tolerate wild play and the "letting off of steam." However, the loss of inner control as displayed through a temper tantrum is not tolerated. The middle-class mother disciplines according to intent rather than to the form of the behavior. However, quarrelsome and neglected families, where little attachment exists between parent and child, produce the highest amount of delinquency. The Gluecks (1950: 110, 115) found a greater attitude of respect for the family from non-delinquents and non-delinquents were more likely to be products of a cohesive family. Bennett (1960: 217-21) stresses a multi-causal approach which related delinquency to a break in the parent-child relationship and inconsistent discipline. Two cross-cultural studies reveal similar findings. According to Weinberg (1964: 481), delinquents in Ghana are less attached to their parents than non-delinquents. Andry's (1971:52-53) study of British youth revealed that non-delinquents have better lines of communication with their parents and are more likely to confide in their parents when they are in troublesome situations than do delinquents.

According to control theory, delinquency is related to the degree of a youth's bonds to the basic institutions of society. A strong bond to society is inversely related to a high degree of delinquency. This section on the family refers to many research studies which are supportive, or at least partly supportive, of control theory. These studies also reveal that the closeness of the bond between a youth and his family is dependent upon the quality of the parental role. In other

words, the strength of the social bond is affected by the parents' effectiveness in discipline, supervision, resolution of family crisis situations and provision of attention to their children.

Hypothesis I: There is no difference in the quality of attachment to fathers between delinquent boys and controls.

Hypothesis II: There is no difference in the quality of attachment to mothers between delinquent boys and controls.

Socialization of an individual and the development of social bonds originate within the family. Once outside of the family, the socialization process and development of social bonds continue within other significant groups, i.e., the school and peer group. For example, Empey and Lubeck (1971: 80) concluded from their study that delinquent boys tend to maintain weak ties to the basic institutions during the transitional period from childhood to adulthood. They also found that not all youth with weak ties become delinquent. Hirschi's (1969) study revealed that the degree of attachment to the family, school and peer group are associated with delinquent behavior. Thus, we may be prudent to explore the possibility that a youth with weak attachment to one social institution, such as the family, may also maintain weak ties to other institutions and social groups, such as the school and peer group. In the next section, studies of the school and its relationship to delinquency will be reviewed. The school represents the first important group experienced by children outside of the family. We will note with interest any similarities in the quality of attachments an individual maintains with the family and the school, and the effect they have on delinquent

behavior.

The School

The situation encountered by the child within the school represents his first major transition and adjustment in the world outside of the family. Not only is the child exposed to a new physical and social environment, but he also experiences a new form of status designation. For example, Parsons (1970: 133) states that status within the family unit is ascribed according to sex, age and generation. However, within the school the child encounters a social environment where status is achieved through differential academic performance. Within the school the child is expected to perform academically and behave according to a socially prescribed manner. The child's success in school is dependent upon his personal capabilities and may also be linked to the quality of attachment and the socialization process within the home.

The high school also acts as a socialization agent. Within urban technological societies, such as ours, which experience rapid social change, additional demands are made in the socialization process from childhood to adult status. For example, Wiatrowski, Griswold and Roberts (1981) state that schools in our society share an important role in socialization and preparation for adulthood along with the family. They tend to credit the school with a greater role in adolescent socialization than Hirschi (1969).

According to Kitsuse and Cicourel (1962), adult status is determined upon gainful employment, and one's occupational status is largely dependent upon educational skills. The family is no longer equipped to provide all of the socialization skills necessary for its

childrens' transitional process to adulthood. Thus, the high school has taken the major role in "adolescent status transition" processing. Due to this process new demands are placed on both the student to conform and on the school to control the process of socialization.

Kitsuse and Cicourel (1962: 75) suggest that in its role as a socialization agent, the high school is becoming highly bureaucratized in its efforts to control the socialization process. They state:

Not only does the school shape the development of young people, it is the only agency that systematically assesses, records, and reports the progress adolescents make toward adulthood.

The high school acts as a clearing house of information. It receives reports from the police, social welfare agencies and the community in general regarding individual youth and disperses information to prospective employers and college admissions offices. The school's possession of this information may be of great concern to the student since it may influence his present and future status within and outside the high school. Kitsuse and Cicourel also maintain that the high school attempts to control the individual students by matching their potential to actual achievement levels. In this respect students may be identified as "under-achievers," "normal-achievers," or "over-achievers." "Under-achievers" and "over-achievers" are considered problems by the school and attempts are made to resolve these problems. As can be inferred, the student may be under tremendous pressure within the school situation. These pressures of conformity and achievement, in addition to pressures from the family and the peer group, may have great influence on the student's behavior outcomes.

A major behavioral concern within the high school, according to Stinchcombe (1964), is that of rebellion. Although his study is on a small town in California, its relevance may extend itself to the scope of our study. Stinchcombe suggests four hypotheses that explain high school rebellion, i.e., hedonism, negativism, alienation from authority and autonomy from authority. First, theories which explain deviant behavior must also explain conforming behavior. Second, rebellion results in circumstances where future status does not relate to present performance. The student may opt for outlets of immediate gratification, hedonistic behavior, rather than deferred gratification if improved academic achievement does not seem to guarantee future status. Third, youth who fail to identify with the student culture are more likely to challenge school authority and identify with adult roles. Identity with adult roles represent a symbolic autonomy from authority. Finally, when strongly internalized goals are not realistically obtainable, expressive alienation occurs.

Since expectations for success (status occupations) are greater for middle-class boys than girls or lower-class youth, the inability to achieve success by middle-class boys may lead to a greater degree of rebellion. Research findings by Stinchcombe concluded that middle-class youth achieve better than youth from lower socioeconomic status, but that there is no significant difference in rebellion between the classes. However, among certain groups there is an increase in rebellion associated with an increase of socioeconomic status. Thus, weak attachment with the high school in regard to authority, social control, student culture, academic achievement, and realization of internalized goals may

lead to rebellion.

Delinquency studies have long maintained that a correlation exists between delinquency and poor school adjustments. To cite a few examples, William C. Kvaraceus and Walter B. Miller (1959); the President's Commission (1967); Albert K. Cohen (1955); and Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin (1966) found that delinquent youth from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are likely to misbehave within the school, be truant and eventually drop out before completing high school. There is also evidence which indicates that a similar relationship cuts across socioeconomic boundaries, as Hirschi (1969: 120) states:

The more academically competent a boy is and/or the more competent he sees himself to be, the less likely he is to be delinquent, regardless of his position in the opportunity structure.

Kelly and Pink (1973) found that middle-class high school students who have a higher degree of commitment to school are less prone to rebellion (fighting, drinking and official delinquency). They also contend that school commitment is a better predictor of rebellion than socioeconomic status. Polk (1969) discovered no significant difference in the percent of working- and middle-class high school students with poor academic performance. He concludes that youth with poor academic achievement are more likely to be rebellious than those with higher achievement. A study by Blk, Frease and Richmond (1974) revealed similar findings. Youth who achieve poorly in school are more likely to become delinquent regardless of which socioeconomic class they hold membership. Venezia (1971) also suggests that the school disposition may serve as an excellent predictor of delinquency. As he states,

school records (academic and behavioral) often identify delinquent prone behavior at a young age.

Poor academic achievement seems to have a more negative effect on middle-class youth than on working-class youth, according to Frease (1973: 453-54). He also states that middle-class youth who perform poorly in school are more inclined to become delinquent. In another article (on the same study) Frease (1973a) concludes that youth who do not achieve academic success in schools which are oriented toward college are more likely to react against this situation through delinquent behavior. Johnson and Silverman (1975: 9-10) suggest that middle-class youth who are achieving poorly in school may experience extreme frustration. This frustration may also be agitated by the youth's inability to prepare for prestigious white collar employment. From their study of a white collar school, Rhodes and Reiss (1969: 21) state"

. . . the receipt of low marks produces anxiety, shame, or frustration which leads to a variety of adaptations, some of which violate norms of the school or the larger community.

Braithwaite (1981: 50) makes a similar observation:

Since middle-class children have higher aspirations for success, it may be that middle-class school failures suffer from a greater discrepancy between aspirations and expectations of occupational success.

Status among the student population is another issue related to delinquency proneness. A major concern in this area is the school policy of classifying (tracking) youth into college bound and non-college bound programs (Frease, 1973). According to Kerckhoff (1972: 85), youth are classified as college or non-college bound by the time they enter high school. In general, higher status within the school is

awarded to those with higher academic achievement. Kelly and Pink (1973: 481-82) state their concern on the issue:

We suggest that negative labels (e.g., 'poor worker', 'unmotivated', 'behavior problem'), once applied and recognized, can lead not only to differential treatment by teachers and peers, but also to progressively declining levels of school commitment.

A longitudinal study of social and academic dispositions of delinquents and non-delinquents from kindergarten through the ninth grade was conducted by Conger and Miller (1966). Their data reveals that differences between delinquents and non-delinquents begin to appear within the period which includes kindergarten through the third grades. Future delinquent boys made a poor adaptation to school in general. They had difficulty adjusting to peers, were more likely to disregard the right of others and have disrespect for authority. Future delinquents also had more academic problems. From the fourth through sixth grades future delinquents and non-delinquents continued to display differences according to a "content analysis of teachers spontaneous, informal, comments" (p. 89). However, rejection of authority became more common for all youth. Future delinquents were more likely to be immature (but not significantly) which may be the result of over protection by the parents or less exposure to new experiences. During the period of early adolescence, seventh through ninth grades, the youth were rated by teachers' reports and self-reports (psychological tests). During this period (similar to the fourth through sixth grades) the social, emotional and academic performances were poorer for future delinquents than non-delinquents. Delinquents were less likely to obey the rules, and to respect authority; and were likely to reject authority. Non-delinquents,

on the other hand, displayed an increase in respect for authority. Delinquents continued to gain less acceptance by peers, were more likely to be underachievers, were less apt to concentrate and academically they gave up easily. Finally, Conger and Miller (1966: 127) state:

. . . delinquents were rated as more lacking in self-confidence and self-respect, less cheerful and happy, less well adjusted to their and the opposite sex, and more attention seeking. These data thus suggest that extreme parental indifference is associated with lower self-esteem in the child and, in fact, seems to be even more deleterious than punitive parental reactions. It may be that even if the mother is only sufficiently interested in the child to chastise or berate him, even if she is discourteous enough to be unpleasant to his friends, this level of interest is associated with higher self-esteem than is maternal indifference (Rosenberg, 1956; 146).

A study on high school dropouts and delinquency by Elliott and Voss (1974) resulted in a number of findings. First, social class does not make a difference in delinquency rates, but it does make a difference in the rate of dropouts. Lower-class situations are more conducive to dropouts and this class has a higher rate of dropouts. Second, there is no difference in delinquency rates between students in school or out of school; a study by Elliott (1966) has similar conclusions. However, graduates had lower rates. Also dropouts are more likely to be adjudicated delinquents than graduates. Third, in somewhat of a contradiction to Stinchcombe (1964), failure to achieve long range goals does not seem to be an important factor in delinquency. Fourth, at the time of dropout, family problems did not seem to be an important factor, rather a crisis situation affecting the student in the school was most important. Elliott and Voss suggest that many dropouts may actually be pushouts. Fifth, dropouts had a higher rate of delinquency while in school than when out of school, similar to a conclusion reached by Elliott (1966).

The pressures, frustrations and stigma of failure in school may account for this association. Finally, Elliott and Voss (p. 205-207) state:

Failure, normlessness, and association with delinquent friends are both causes and consequences of involvement in delinquent behavior. Delinquency increases the likelihood that youth will do poorly in school and perceive themselves as rejected by their parents. Involvement in delinquent behavior has a particularly strong influence on feelings of normlessness in school as well as friendship choices.

A study by Lichter, Rapien, Seibert and Sklansky (1962) reveals that most male delinquents had difficulties with academic work and/or misbehavior in the class room during elementary school. About one-half of the dropouts had these difficulties by the fourth grade. Almost all (about 90 percent) of the dropouts had difficulties in high school. Few of the dropouts came to the high school academically prepared.

Hypothesis III: There is no difference in academic performance between delinquent boys and controls.

It also appears that middle-class youth who are dissatisfied with family life may use their poor school disposition to strike back against their parents. Since middle-class families place education very high on their childrens' priorities, what better weapon does the child have than to violate educational norms? These children also seem to have lost interest in school at an early age and begin to fall behind the other students. The pressures at home may be an important factor in their poor school disposition.

Family and school situations may be linked to the cause of delinquent behavior under certain circumstances. For example, some youth may arrive at school under the stress of serious family problems and bring an exceptional need for personal attention from school staff. However,

school personnel seldom have time to meet the extra needs of these youth. Thus, these youth often refer to the attention gaining mechanism used at home, i.e., acting out. Again the youth gains attention, but as before it is in the form of discipline. Their negative experience with adults and authority figures is reinforced and may result in rebellion against the school. To cite a few examples, Hirschi (1969: 131) concluded from his research that youth who have weak attachments to their parents also tend to disregard their teachers and have a negative attitude toward school in general. Waitrowski, Griswold and Roberts (1981) also found that high parental attachment is positively related to school attachment.

We may conclude from the above research studies that delinquent youth are more likely to encounter problematic situations within the school setting. A greater degree of disciplinary problems, disrespect for authority, poor academic performance in relationship to ability, truancy and dropping out of school is experienced by delinquent youth, and consequently they are more likely to become alienated from the school. We have also seen that poor school disposition is likely to be related to problematic family situations. Thus, a possibility remains that a link exists between attachments to the family and the school, i.e., the degree of attachment to the family is directly related to the degree of the attachment to the school situation. This possible link and tie between attachments to the family and the school may also be extended to a third significant social entity encountered by youth, the adolescent peer group. During adolescence, the peer group serves as an important function in the socialization process leading to adulthood and has a great influence over its members. The effectiveness of the peer

group may be highly influenced by the relative strength of the bonds brought in by its members. If control theory is valid, delinquents would have weaker attachments to the family, school and peer group than non-delinquents.

The Peer Group

Studies of delinquent peer groups are most likely to concentrate on inner-city gangs (Thrasher, 1927; Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Yablonsky, 1963; Short and Strodtbeck, 1965). There are a few studies of delinquent peer groups comprised of middle-class suburban youth, however, the empirical research on this phenomenon is limited. For example, research by Greeley and Casey (1963) is based on a single group, and the Meyerhoffs (1964) study examines only a few groups. A limited number of studies will be reviewed which provide possible insights concerning middle-class, delinquent, peer groups.

According to control theory, delinquent youth are more likely than non-delinquents to have weak or broken ties to conventional society (Hirschi, 1969). During the period of adolescent peer group formation, individuals seek associations with others who have similar "stakes" in conventional society. Delinquent youth are, thus, more likely to gravitate toward delinquent peers and non-delinquents will gravitate toward youth with conventional attitudes. Hirschi states that delinquent peer groups are not likely to recruit new members or influence the behavior patterns of members, since delinquent youth have engaged in delinquent activities previous to peer group membership. He also emphasizes that delinquents are, also more likely to have weak affective ties to their peers than are non-delinquents.

Hypothesis IV: Delinquents are not more likely to associate with delinquent peers than are controls.

Hypothesis V: There are no differences in attachments to peers between delinquents and controls.

Before proceeding, a brief notation regarding the function of the adolescent peer group is addressed. This is an important function in the understanding of behavior since the evolution of the adolescent peer group is closely linked to the family and the wider society. Similar to the family, the peer group performs a crucial role in a youth's socialization process. The concept of control theory is enhanced through an understanding of the composite network of associations, experiences and social bonds between the family and society, and the adolescent peer group. The peer group tends to select from and apply some of the experiences gained from the family and the society, and develop its own set of norms which have a great influence over its members.

The adolescent peer group functions as part of the transitional process from childhood within the family unit to adulthood within the larger society (Kerckhoff, 1972: 87-89). In effect, the adolescent peer group acts as a springboard from the small intimate family setting where mutual commitments and obligations exist among the members to a complex impersonal social structure where relationships are based on achievement. In our technological society, the family is unable to prepare the child with all of the instructions necessary for adult life; nor is the family able to supply all of the emotional support necessary for this transition.

The adolescent peer group also acts as an agent of socialization. Within this group the members are aware of the fact that they must do

the right thing "in the eyes of their peers." For example, the peer group also serves in the function of sex role identification. Adolescent peer groups set standards for sex roles among its members and ridicule those who violate the rules. Sex role norms which evolve within the peer group are most often brought into the group from the members' family experiences (Kerckhoff, 1972: 87-89). In the same respect the peer group may set definitions favorable or unfavorable to the violation of the law as expressed in the theory of differential association (next section).

Shanley (1967) suggests in his review of the literature on middle-class delinquency that further research include investigation into causal factors related to the peer group and the family. For example, Hirschi (1969: 143) found that a high degree of attachment to one's parents is directly related to the degree of attachment to one's peers. In other words, the delinquent youth who is weakly attached to his parents is not likely to compensate his need for attachment through his peer group. Delinquent youth may seek additional emotional support and recognition from their adolescent peer group in order to compensate for the lack of strong ties to their families. Unfortunately, the peer groups of delinquents often fail as surrogate families and as tightly knit peer groups. The inadequate socialization and emotional support they receive from their families is a limiting factor on the amount of social skills they are able to bring into the adolescent peer group. Thus, youth with weak bonds to their families are more likely to have weak bonds to the school and their peers.

Empey and Lubeck (1971: 115) found that delinquent youth in Los

Angeles, California who maintain weak attachments to their families tended to identify more with their peer group and delinquent activities. Empey and Lubeck suggest that when the family fails, other social units are seldom available to intercede. McCord, McCord and Thurber (1962) in a study of predominately lower-class youth found that youth from two parent conflict homes were about twice as likely to have a delinquent reference group than were youth from two parent tranquil homes or broken homes. We are interested in investigating whether or not a relationship exists between the strength of attachment to parents and membership in delinquent or non-delinquent peer groups among middle-class youth. We are also interested in the differences, if any, in the strength of attachments between members of both delinquent and non-delinquent peer groups.

Greeley and Casey (1964: 40) state that the following conditions are likely to contribute to the emergence of middle-class delinquent gangs:

Middle-class youth groups, we would predict, will tend toward delinquency when it has: (a) a large number of 'nouveau bourgeois' members; (b) a large number of notable 'father absent' members; (c) a large number of poor academic performers; and (d) an insufficient number of 'countervailing personalities' to control deviant tendencies.

White suburban delinquency, according to Eisner (1969: 96-107), results from the parental belief that they know what is best for adolescents and mold the youth's environment in three major directions. First, school children are segregated by chronological age which limits the child's contacts with role models of different ages. Second, the social life of youth is institutionalized. Their life is scheduled and super-

vised by adults within homogeneous age groups. A youth's contact with adults is limited to parents and teachers. Third, suburban youth attend schools comprised almost entirely of middle-class student bodies and the parents ensure that their children are socialized properly for entry into the middle-class. However, at the same time adults have excluded youth from adult life which has resulted in the formation of the youth culture. The youth culture in turn sometimes engage in activities which are not condoned by adults.

Another dimension of group delinquency and societal values may be viewed in relation to drift (Matza, 1964), and techniques of neutralization (Sykes and Matza, 1957). According to Matza delinquents hold a delicate balance between convention and crime. In general they uphold the societal values, however, there are some values with which they do not hold consensus. This leads to conflict and possible delinquent conduct. Thus, they may drift into delinquency when they are in conflict with societal values and drift back to conformity when they are in consent. However, even when they are in violation with the law, they try to neutralize their behavior through rationalizations which the delinquent may view in his mind, and through the context of his subculture, as excuses for his behavior. In this respect they may at the same time maintain an attachment to the societal values system. Sykes and Matza list five techniques of neutralization: (1) denial of responsibility, (2) denial of injury, (3) denial of victim, (4) condemnation of the condemners, and (5) appeal to higher loyalties, i.e., societal values may be sacrificed for the values of a primary group.

Control theory according to Hirschi makes three assumptions regard-

ing the relationship between delinquency and the peer group. First, delinquents associate with delinquents, and non-delinquents associate with other non-delinquents. Second, delinquent youth have weak ties to conventional society before gaining membership into delinquent peer groups. Third, delinquent youth are more likely to have weak attachments to their peers than non-delinquents. In the next section we will discuss the theory of differential association (Sutherland, 1947) and compare it to control theory.

Differential Association

One of the most prominent theories of the relationship between delinquent behavior and the peer group is that of differential association (Sutherland, 1947). This theory, which is not limited by social class boundaries, may aid our understanding of delinquent behavior in conjunction with both control and containment (see next section) theories. Criminal behavior is a learning process, according to the theory of differential association. A youth within the context of his social environment may have exposure to a diverse range of delinquent and non-delinquent associations. The "frequency, deviation, priority and intensity" of his differential associations with delinquents or non-delinquent will have a definite effect on his behavioral outcomes. For example, if he closely associates with those whose definitions are more favorable to the violation of the law, he will tend toward delinquent behavior. On the other hand, if associations are primarily with those who do not hold favorable definitions to the violation of the law, he will be less likely to adopt delinquent behavior patterns.

A study of middle-class delinquency by Richards, Berk and Forster

(1979) reveals some results which are supportive of differential association theory. They found that the strongest correlation to vandalism is peer relationships. Respondents to their study who participate in acts of vandalism are more likely to associate with peers who engage in acts of vandalism than respondents who do not commit such acts.

Richards, Berk and Forster also state that shop-lifting and minor theft are techniques which are learned within the peer group and are carried out with peers. They found that the best measure of peer related delinquency is whether or not the respondent commits the same type of offense(s) as his/her peers.

Scott and Vaz (1963) emphasize the importance of the youth subculture. They contend that the middle-class family in our society has transformed from a patriarchal controlled unit to a more democratic one. Within the democratic family the parents also involve the children in the decision-making process. A more permissive atmosphere occurs as rules become relaxed and intra-familial relationships become vague. Permissiveness has also become characteristics of the school and the society, itself. Middle-class youth are thus likely to experience role confusion. Due to these circumstances, the adolescent peer group assumes a major responsibility and influence in defining moral boundaries, acceptable types of deviance, and the role of youth in society. Since there is no common consensus among all peer groups as to what is right and wrong, youth are highly dependent and pressured to conform to the norms established by the particular group they join. This is highly suggestive of Sutherland's differential association theory.

The theories of differential association and control are in agree-

ment that delinquents are more likely to associate with delinquents, and non-delinquents are more likely to associate with non-delinquents. However, these two theories do not agree upon the origins of delinquent behavior. Differential association views delinquency as a learning process gained through association with other delinquents. Control theory, on the other hand, claims that delinquents have weak or broken ties with conventional society and have engaged in delinquent acts before membership in a delinquent peer group. Hirschi (1969: 230) reflects on his version of control theory and states, "The theory underestimated the importance of delinquent friends; it overestimated the significance of involvement in conventional activities." Linden and Hackler (1973) suggest that control theory should be linked with differential association. The delinquent may agree with the values of society, but association with other delinquents may "make delinquency involvement more likely."

Containment Theory

Containment theory, which probes into the self-concept, may also provide productive insights on the etiology of middle-class delinquency, since it cuts across boundaries of socioeconomic status. The theoretical framework, largely developed by Walter C. Reckless (1961, 1967, 1970) incorporates both internal and external factors. Outer (external) containment is represented by the primary groups, the family being the most important, within a society which maintain norms and constrain members to conform. Inner containment is the strength or weakness of the inner self to comply with the constraints imposed by outer containment. These two forms of containment guard against the various pres-

asures and pulls which may cause an individual to stray from societal norms.

There are some limitations to the scope of containment theory. It excludes extremes of behavior and personality adaptations. According to Reckless (1967: 477):

The containment paradigm applies only to the non-psychotic non-symptomatic, non-faculty-character-structure forms of behavior, which represent a normal range of interaction between the person and his situation and a normal transgression of the dominant prevailing norms and law.

A series of articles by Reckless, Dinitz and Murray (1956), Reckless, Dinitz and Kay (1957), and Dinitz, Scarpitti and Reckless (1962) to cite a few, resulted from a research project conducted in Columbus, Ohio. Two groups of twelve year old white boys were selected by sixth grade teachers from schools located in high delinquency areas. The first group consisted of boys judged by their teachers as not likely to be involved in the juvenile justice system. The second group consisted of youth judged as likely to be involved within the juvenile justice system.

One study by Reckless, Dinitz and Murray (1956) concentrated on the non-delinquency prone group of boys. The results revealed: first, these youth had few if any friends who were in trouble with the law. Second, their parents held close supervision over them and emphasized non-deviant activities. In general, the parents seemed interested in their children. Third, the boys believed that both parents provided an equal amount of affection towards them. Fourth, the parents economic and marital situations were stable. Finally, these youth expressed good self-concepts and internalized conforming values held by persons close to them; thus, they were insulated from delinquency. Reckless and Dinitz

(1967) in another article also stress the importance of a positive self-image as a guard against deviance.

Dinitz, Scarpitti and Reckless (1962) added a longitudinal dimension to the Columbus, Ohio study. They conducted a second test on the youth when they were sixteen years of age. These tests revealed that the boys who were more delinquency prone at twelve years of age were more often involved in the juvenile justice system by the time they were sixteen. The delinquency prone group also held lower self-images at both ages than the non-delinquency prone boys.

One example which indicates that self-concept may cross social class boundaries is provided by Fannin and Clinard (1965). Their investigation consisted of a comparative study of lower-class and lower-middle-class youth from urban areas committed to a midwestern correctional institution. There were many similarities from both groups in self-concept as males. However, differences were reported between the two social classes in relationship to behavioral orientations. Fannin and Clinard observed that the lower-class youth were more likely to hold a more powerful, fierce, tougher, fearless and dangerous self-concept. Whereas the lower-middle-class youth had a greater tendency to conceive of themselves as "more clever, smart, smooth, bad and loyal." These findings also relate to the implication earlier in this paper that the forms of deviance may vary according to social class.

There are also a few studies which infer that a close relationship may exist between self-concept and control theories. The first example is provided by Hall and Waldo (1967). They suggest that academic achievement may be linked to self-concept. They conclude that an indi-

vidual's attitude toward his academic capacity is related to actual academic achievement. Their findings also indicate that delinquents are more likely to have low academic capacity than non-delinquents.

Frease (1972) states that non-college bound students suffer from status deprivation and that a positive relationship exists between high grades and self-concept. Frease also maintains that youth with low self-identities are more likely to associate with youth who are involved in delinquent activities.

A relationship between self-concept and attachment is also exemplified by Rosenberg's (1965) research. Rosenberg observed a difference in the degree of sons' attachment to their fathers according to their socioeconomic status. Middle-class boys were closer to their fathers than lower-class boys and upper-class boys were the closest attached of all. The research also indicates that a relationship exists between the closeness of the father and son, and the son's self-esteem. The closer the father is to the son, the greater is the son's self-esteem. Rosenberg also noticed that a relationship existed between parental indifference and low self-esteem. This relationship held when tested against differences in socioeconomic status, religion, gender and size of community.

Hypothesis VI. There is no difference in self-concepts between delinquents and controls.

Finally, Jensen (1973) reveals a relationship between a youth's degree of self-esteem and the strength of his attachment to his parents. A strong parental bond is directly related to a youth's high self-esteem. Jensen's findings in this matter are in agreement with the concept of inner containment evolved by Reckless, i.e., strong bonds to significant

others (parents) form a high degree of inner containment in the form of self-esteem and thus insulate the youth from delinquency. However, Jensen differs from Reckless in that he found that other significant persons, peers, may also contribute to a youth's degree of inner containment. For example, a youth may have close attachments to his parents, but have his degree of inner containment weakened if the situation within his peer group is favorable to the violation of the law. In effect, Jensen finds importance in Sutherland's theory of differential association where Reckless would not find it as important. Research findings of Voss (1969) compliment those of Jensen. Voss found that a combination of the effects of containment and differential association theories provides a better explanation of delinquency than either theory by itself.

Conclusion

Three theories; control (Hirschi, 1969), differential association (Sutherland, 1947) and containment (Reckless, 1961, 1967, 1970) have been selected as plausible explanations of serious delinquent behavior among white middle-class males residing in suburbia. The reasons for their selection follows: (1) they are amenable to the empirical test of our available data. (2) The theoretical framework of each includes a relationship to one or more of the most important groups which comprise the adolescent world, i.e., the family, school and peers. (3) They are not class based.

Each of the three theories may be supported by data as a valid explanation of middle-class delinquency. However, it is also likely that the combined effects of two or all three theories may provide a

greater explanation than a single theory. For example, Linden and Hackler (1973) recommend the linkage of control theory with the theory of differential association. Voss (1969) and Jensen (1973) conclude from their research findings that differential association and containment theories explain delinquent behavior best when factors of both are combined. The advantage of the combined effects of two or all three theories is that the strength of one may resolve the weakness of another.

Having reviewed the theoretical framework of this study, a detailed explanation of our sample selection and methodological procedures follows in Chapter II. Our experimental (delinquent) and control groups are selected from two different sources. The data on the delinquent group is from qualitative archival records. Information on the control group is quantitative. Details are provided regarding the method of coding the qualitative information onto a quantitative instrument identical to the one used for the control group.

An analysis of hedonistic and non-hedonistic offenses is presented in Chapter III. Self-reported delinquent behavior of boys in the control group is compared to self-reports of boys from lower socioeconomic backgrounds who reside in the suburbs and the central city. There is also a detailed account of the official offenses attributed to boys in the delinquent group.

Chapters IV, V and VI provide an analysis of data for the test of control theory. Comparisons are made between the delinquents and the boys in the control group. More specifically, Chapter IV covers the quality of the social bond between boys and their parents. The relation-

ship between the boys, and their fathers and mothers are treated separately. Attachments of the boys to the school are discussed in Chapter V. In Chapter VI peer relationships of the boys are examined.

Chapter VI also serves to test the theory of differential association. Boys from both groups are compared according to their association with delinquent or non-delinquent peers, and with drug abusing and non-drug abusing peers. A test of containment theory is found in Chapter VII. The self-concepts (inner-containment) of the boys from the delinquent and control groups are compared.

Important variables related to the family, school, peer group and self-concept (and similarly related to the theories of control differential association and containment) are further analyzed in the multivariate technique of discriminant analysis in Chapter VIII. The four variables, i.e., father-son relationship, academic achievement, association with delinquent or non-delinquent peers and self-concept, which are entered into the final equation result in excellent predictors of delinquency.

Conclusions are presented in Chapter IX. First, is a review of the important research findings and methodological difficulties. Second, are recommendations for future research studies regarding delinquency. Finally, policy implications are suggested based upon the findings of this study.

CHAPTER II

THE SAMPLE AND METHODOLOGY

Only a small quantity of empirical studies exist on white middle-class delinquency in suburbia. This sparse quantity of data apparently reflects the relatively low official rates of delinquency among middle-class youth and difficulties in gaining access to information on this population. Even a number of our own efforts to gain access to such information met with failure. Fortunately, the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Illinois, and the Institute for Juvenile Research, a division of the Illinois Department of Mental Health, have consented to make available a substantial amount of data pertinent to our project. These two sources offer a rare opportunity to gain access to empirical data on delinquents and controls (randomly selected from the suburban area of metropolitan Chicago) and provide a basis for the test of our hypotheses.

This chapter presents the methodological approach used to examine the validity of our theoretical framework through the analysis of empirical data. Our empirical data is not only obtained from two different sources, it is also presented in two different formats (one quantitative, the other qualitative). Thus, the methodological procedure is also designed to make the best use of both data sources for comparative purposes. First, there is a review of each data source. Second, the groups are closely matched to control against some factors which may cause extraneous differences. Third, a technique is utilized which combines data from both sources within a single instrument.

This includes a process of converting qualitative data onto a quantitative instrument. Fourth, the data will be analyzed through the statistical technique of discriminant analysis.

In 1972, the Institute for Juvenile Research gathered quantitative data for their "Youth and Society in Illinois" (1975) study. A stratified household probability sample was selected from the total Illinois population of 14-18 year olds residing in households. Households were selected rather than school populations in order not to eliminate school dropouts. Eventually over 3,100 youths completed a self-administered questionnaire (Appendix A). Many of the questionnaire items served as excellent indices for the empirical test of our hypotheses. Although a number of monographics have been written from the data by the Institute for Juvenile Research staff (1975, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1975d, 1975e, and 1975f), no other studies of middle-class delinquency have been completed nor is one in progress using this data. Those cases selected from the Institute for Juvenile Research study will constitute the control group.

Data from our second source of information, the Juvenile Court, is contained within the individual case record files. These files contain a face sheet (names, ages, places of birth, school or occupation of all family members and other similar information), records of court appearances and dispositions, a somewhat comprehensive social investigation, school reports, police contacts, and possibly one or more psychological, psychiatric, or social work reports provided by the Court and/or outside social welfare organizations. Due to the confidentiality of these records we have agreed not to identify any of

the subjects or breach their rights of privacy.

Although the Court data is in narrative form, as compared to the structural closed-ended questionnaire used in the Institute for Juvenile Research study, the types of information found in both data sources are very similar. For example, the case records reveal information concerning the family, peer group, school and contact with agencies of social control, i.e., police, courts and detention centers. The case records used in this study are from youth who are or have been under the supervision of the Probation Department and not those diverted at the point of Court Intake. The court youth considered for this study are wards of an agency of social control, and are designated as the delinquent group. These cases were selected from four townships, i.e., Evanston, New Trier, Niles, and Northfield which lie north of the City of Chicago. This geographic area receives coverage from a single court probation unit.

In order to eliminate as many outside factors which may be capable of inducing spurious conclusions, controls will be placed on the cases selected for this study. For example, Bandurria and Walters (1959: 9), Gold (1963: 45-59), Robins (1966: 17) and Allen and Sandhu (1967: 263) recommend that data be controlled by age, sex, race and socioeconomic status. We will follow these recommendations and control the data by defining the group members as follows:

Sex Male
 Age 14-16 Year Old
 Race White
 School Status In School
 Geographic LocationChicago Standard Metropolitan
 Area, outside central city
 Father's EducationAt Least Some College
 Father's OccupationProfessional or Managerial
 Father's Employment
 StatusEmployed

These tight controls clearly delineate our two groups of boys as white, middle-class suburbanites. Exclusion of dropouts and unemployed fathers also eliminated outside influences which could possibly alter our findings. Also an additional qualification is imposed upon the delinquent group. All court cases must have a minimum of two recorded contacts with the juvenile justice system. This turned out to be a wise decision since the few boys with only one official contact were generally passively involved in the commission of the offense and were victims of circumstance resulting from peer pressure.

Although the use of many controlling variables reduces the possibility of extraneous differences, it also places limitations on the size of both research groups. Twenty-seven boys from the Juvenile Court met our criteria for selection in this study. Most of these boys have extensive contacts with the juvenile justice system (see Chapter III for details).

Fifty boys were selected as controls from the Institute for Juvenile Research study. These boys represented the total number of

respondents who met our definitions of age, race, school status, geographic location and socioeconomic status. The controls reported minimal contact with the juvenile justice system. For example, only four of them reported police apprehensions resulting in community adjustments; and only one reported appearing at a juvenile court hearing, but a disposition regarding the hearing is not provided.

One very important limitation of the Institute for Juvenile Research study, which should be noted, is an absence of information concerning the mother's occupation. In one-parent families headed by the mother, which lacked information regarding the father, it is not possible to assess the mother's socioeconomic status using the indices of education and occupation. This results in no representation from one-parent families in the control group, whereas seven boys from the delinquent group are from one-parent families. A few recent studies by Hennessey, Richards and Berk (1978), Richards, Berk and Foster (1979) and Grinnell and Chambers (1979) did not find an important relationship between delinquency and broken homes. Hennessey, Richards and Berk (p. 523) state:

. . . our data indicate that there is no effect of broken homes on self-reported delinquency among these middle-class juveniles. This is not to say that middle class family interaction patterns (fighting, disobedience, and the nature of affective ties among family members) exert no influence on delinquency, but that broken homes have no independent effects.

Our interest in the family for this study is the quality of the parent-child bond and not the number of parents living in the home. An addition of one-parent families to the control group might cause a change in our results. It could be that middle-class white boys from one-parent families experience more difficulties with family, school and

peer relationships. We will never know, of course, due to the flaw in the questionnaire design. However, it is a matter which must be taken into account while analyzing the data.

As stated previously, each of our two data sources differ in their type of format, i.e., data from the Institute For Juvenile Research is quantitative and the Juvenile Court data is qualitative. The best method to utilize both data sources for the test of our hypotheses is through a uniform instrument. This is possible, since both sources contain similar types of information. A modified version of the Institute's questionnaire was selected as the uniform instrument (Appendix B). The modified version contains items relevant to the test of the hypotheses. With the use of a quantitative technique it becomes possible to perform a statistical analysis to test the validity of our hypotheses. A pre-test was used on six court cases. The transformation of archival information from the court cases to the questionnaire proved to be successful and was applied to the remainder of the court cases. Also, to demonstrate the versatility of transforming quantitative data to qualitative form, a monograph on a boy from the control group was constructed from questionnaire responses (Appendix C). This monograph is similar to the probation officer's social investigation.

Juvenile Court documents also have their limitations which must be addressed. One source of possible difficulty may be attributed to the labeling perspective of deviant behavior. Some proponents of this theory (Becker, 1964; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; and Cicourel, 1968) suggest that the processing of individuals by the legal system reinforces their deviant identities. In essence the legal process may

promote secondary deviance as formulated by Lemert (1951). Thus, increased contact with the juvenile justice system may result in an increased deviant orientation. Lemert (1967) states that stigma of being a deviant and a failure, which a youth obtains through juvenile court processing, may also extend to the school and community environments. Relevant to this study, Ageton and Elliott (1974) found that white males are more prone to the effects of labeling than minorities or females.

Cicourel (1968) states the relationship between a probation officer and a youth may have an effect on the disposition of a case. However, he also found that many of the probation officers' impressions of their clients are not recorded. Lemert (1967: 94) also comments on the limitations of juvenile court records:

A major difficulty in the large bureaucratic urban juvenile court is that the functional context of child problems directed to it easily gets lost; it has to be reconstructed by bits and pieces of information obtained through investigations and inquiries conducted under highly artificial circumstances, and communicated in written reports which easily become stereotyped as they pass from person to person.

Finally, Needleman (1981) found inconsistencies in the juvenile court screening process, including the documentation of information. This is an important matter since the screening unit plays a major role in determining whether youth are diverted from the court or sent before a judge. Needleman states that, in some cases, the probation officers (in the screening department) placed subjective interpretations in the court records, rather than the facts. She also discovered that fragments of information may have been pieced together in order to influence a judge's decision. Although the probation officer may manipulate

information at times in their interest for the child, this may result in misleading information.

Coding the information from the Juvenile Court case records onto the modified questionnaire became a complex and time-consuming process. Many steps were involved to maximize accuracy and reliability. The selection of the delinquent group was made from boys active with the north suburban probation unit sometime during the period of late 1975 to late 1976. Some of the boys were also active before and/or after this time period. The 27 boys who were eventually selected represent a universe of all boys meeting our standard of data controls within the time frame specified above. By the time the coding of the data began, all of the cases had been terminated from court supervision for a variety of reasons, i.e., successful completion of supervision or probation, commitment to a correctional institution, etc. Thus, we were able to work from a complete set of documents.

At this time another limitation of our study needs to be addressed. Empirical data for the I.J.R. study was collected in 1972. The cases of the delinquent boys under study were processed by the court from late 1975 to late 1976, resulting in a three to four-year gap. Thus, the possibility must be taken into account that some form of social change or social climate may have occurred and, consequently, may be responsible for alterations in our findings. There is no practical method available to account for a possible social change during this time period.

The transfer of information from the court documents onto structured questionnaires is subjective and prone to intentional and

non-intentional bias on the part of the coder. In order to reduce this possibility of bias, a decision was made to have each case coded by two coders working independently and without collaboration. This process was used for 26 of the cases. There was an exception of one case which was recalled by the Juvenile Court and sealed before it could be transferred onto the questionnaire by the second coder. This case was sealed by the legal department since the individual was alleged to have committed a series of crimes as a young adult.

The actual process of transferring the court information onto the questionnaire required a careful reading of the entire case record. Many of the case records contained many pages with new information added during the entire supervision/probation period. Where a piece of information from the case record applied to a questionnaire item, the coder denoted the most accurate score according to his/her best judgment. As an additional measure of reliability the coders wrote short comments (usually paraphrases to prevent the identity of an individual) next to many of the questionnaire items as a justification of the selected score. This was of great value as we will see later.

An inventory sheet was prepared for individual cases which itemized the scores of both coders for each questionnaire item (an example is illustrated in Table 2-1). This provides an excellent tool for denoting agreements and disagreements between the two coders. It also indicates where compromises are made and where items scored by only one coder are accepted.

At this time we should note that the court information does not relate well to the I.J.R. questionnaire items on self-concept. How-

TABLE 2-1

INVENTORY OF THE SCORING OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS OF
A SINGLE CASE BY TWO CODERS

<u>Questionnaire No. 20</u>	Scores Recorded by Coder I						Scores Recorded By Coder II						Coders Agree	Coders Disagree	Score for One Coder Justified Equals X	Compromise
Questionnaire Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6				
14									X							
15									X							
16			X							X			X			
18							X									
20							X									
21																
22																
24							X								X	
26																
27																
30																
32	X						X						X			
53		X						X					X			
54		X						X					X			
55				X						X			X			
56			X						X				X			
65		X						X					X			
66		X						X					X			

TABLE 2-1 (cont.)

Questionnaire No. 20 Questionnaire Item	Scores Recorded by Coder I						Scores Recorded by Coder II						Coders Agree	Coders Disagree	Score for One Coder Justified Equals X	Compromise
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6				
	68	X						X								
69	X						X						X			
71		X						X					X			
72		X						X					X			
74		X						X					X			
75		X						X					X			
88	X						X						X			
89																
90																
91																
92		X						X						0		
95																
96		X														
110					X					X			X			
112		X						X						0		
114		X						X						0		
116		X						X					X			
120		X						X					X			
123		X						X					X			
125		X						X					X			
132		X														
Self-Image Score		LOW						LOW					X			
Total													21	3	1	0

ever, the case records generally contain overall test results and/or observations but do not include individual items of the test. Where possible, self-concept of the delinquents are rated: "high," "medium," or "low." The self-concept scores for delinquent youth will be compared to score averages of the nine self-concept items reported by the controls in Chapter 7.

Table 2-2 displays the number of questionnaire items scored by both coders for each court case. It also denotes the number of items agreed and disagreed upon for every case. For those items scored by both coders, they agreed 84.3 percent (445 items) of the time and disagreed 15.7 percent (83 items). The percentage of agreement is reasonably high and attests to the feasibility of transferring archival information onto the quantitative instrument. This is particularly encouraging since each case record is comprised of numerous sources of information. For example, there are varying combinations of reports from police officers, court personnel, psychologists, psychiatrists, school personnel, social workers, etc. This information also reflected changes which occurred over the period of court supervision or probation. These obstacles were confronted during the coding process and were overcome for the most part. Appendix D contains reliability scores on the coding of individual questionnaire items used to test our hypotheses.

Table 2-3 illustrates a cross reference of accepted and rejected responses for each case and questionnaire item. In addition to the 445 scores agreed upon by both coders another 67 scores have been accepted for use in our data analysis. First, there were 12 compro-

TABLE 2-2

AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT IN SCORING BY TWO CODERS

Questionnaire Number Questionnaire Item	Number of Items Coded		Total
	Two Coders Agree	Two Coders Disagree	
1	18	0	18
2	17	1	18
3	8	0	8
4	12	1	13
5	8	2	10
6	18	1	19
7	21	1	22
8	12	5	17
9	9	6	15
10	14	3	17
11	12	5	17
12	22	5	27
13	23	2	25
14	19	2	21
15	14	6	20
16	24	2	26
17	19	7	26
18	21	7	28
19	21	2	23
20	21	3	24
21	20	1	21
22	18	4	22
23	23	1	24
24	12	7	19
25	21	8	29
26	18	1	19
Total	445 (84.4%)	83 (15.7%)	528 (100.1%)

mises made on items not agreed upon by both coders. Although the coders did not have exact agreement, the scores were not very different. For example, 10 of the compromises are for questionnaire items 55 and 56 which relate to the relationship between the boys and their fathers or mothers. These relationships are coded according to the following choices: (1) "very well," (2) "fairly well," (3) "not too well," and (4) "not well at all." In those instances where the difference in scoring is between "very well" and "fairly well," or "not too well" and "not well at all" a compromise was made. Each compromise is made in the direction toward acceptance of the null hypothesis. In other words the compromises for this example is either "very well" or "not too well." The same logic applies to compromises on questionnaire items 30 and 32. Thus, compromises provide additional information but are not biased toward our theoretical orientation.

Second, 37 scores have been accepted which were recorded by only one coder. Each of these scores is supported by sufficient documentation to justify its acceptance. As careful as the coders were in performing their task, some items happened to elude them. This may have been partially the result of the numerous reports contained in most of the case record folders. For example, some very brief comments were overlooked and in some cases one or more siblings were active with the court at one time or another. The case record files are kept on families, not on individuals, thus sometimes it became difficult to decipher information from one brother to another.

Finally, as stated earlier, one case (individual questionnaire number 27, see Table 2-3) was only scored by one coder. Information from

this case was included after imposing a methodological adjustment. It was decided to exclude a percentage of scores equal to the percentage of scores disagreed upon by the two coders (15.7 percent). Thus three scores were randomly excluded from the total of the 21 scored items.

Table 2-3 also permits us to review the amount of acceptable scores for each questionnaire item. Very few, if any, acceptable scores are reported for questionnaire items 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30, 89, 90, 91, 95, 96, 112 and 116. These items are excluded from our data analysis. Originally, a decision was made to reject any item which has less than a 40 percent rate of acceptable responses. The remaining 24 questionnaire items have a range of 12 (44.4 percent) to 24 (88.8 percent) accepted responses. There is an average of 18.25 (67.6 percent) responses for items considered for inclusion in the data analysis.

The Juvenile Court records also contain valuable qualitative data. This qualitative data provides an additional tool in the analysis of delinquency. For example, there is an advantage in the use of interview data and documents, according to S. K. Weinberg (1960), since they may reveal a series of related events which describe social processes. Howard S. Becker in the "Introduction" to Shaw's The Jack-Roller, A Delinquent Boy's Own Story also advocates the use of the life history as an appropriate method for the analysis of social process. The use of the Court records should expand the scope of our study by possibly linking a number of variables and hypotheses which may reveal social process. For example, the Institute of Juvenile Research mainly accounts for present and more recent events in the respondent's life and provides

TABLE 2-3

AGREEMENTS, DISAGREEMENTS, AND COMPROMISES REACHED BY TWO CODERS ON QUESTIONNAIRE

ITEMS FOR 27 JUVENILE COURT CASES

Questionnaire Items	Individual Questionnaires																											Number of Accepted Scores
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2																											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
14						X		X											X								3	
15																											1	
16																											22	
18																											7	
20																											15	
21																											2	
22																											1	
24																											8	
26																											1	
27																											0	
30																											5	
32																											19	
53																											24	
54																											21	
55																											23	
56																											24	
65																											17	
66																											21	
68																											16	
69																											16	
71																											21	

TABLE 2-3 (cont.)

Questionnaire Items	Individual Questionnaires																												Number of Accepted Scores
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2																												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
72	X	X	⊙			X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	20
74	X	X				X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	20	
75	X	X	0			X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	21	
88	X	X	X	⊙	X	X	X								X	X	X	X	X				X	X				14	
89					X	X	X				0	X	X	X	X	X											X	9	
90					X	X	X				0	0	X	X	X	X	X										X	9	
91							0				0	X	X													X	3		
92	X	⊙	X	X	⊙	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	0	X	X		X	X			X	X	19
95									⊙				X					X							X			4	
96	X									X	X	X	X	X				0	X	X		X	X			X	X	9	
110	⊙	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0							0	16
112							X	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	X	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	9		
114						0	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	X	0	X	0	X	0	X	0	12		
116															X	X								0	X			3	
120	X	X	⊙	X	X	X	X	⊙	X	⊙	X	X	⊙	⊙	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X					X	22
123	X	X	⊙	X	X	X			X	⊙	X	X	X	⊙	X	X									X	X	X	16	
125	⊙			X			X	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	0	X	X				X	12
132	⊙	⊙	X		X	0	X	X		⊙	X	⊙	X	0	X	X											X	12	
Self-Image	X	X	X		X	X		0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	⊙				X	15		

X = Agreement by both coders.

C = Compromise.

⊙ = Item scored by one coder and accepted due to sufficient documentation.

0 = Item scored differently by two coders and where no compromise is made.

minimal information on events which occurred earlier in his life. The Court data, on the other hand, does account for events which occurred earlier in the lives of its wards. However, the Institute's data content will be more uniform than the Court's.

The analysis of qualitative data, such as that found in the Juvenile Court's case records, has a long history in the study of juvenile delinquency. Burt (1925) and Shaw (1930, 1931) helped popularize the life history document, which was a detailed autobiography. However, the volume of information necessary for the life history document, places a severe limit on the number of individual cases to be used for a study. More recently, Martin, Fitzpatrick and Gould (1970) have modified the case history approach to include the interaction of sociological and psychological variables. Robins (1966: 135), for example, researched the childhood behavioral history of adults through a review of records from child guidance clinics, the police and from the Juvenile Court.

Results of this study will thus be based on two types of information, one quantitative and the other qualitative. The multi-method approach is supported by some social researchers. For example, Sieber (1973) states that a methodology which utilizes both survey research and fieldwork techniques may be superior to reliance on only one method or the other. Sieber suggests that fieldwork aids survey research as follows: first, fieldwork offers an advantage for exploratory research. Second, it helps build a rapport with the respondent and pave the way for a more receptive atmosphere. Third, it is an aid in the formulation of hypotheses and theory. Fourth, it may be used to construct

indices. Fifth, it may serve to validate statistical indices. Finally, it may clear up ambiguous findings from survey research. Webb, et al. (1973: 174-75) suggest that the best tests of hypotheses are made from more than one source of data. They state that the researcher's problem is not to choose one method, but rather to choose which methods shall be used. Glasser and Strauss (1968) also recommend the use of both quantitative and qualitative data in the generation of their brand of "grounded theory."

Qualitative information from the Court case records is utilized in this study to support and supplement the statistical analysis. In the following chapters related to the analysis of the data, qualitative data is presented in narrative form to justify the selection of quantitative scores for Court cases. Qualitative data is also used to probe deeper into causal relationships. For example, in the analysis of the boys' relationships with their fathers, we are not just able to reach the conclusion that the relationships are positive or negative. We are also able to penetrate into the details of the factors which govern the quality of the relationships. Thus, a deeper insight and understanding of the causal factors which may account for delinquent behavior is revealed. Unfortunately, qualitative data does not exist on the control group and we are not able to probe deeper into the reasons for their relatively lower participation in serious delinquent acts.

We will follow a multi-variable approach due to the number of variables necessary to test our hypotheses. This approach also opens the possibility that no one theory, but rather a combination of factors from two or more theories best explain the cause of delinquency. The

use of a multi-variable approach, as we suggest, is strongly supported by Gold (1963: 187). Gold states that the combination of many factors occurring simultaneously is essential if we are to understand the causes of delinquent behavior. Johnson and Silverman (1975: 16) advocate the application of the multi-variable approach to the study of middle-class delinquency.

. . . the relevant explanatory variables may vary in different cases, and that in addition simply to identifying relevant variables, it is essential to look at the specific configuration of variables as they impinge upon the individual. Both the specific set of variables and their interaction are important to any explanatory mode. (Johnson and Silverman, 1975: 17)

An appropriate method of quantitative analysis to determine difference, if any, among many variables between two groups, as represented in this study, is that of discriminant analysis. One use of discriminant analysis is, according to Kerlinger (1973: 650), ". . . to study the relations among variables in different populations and samples." In order for us to make proper use of discriminant analysis a few data requirements are necessary (see below), due to the combination of two data sources.

Ideally, discriminant analysis requires a total population size which is at least two, and preferably, three times larger than the total number of variables (Tatsuoka, 1970: 38). The Institute for Juvenile Research data contains 50 cases (controls) for our study. The Juvenile Court archives provide 27 cases of delinquents (experimental group). Since there are only 24 variables and a total population of 77, we fall into the ideal proportion of a population at least three times the size of the number of variables. We also meet the requirements of a second ideal: the smallest group should have at least as many

cases as the number of variables.

Available data permits an empirical test of three theories, control, differential association and containment. Hypotheses, presented in the null form, are put to test through an analysis of quantitative data gathered from the delinquent and control groups. Acceptance of a hypothesis is dependent on meeting specific requirements. First, a standard score for Gamma (Z score) at the 5 percent level must reveal that there is no significant difference between the two research groups. Second, gamma, a measure of association, is used for two reasons. Through knowledge of the rankings of one variable against another in a bivariate relationship, gamma scores indicate the amount of guessing errors which are eliminated. The sign (positive or negative) is also important, since it signifies whether the relationship between two variables is direct or inverse. Thus, the sign's direction may support or reject the direction of the theoretical formulation.

Conclusion

Class based theories have dominated the literature on juvenile delinquency. Until more recently, official data clearly indicated that delinquency was over represented in inner city areas. Since relatively higher rates of delinquency were found in the inner city, it became the focus of the social scientist. Resulting theories of delinquency became dominated by themes of socioeconomic causation. However, the advent of self-reported, delinquency studies and more recent official data brought about the revelation that delinquency is wide-spread throughout our society and is not restricted to a few ecological areas.

This study is influenced by the fact that middle-class, suburban

delinquency is a problematic issue for the communities involved and for class based theories. Middle-class delinquency opens serious questions about class based theory. The classed based theories do not explain middle-class delinquency nor do they explain the fact that most youth from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are not delinquent. In this respect our study selected three theoretical orientations (control, containment and differential association) which are not class based and have revealed some evidence of empirical support in previous studies. These theories which complement one another also account for the major social groups encountered by adolescents, i.e., the family, school and peer group. It is believed that the empirical analysis will support these theories and that we will gain some understanding of a general process of delinquency. We also envision the possibility that the degree of strength of a youth's attachment and self-identity to his family, for example, will influence his degree of attachment and self-identity associated with the school and peer group.

Empirical data used to test the series of hypotheses associated with control and containment theories is obtained from the Institute for Juvenile Research and the Juvenile Court of Cook County. The I.J.R. conducted a quantitative survey on Illinois youth in 1972. This survey contains a sufficient number of cases of white, middle-class, suburban boys, thus the data can be used to test our hypotheses. The Juvenile Court data is collectable from case records, and although it is qualitative, the court data can be coded onto the I.J.R. questionnaire. Thus, the data from both sources can be analyzed from a single instrument. Two groups, controls and delinquents, then will be classified

FIGURE 2-1

LIMITATIONS OF THE TWO DATA SOURCES

Juvenile Court Case Records**Institute for Juvenile
Research Survey Data**

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Small number of youth
(n = 27) included in
experimental group | 1. Small number of youth
(n = 50) included in
control group |
| 2. There is a difference
of three to four years
in the collection of
data for both sources
of information | 2. There is a difference
of three to four years
in the collection of
data for both sources
of information |
| 3. Possible effects of
labeling and bias by
recorders' of informa-
tion | 3. Unable to identify
socioeconomic status
of one-parent families
headed by the mother |
| 4. Possible errors in the
coding of qualitative
information onto a
quantitative instrument | |
| 5. Information on key
variables missing from
some cases | |
-

from this data for analysis, through the statistical technique of discriminant analysis.

Finally, there are some important limitations of the data that are necessary to qualify before proceeding to their analysis (Figure 2-1). First, the size of both research groups is small and there is a three to four year gap between the collection of data for the I.J.R. study and Court records. Second, in the one-parent families headed by females contained in the I.J.R. study, it is not possible to determine socioeconomic status. Third, the Court data may be affected by labeling and the bias of the recorders of the information, there may be coding errors in the transfer of information from the Court records to the questionnaire, and important information is not contained in some case reports. Thus, any significant differences between the two groups cannot be considered as absolute. It should be clear that there is no intention to misrepresent this data. However, as we shall discover there are some significant differences between the two groups which do not seem to be accounted for by chance, but rather seem to be the result of social situations.

CHAPTER III

INVOLVEMENT OF MIDDLE-CLASS, SUBURBAN BOYS

IN DELINQUENT ACTIVITIES

Just what is the involvement of white, middle-class suburban boys in delinquent behavior? If class-bias theories of delinquency are taken into consideration, we would expect middle-class boys to have a relatively low involvement in delinquency when compared to boys of lower socioeconomic status. Middle-class boys are not blocked from access to the opportunity structure, and thus encounter fewer factors which may influence deviant behavior. However, we have seen in an earlier chapter, that studies on self-reported delinquency and official data do not support this reasoning. Middle-class boys are involved in a fair amount of delinquency.

There have also been a number of studies on middle-class delinquency which state that the types of offenses differ according to social class. As stated earlier, Schulman (1949), Chilton (1967), Scott and Vaz (1970) contend that middle-class youth are more likely to engage in hedonistic types of illegal behavior than youth from lower categories of socioeconomic status. More specifically, middle-class hedonism includes: traffic violations, drinking, sex, mischief and vandalism. For the purpose of this study, chemical substance abuses other than alcohol are also included due to their widespread use for more than a decade. However, according to the literature, it is expected that middle-class youth are less likely to participate in

non-hedonistic delinquency, i.e., violent and theft types of behavior. For example, Chilton (1967) states that he would not expect middle-class youth to engage in theft types of offenses. Scott and Vaz (1963) and Vaz (1967) would expect middle-class youth to have very limited involvement in crimes against persons. On the other hand, youth of lower socioeconomic status would most likely engage in non-hedonistic types of delinquent behavior. Although the literature on this subject was published more than a decade ago, it is lacking in empirical support or rejection. Our study will investigate this matter.

One explanation concerning the differences in specific offense types committed by middle-class and lower-class youth is related to class bias theories of delinquency. For example, Cohen (1955), Cloward and Ohlin (1960), and Short and Strodtbeck (1965) maintain that, in general, there are few differences in societal values and goals held by members of all social classes. However, lower-class youth are most likely to be blocked from the legitimate means to the societal goals of economic success. According to Cohen, the inability of lower-class boys to achieve success as defined by the middle-class may lead to a state of status frustration. Some lower-class boys, feeling rejected by middle class society, may find support and status within the delinquent subculture by rebelling against his rejectors. The subculture provides status to its members through such group norms as physical aggressiveness and the violation of property rights. In essence, they reverse some important middle-class standards of behavior.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) also contend that many lower-class youth are frustrated due to their inability to gain access to the

legitimate means of societal goals. Without legitimate access to the means, lower-class boys may opt for illegitimate means toward their success goals. Accordingly, lower-class boys may join criminal (theft oriented) or conflict (violence-oriented) subcultures in the search for the success goal, which they have not abandoned. Cloward and Ohlin also state that middle-class delinquency is generally hedonistic.

Short and Strodtbeck (1965) found that gang boys, and non-gang boys from the lower-class and the middle-class had similar values. This was true of both black and white boys. However, non-middle-class boys were more likely to define deviance in a different manner than middle-class boys.

A theoretical perspective on middle-class delinquency and specific offense outcomes was advanced by Scott and Vaz (1963). Their study, similar to the above mentioned theories related to the lower-class, focuses upon middle-class values and the adolescent peer group. However, their emphasis is different; it relies on a few features which the authors suggest are particular to the middle-class. First, the transition period between childhood and adulthood is much longer for middle-class adolescents than for their lower-class peers. Scott and Vaz reason that middle-class youth are more likely to be kept out of the employment market and from enjoying adult status for a longer period of time, since they are more likely to attend college. Second, decision-making in the middle-class family has become a joint process involving parents and children. This process was formally under patriarchal control. In addition, the family has become more permissive, and academic standards have been lowered.

According to Scott and Vaz (1963), the longer transition period from childhood to adulthood for middle-class youth, and changes in the family and school have resulted in the emergence of an adolescent peer culture. Relaxed academic standards have provided additional leisure time, and the family is not able to provide all of the socialization functions necessary for adolescents in our complex society. Thus, the peer culture fills the void. It is within the peer culture that middle-class adolescents learn adult roles (this is discussed in greater detail in Chapter VI.

The peer culture also establishes its own set of moral standards, which includes acceptable types of deviant behavior. It appears that the types of deviant behavior which are acceptable to the middle-class peer culture reflect those of adult, middle-class hedonistic activities, i.e., automobiles, alcohol and sex. Violent offenses or robbery, on the other hand, would not be considered acceptable to the middle-class peer culture. Scott and Vaz (1963) emphasize that the illegal behavior of middle-class youth occurs as a result of the over-all peer culture. They do not foresee separate deviant peer groups among the middle-class similar to lower-class delinquent gangs.

This chapter will examine the nature of white suburban middle-class delinquency among boys and their involvement in the juvenile justice system. In the first section, data from the Institute for Juvenile Research is used to compare participation in hedonistic and non-hedonistic offenses by boys in our middle-class control group, and non-middle-class boys from suburbia and the City of Chicago. Second, there is a detailed overview of hedonistic and non-hedonistic

offenses. Finally, the participation of delinquents and controls in delinquency and the juvenile justice system are compared.

A cross-class comparison of participation in hedonistic and non-hedonistic offenses is possible through data used in the Institute for Juvenile Research, "Youth in Illinois" study. The I.J.R. questionnaire lists 31 self-reported items related to illegal behavior. Of these items, 18 are hedonistic and 11 are non-hedonistic. The hedonistic offenses include: 10 items related to drug and alcohol use, 3 items involving traffic violations, two items on gambling, and one item each involving the placing of an anonymous phone call, vandalism and the stripping of automobiles. We designated the latter two offenses as hedonistic, since they fall under this category in the literature on middle-class delinquency (England, 1960). There are 11 items related to non-hedonistic offenses. Five of the non-hedonistic offenses are related to theft, 5 are related to offenses against persons and one involves the sale of drugs. There are also two status offenses, running away from home and truancy, which fall into neither category. Or at least, the literature on middle-class delinquency does not mention them as hedonistic or non-hedonistic.

Tables 3-1 and 3-2 reveal positive responses to the commission of hedonistic and non-hedonistic offenses for three groups defined by socioeconomic status and location. Suburban middle-class boys (our control group) are compared to two other groups of 14-16 year old white boys whose fathers have less than a college education, are neither employed in professional or managerial occupations, and are not necessarily employed. These latter two groups are designated as

non-middle class and categorized according to suburban or City of Chicago residence. Each youth is also categorized according to the number of different types of hedonistic acts in which he has participated. The absolute number of times a boy has participated in a particular act cannot be determined from the data. (There are too few middle-class, white boys from Chicago in the sample to be used in a comparison.)

All three groups represented in Table 3-1 participated in a considerable amount of hedonistic behavior. For example, 48 per cent of the suburban middle-class controls, 57 per cent of the non-middle-class suburban boys, and 45 per cent of the Chicago non-middle-class boys reported that they committed four or more different types of hedonistic offenses. An application of a t-test at the .05 level of confidence reveals no significant difference in the commission of hedonistic offenses when comparing the suburban middle-class boys with the two non-middle-class samples. A measure of variance test between controls and suburban non-middle-class boys results in no significant difference. In a similar fashion, the test of variance between the suburban middle-class boys and non-middle-class Chicago boys also reveals no significant difference. Results of our study reveal that participation in hedonistic behavior is not significantly related to socioeconomic status or metropolitan location for white boys.

Table 3-2 reveals the participation of white boys from different socioeconomic levels and locations in non-hedonistic offenses. Again all three groups reported considerable involvement in non-hedonistic delinquency. For example, 50.0 per cent of the suburban middle-class

TABLE 3-1

POSITIVE RESPONSES TO HEDONISTIC OFFENSES

Number of Different Types of Specific Offenses Committed	White Suburban Middle- Class Boys		White Suburban Non- Middle-Class Boys		White Chicago Non-Middle- Class Boys	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
	None	6	(12.0)	6	(5.2)	3
1	5	(10.0)	11	(9.6)	12	(30.0)
2	6	(12.0)	16	(13.9)	4	(10.0)
3	9	(18.0)	16	(13.9)	3	(7.5)
4	6	(12.0)	17	(13.8)	2	(5.0)
5	7	(14.0)	17	(14.8)	3	(7.5)
6	1	(2.0)	7	(6.1)	3	(7.5)
7	4	(8.0)	5	(4.3)	2	(5.0)
8	2	(4.0)	5	(4.3)	3	(7.5)
9	2	(4.0)	4	(3.5)	1	(2.5)
10	2	(4.0)	3	(2.6)	2	(5.0)
11			3	(2.6)		
12			2	(1.7)		
13					2	(5.0)
14			1	(0.9)		
15			1	(0.9)		
16			1	(0.9)		
17						
18						
N =	50	(100%)	115	(100%)	40	(100%)
M =	3.82		4.60		4.08	

Suburban middle-class boys compared with suburban non-middle-class boys: $t = 1.40 < 2.120$ (not significant).

Suburban middle-class boys compared with Chicago non-middle-class boys: $t = 1.12 < 2.160$ (not significant).

TABLE 3-2

POSITIVE RESPONSES TO NON-HEDONISTIC OFFENSES

Number of Different Types of Specific Offenses Committed	White Suburban Middle- Class Boys		White Suburban Non- Middle-Class Boys		White Chicago Non-Middle- Class Boys	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
None	6	(12.0)	14	(12.2)	8	(20.0)
1	8	(16.0)	15	(13.0)	5	(12.5)
2	11	(22.0)	15	(13.0)	4	(10.0)
3	11	(22.0)	25	(21.7)	5	(12.5)
4	6	(12.0)	14	(12.2)	8	(20.0)
5	4	(8.0)	9	(7.8)	3	(7.5)
6	2	(4.0)	3	(2.6)	2	(5.0)
7			5	(4.3)	2	(5.0)
8	1	(2.0)	4	(3.5)		
9	1	(2.0)	3	(2.6)	1	(2.5)
10			5	(4.3)	1	(2.5)
11			3	(2.6)	1	(2.5)
N =	50	(100%)	115	(99.8%)*	40	(100%)
M =	2.72		3.62		3.28	

Suburban middle-class boys compared with suburban non-middle-class boys: $t = 1.63 < 2.201$ (not significant).

Suburban middle-class boys compared with Chicago non-middle-class boys: $t = 1.38 < 2.201$ (not significant).

*Rounding error.

boys, and 61.7 per cent of the suburban non-middle-class and 57.5 per cent of the Chicago boys admitted participating in three or more different types of offenses which are classified as non-hedonistic. There was no statistically significant difference in variance between the middle-class suburban boys when compared to either of the two non-middle-class groups. A comparison of the suburban middle-class boys with suburban non-middle-class boys implies no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence. Similarly, there is no significant difference in the comparison of controls with Chicago non-middle-class boys. Thus, the participation of white boys in hedonistic or non-hedonistic styles of delinquent behavior does not significantly vary according to the variables of socioeconomic status or by metropolitan location.

We have already seen that most, 88.0 per cent, of our controls reported that they engaged in one or more different types of hedonistic offenses. They participated in a mean of 3.82 different types of hedonistic offenses. Similarly, 88.0 per cent engaged in one or more types of non-hedonistic offenses with a mean of 2.72. In this section we will examine the amount of participation by controls in each type of self-reported hedonistic and non-hedonistic activity through a series of sub-categories. Hedonistic sub-categories are: alcohol use, non-alcohol drug use, automobile offenses, the placement of anonymous phone calls and gambling. Non-hedonistic offenses are classified as theft, violence and the illegal sale of drugs. This will provide a detailed account of participation levels for specific offenses.

Self-reports reveal that most of the controls have had some

involvement with alcohol (Table 3-3). As illustrated, 72.0 per cent of these youths drank alcoholic beverages with the consent of their parents. Also, 44.0 per cent reported drinking alcohol without parental permission. Not only have many of the youth tried alcohol at least once, but 34.0 per cent admitted that they drank to the state of intoxication. Only two respondents admitted to the purchase of alcoholic beverages. Not only were many of the controls involved in some form of alcohol use, but 8.0 per cent drank "often" with parental permission and 8.0 per cent drank "often" without parental permission. Also 6.0 per cent claimed that they "often" became intoxicated.

Although the use of alcohol by the controls is fairly common, few admitted usage of other drugs. About 12 per cent of the controls reported use of marijuana or hashish and one youth reported use of a psychedelic. None of the controls reported use of any of these drugs "often." None of the controls reported use of amphetamines, barbiturates or heroin. Some controls engaged in experimentation with a few of the drugs, while none reveal heavy use of them. The wide use of alcohol and the more limited use of other drugs is likely a reflection of hedonistic behavior within adult society.

The lure of the automobile also results in a considerable amount of hedonistic behavior. Thirty per cent of the controls reported operation of an automobile without a drivers' license or permit (Table 3-3). In the same respect 22.0 per cent admitted driving a car "too fast or recklessly." The popularity and status of automobiles is strongly reflected in their misuse by the respondents. However, this misuse is most likely to be in the form of self-indulgence and thrills

TABLE 3-3

SELF REPORTS OF PARTICIPATION IN HEDONISTIC OFFENSES BY CONTROLS

Type of Behavior or Offense	Never		Once or Twice		A Few Times		Often	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
<u>Alcohol/Drugs:</u>								
Drank Beer, Wine or Liquor With Parents Permission	14	(28.0)	14	(28.0)	18	(36.0)	4	(8.0)
Drank Beer, Wine or Liquor Without Parents Permission	28	(56.0)	5	(10.0)	13	(26.0)	4	(8.0)
Bought Beer, Wine or Liquor	48	(96.0)	1	(2.0)	1	(2.0)	0	(0.0)
Drank Enough to Get Drunk	33	(66.0)	7	(14.0)	7	(14.0)	3	(6.0)
Used Glue/Gas/Other Inhalants	46	(95.8)	1	(2.1)	1	(2.1)	0	(0.0)
Used Marijuana or Hashish	42	(87.5)	3	(6.3)	3	(6.3)	0	(0.0)
Used Heroin	48	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
Used LSD/Mescaline/Other Psychedelics	47	(97.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(2.1)	0	(0.0)
Used Downers/Barbituates (without Prescriptions	48	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
Used Methedrine (speed)/Other Uppers/ Amphetamines (without Prescription)	48	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
<u>Vandalism:</u>								
Deliberately Damaged Private/Public Property	34	(68.0)	10	(20.0)	6	(12.0)	0	(0.0)
<u>Auto Violations:</u>								
Stripped Cars of Parts to use or Sell	48	(96.0)	2	(4.0)	0	(0 .0)	0	(0.0)

TABLE 3-3

SELF REPORTS OF PARTICIPATION IN HEDONISTIC OFFENSES BY CONTROLS

(continued)

Type of Behavior or Offense	Never		Once or Twice		A Few Times		Often	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
<u>Auto Violations:</u>								
Drove Without a Driver's License or Permit	35	(70.0)	7	(14.0)	4	(8.0)	4	(8.0)
Rode Around in Stolen Car Just for the Ride	48	(96.0)	2	(4.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
Drove Too Fast or Recklessly	39	(78.0)	4	(8.0)	6	(12.0)	1	(2.0)
<u>Anonymous Phone Call:</u>								
Made an Anonymous Phone Call Just to Annoy Someone	17	(34.0)	13	(26.0)	16	(32.0)	4	(8.0)
<u>Gambling:</u>								
Placed a Bet with a Gambler on a Profes- sional Sporting Event	42	(84.0)	4	(8.0)	3	(6.0)	1	(2.0)
Placed a Bet with a Gambler on a Numbers Game, etc.	44	(88.0)	6	(12.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)

(driving without a license and violating traffic laws) rather than riding in a stolen auto. Only two youth admitted to be riders in a stolen automobile. Two youth also reported they "stripped" someone's car of parts to use or sell.

Almost one-third, 32.0 per cent, of the controls engaged in the act of vandalism. Whereas, 20.0 per cent reported they committed an act of vandalism "once or twice," and 12.0 per cent committed it a "few times;" none claimed they were involved "often." While many of the controls participated in vandalism, such participation was generally infrequent.

The final types of hedonistic behavior to be reviewed are anonymous phone calls and gambling. Two-thirds of the controls were involved in the placing of anonymous phone calls. This seems to be a fairly popular activity since 32 per cent reported making anonymous calls "a few times" and 8 per cent were involved "often." This is generally a mischievous type of activity (although the seriousness of the calls is not reflected in the data), thus, it is classified as hedonistic behavior. Controls also engaged in gambling to some degree. Sixteen per cent placed bets on professional sporting events, and 12 per cent placed bets on other types of gambling activities.

Self reported data by our control group clearly demonstrates that white, suburban, middle-class boys actively participate in hedonistic types of delinquency. This gives further support to previous research on the subject. We particularly observed that these boys are most likely to participate in drinking activities, automobile related violations, placement of anonymous phone calls and vandalism. However,

it should be noted that very few of the youth reported that they engaged in any particular act "often." There tends to be considerable experimentation with hedonistic behavior, but little commitment to any particular offense.

Participation in non-hedonistic offenses against property (Table 3-4) by controls is just as prevalent as hedonistic activities. The majority, 62 per cent, of the sample reported taking less expensive items from their homes or a school. Self reports also reveal that 46 per cent of the boys stole small items from stores. However, there were very few who engaged in these petty thefts "often." Reported involvement in more serious types of theft is very small. For example, only 6 per cent admitted to the theft of items with a value of twenty dollars or more and these respondents participated only "once or twice." Also 6 per cent engaged in the act of burglary, and none committed the act "often." Thus, for the most part involvement by non-delinquents in property offenses is petty and few participate in any one act more than "a few times." It is, however, interesting that nearly half of the sample (46.0 per cent) reported possessing property which they know was stolen. Again, almost all committed this act only "once or twice." It would be more interesting if there had been information on this last item, such as the value of the stolen property.

Offenses against persons represent the least likely type of delinquent behavior expected by the non-delinquent controls. However, the controls did indicate some participation in violent behavior. For example (Table 3-4) 60 per cent admitted participation in a "fist

TABLE 3-4

SELF REPORTS OF PARTICIPATION IN NON-HEDONISTIC OFFENSES BY CONTROLS

Specific Offense	Never		Once or Twice		A Few Times		Often	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
<u>Theft:</u>								
Takes Little Things Without Permission from Home or School	19	(38.0)	20	(40.0)	9	(18.0)	2	(4.0)
Takes Something Small from a Store	27	(54.0)	18	(36.0)	4	(8.0)	1	(2.0)
Took at Least \$20.00 or Something Worth at Least \$20 that Did not Belong to Youth	47	(94.0)	3	(6.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
Kept or Used Something Youth Knew Had Been Stolen	27	(54.0)	21	(42.0)	2	(4.0)	0	(0.0)
Broke into Someone's Home or a Store, in order to Steal Something	47	(94.0)	2	(4.0)	1	(2.0)	0	(0.0)
<u>Sale of Drugs:</u>								
Sold Drugs (except Alcohol)	47	(97.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(2.1)	0	(0.0)
<u>Violence:</u>								
Had a Fist Fight	20	(40.0)	23	(46.0)	5	(10.0)	2	(4.0)
Took Part in a Gang Fight	44	(89.8)	5	(10.2)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
Carried Weapon (Gun, Knife, Razor, etc.) if Needed to Use Against Another Person	38	(76.0)	9	(18.0)	1	(2.0)	2	(4.0)
Used a Weapon in a Fight (Brick, Knife, Razor or Anything Else)	50	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
Used Force or Threatened Force to Get Money from Another Person	48	(96.0)	2	(4.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)

fight," and 4 per cent responded "often." The seriousness of these "fist fights" is impossible to determine from the data. Also, 10.2 per cent of the controls reported participation in a gang fight "once or twice." Unfortunately, there are no further details, especially in relation to the definition of a gang fight in suburban, middle-class fashion.

It is interesting to note that 24 per cent of the non-delinquent controls reported carrying a weapon for protection. However, none reported use of a weapon in a fight, and only 4.0 per cent admitted using threats or force "once or twice" to obtain money from another person. Thus, engagement in offenses against persons by white-middle-class controls is almost negligible.

There are a few infractions of the law, running away from home and truancy, which do not clearly fit under our hedonistic or non-hedonistic classifications. These acts are better known as victimless or status offenses. They are, however, important to this study since they represent a segment of illegal behavior.

In regard to contacts with the juvenile justice system only a few controls were formally processed. The only substantial contact with the juvenile justice system occurs through informal warnings from the police. Just over 40 per cent of the controls stated that they had been warned by the police, when in fact "they had not done anything wrong." Only one individual claimed that he was warned "often." However, formal contacts with the juvenile justice system are rare. For example, only 8 per cent reported receiving a community adjustment and there were no reports of unofficial juvenile court hearings. One

youth did report that he appeared before a juvenile court "once or twice" for an official hearing. However, the questionnaires do not account for court dispositions.

As reflected in the self reports, boys in our control group were involved in a wide variety of deviant acts. For example, under the category of hedonistic acts, controls were most likely to engage in the use of alcohol, automobile violations, anonymous phone calls, gambling and vandalism. Controls also experimented with non-hedonistic offenses, especially petty theft, possession of stolen goods, fist fighting, and the carrying of weapons. Finally, a number of controls committed status offenses, i.e., run away from home and most notably, became truant. Although many of the controls reported that they engaged in the above mentioned offenses, few individuals reported more than a few occurrences of any particular type of offense. It should also be noted that the offenses which had the fewest participants are the more serious ones, i.e., strong arm robbery, use of a weapon, burglary, larceny of at least twenty dollars, auto theft and the stripping of cars for parts, and the sale of drugs. It is just as important to note that there was some participation by controls in many of these most serious acts. Therefore, it may be stated with confidence that membership in the middle-class and residence in suburbia is not by any means a perfect insulator from delinquency.

The presumption that middle-class delinquency is enacted in hedonistic rather than non-hedonistic types of behavior is not supported by the official reports from the delinquent group. Table 3-5 clearly demonstrates this fact with a presentation of court petitions categorized by specific offenses. Offenses which are conceivably

TABLE 3-5

OFFICIAL ACCOUNT OF JUVENILE COURT PETITIONS FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH
CATEGORIZED BY SPECIFIC HEDONISTIC AND NON-HEDONISTIC OFFENSES

Specific Offense	Number of Youth Petitioned*	Number Petitions
<u>Hedonistic:</u>		
Criminal Damage to Property	7	10
Criminal Tresspass to Vehicle	7	14
Delivery/Possession of Marijuana	4	6
Reckless Conduct	1	1
Disorderly Conduct	1	1
<u>Non-Hedonistic:</u>		
Burglary	13	55**
Theft	10	14
Robbery	3	3
Arson	2	2
Unlawful Use of Weapon	3	4
Intimidation	1	1
Rape/Deviate Sexual Assault	1	3
Battery/Aggravated Assault/ Attempted Murder	6	9
<u>Other: (Status Offenses)</u>		
Runaway	2	2
Ungovernable	2	2
Truancy	3	3
Total		130

*Many of the youth were petitioned for two or more different types of specific offense.

**One boy was petitioned for 30 burglaries.

indicative of hedonistic behavior (vandalism, criminal trespass to vehicle, delivery/possession of marijuana, reckless conduct and disorderly conduct), represent about one-fourth (24.6 per cent) of the total number of petitions. It should be noted that many of these hedonistic offenses were very serious acts. For example, the incident of reckless conduct resulted in the death of one victim and serious injuries to a few others.

A most important revelation of Table 3-5 is the involvement by white middle-class, delinquent boys in serious non-hedonistic offenses against property and persons. These offenses account for 70.0 per cent of the petitions. In all there were 91 petitions for non-hedonistic offenses against property and persons (burglary, theft, robbery, arson, unlawful use of weapons, intimidation, rape/deviate sexual assault, and battery/aggravated assault/attempted murder). Almost all of these petitions against property and persons were very serious incidents, and would probably be classified as felonies if they were committed by adults.

Just as important is the fact that the 27 delinquent boys had a total of 130 petitions, a median of 3 petitions. One boy was petitioned for 30 burglaries, and six others have only one petition. The fact remains, the delinquent boys under investigation are deeply involved in serious delinquent activities.

A further investigation into the illegal behavior of our delinquent group is illustrated in Table 3-6. This table lists the specific offenses under which the delinquents received community adjustments. A community adjustment implies that the police gave a

TABLE 3-6

COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENTS FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH CATEGORIZED BY SPECIFIC
HEDONISTIC AND NON-HEDONISTIC OFFENSES

Specific Offense	Number of Youth Adjusted*	Number of Adjustments
<u>Hedonistic:</u>		
Criminal Damage to Property	13	21
Criminal Trespass to Vehicle	2	4
Drug/Alcohol Violations	9	9
Mischief	4	12
Disturbance	1	1
Disorderly Conduct	8	10
Traffic Violation	3	3
Fireworks	5	5
<u>Non-Hedonistic:</u>		
Theft	11	26
Other Property Offenses	1	1
Battery/Assault/Other Offenses Against Persons	2	2
<u>Other:</u>		
Runaway	6	7
Ungovernable	1	1
Truancy	1	1
Curfew	5	6
Trespassing	2	2
Suspicious	2	2
Other	4	7
Total		120

*Many boys were community adjusted for two or more different types of specific offense.

warning to the boy and his parents for an alleged violation of the law. The incident is recorded, but a referral is not made to the juvenile court. The 27 boys received a total of 120 community adjustments with a median of three. They also received a total of 250 court petitions and community adjustments for an average of 9.3 (the median = 6) recorded contacts with the juvenile justice system.¹ Thus, the delinquent boys are not just random offenders unlucky enough to be apprehended once or twice. Their official records, petitions and community adjustments, indicate a commitment to illegal activities.

Hedonistic behavior among the delinquent boys is more apparent for offenses which are processed as community adjustments (Table 3-6) than for those petitioned. About 54 per cent of the community adjustments are hedonistic, i.e., vandalism, criminal trespass to vehicle, drug/alcohol offenses, mischief, disturbance, disorderly conduct, traffic violations and fireworks. Few details, if any, were provided on most of the community adjustments. It may appear that offenses which are petitioned in the white middle-class suburbs are generally restricted to non-hedonistic types of illegal acts associated with inner-city

¹An interesting comparison can be made with a study by Empey and Lebuck (1973:21). Their sample included boys from Los Angeles County assigned to a private correctional institution and boys from Utah who were placed in correctional institutions and boys from Utah County who were processed by the Juvenile Court. The Los Angeles boys had an average of 4.5 recorded offenses and the Utah sample had 6.2. Of course, there may be different procedures and other factors which influence the processing of Juveniles in Los Angeles County, Utah County, the state of Utah and the north suburban area of Chicago (Cook County). But, the boys represented in our delinquent group do have a higher average of recorded offenses (9.3) than the Los Angeles or Utah sample.

TABLE 3-7

COMPARISON OF PARTICIPATION IN HEDONISTIC, NON-HEDONISTIC
AND STATUS OFFENSES BY DELINQUENTS
AND CONTROLS

Offense	Number of Delinquents Involved*		Number of Controls Involved**	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
<u>Hedonistic:</u>				
Criminal Damage to Property	15	(55.5)	16	(32.0)
<u>Auto Related Violations:</u>				
Criminal Trespass to Vehicle	7	(25.9)	2	(4.0)
Stripped Others Cars			2	(4.0)
Reckless Driving	3	(11.1)	11	(22.0)
Drove Without License	2	(7.4)	15	(30.0)
<u>Drugs/Alcohol:</u>				
Delivery/Possession of Marijuana	8	(29.6)		
Drank Without Permission			22	(44.0)
Bought Liquor			2	(4.0)
Other Drug/Alcohol Violations	5	(18.5)		

*Court petitions

**Self Reports

TABLE 3-7
(continued)

Offense	Number of Delinquents Involved*		Number of Controls Involved**	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
<u>Non-Hedonistic</u>				
<u>Offenses Against Persons:</u>				
Robbery	2	(7.4)		
Strong-arm Robbery	1	(3.7)	2	(4.0)
Unlawful Use of Weapon	3	(11.1)	0	(0.0)
Carried Weapon Battery/Assault	8	(29.6)	12	(24.0)
Participated in Gang Fight			5	(10.2)
<u>Offenses Against Property:</u>				
Theft	14	(51.8)		
Small Things Taken from Store			33	(46.0)
Small Things Taken from Home or School			31	(62.0)
Theft of More than \$20.00			3	(6.0)
Burglary	16	(59.3)	3	(6.0)
Kept or Used Stolen Property			23	(46.0)
Sold Drugs	1	(3.7)	1	(2.1)
<u>Status Offenses:</u>				
Ran Away from Home	6	(22.2)	5	(10.0)
Truancy***	17	(63.0)	17	(34.0)

*Court petitions and community adjustments

**Self reports

***Includes school reports

areas. A comparison of the petitioned offenses (Table 3-5) and community adjusted offenses (Table 3-6) reveal this relationship. However, it is undeniable that the petitions represent the most serious infractions, whereas community adjustments do not. Thus, it is the degree of seriousness, not the type of offense, which generally determines whether petitions or community adjustments are processed.

An illustration of the various offenses committed by white suburban middle-class boys is presented in Table 3-7. This table compares offenses documented in the official records of the delinquent group with self reported activities of controls. This comparison is not exacting. There are differences between official records and self reported delinquency. However, it represents the only method of comparing the two groups. The major interest of this comparison is that it illustrates the variety of hedonistic and non-hedonistic offenses committed by both groups.

White, middle-class delinquents and controls participated in numerous hedonistic, non-hedonistic, and status offenses. Both groups also indicate considerable involvement in the sub-categories of our major classifications. For example, delinquents and controls participate in hedonistic acts of vandalism, auto related violations, and involvement with alcohol and drugs. Both groups of boys also participated in a variety of non-hedonistic acts related to offenses against property and persons.

Conclusion

Data from our study does not support some sources found in the literature which claim that delinquency among middle-class youth is either rare or non-existent. Boys from both our delinquent and control groups engaged in a considerable amount of illegal behavior. The data also rejects the contention that the types of offenses committed by middle-class boys are predominantly hedonistic, and that they have little involvement in theft and violent offenses compared to boys from a lower socioeconomic status. Controlling for age and race, controls were compared with both suburban and city boys of lower than middle-class socioeconomic status. Findings clearly demonstrate that there are no statistically significant differences between the classes with regard to participation in either hedonistic or non-hedonistic offenses. Socioeconomic status and metropolitan location do not seem to influence the selection of specific offense categories, i.e., hedonistic or non-hedonistic. Official records of delinquent boys also indicate they had considerable participation in both hedonistic and non-hedonistic delinquent acts.

There is a difference in the seriousness of delinquent acts between the control group and delinquents. Although the offense records of the delinquents are detailed, we caution that the self reports of controls are not very detailed according to the seriousness of the offenses. Both groups engaged in many types of theft, however, only 3 (6.0 per cent) of the controls reported participating in a theft of \$20.00 or more. Each of these three boys stated that they engaged in a theft of \$20.00 or more only "once or twice." Thus, the

controls committed a maximum of six major thefts. The delinquents were petitioned for 72 types of theft (burglary, theft and robbery), almost all of them were felonies. Both groups also had their share of participation in offenses against persons, but none of the controls and three of the delinquents made use of weapons against others. Unfortunately, it is not possible to take the comparison of seriousness much further due to lack of details about the controls.

A vast difference does exist between delinquents and controls with regard to their involvement in the juvenile justice system. Delinquents received a total of 120 community adjustments (an average of 4.4) and 130 court petitions (an average of 4.8). The official records clearly indicated that in general, the determining factor in making a community adjustment or court petition, is the seriousness of the offense. Whereas, 42.0 per cent of the controls reported that they had been warned by the police, only 8.0 per cent reported receiving a community adjustment. Only one control reported being referred to a juvenile court and that was "once or twice." It is of interest that three of the delinquents were committed to juvenile correctional institutions. There is the possibility that only one control could have been committed to a correctional institution since only a juvenile court in Illinois can make a commitment. Also, two of the delinquents were placed in psychiatric hospitals and three were placed in residential treatment centers. The Institute for Juvenile Research data does not provide this information for controls. In summary, middle-class boys do engage in a considerable amount of delinquency and the boys in our delinquent group indicate a strong commitment to involvement in

serious illegal acts.

Theories based on socioeconomic status do not explain middle-class delinquency. As we have observed, both delinquents and controls in this study exhibit a considerable amount of hedonistic and non-hedonistic delinquency. Yet, these boys are not blocked from the opportunity structure. Thus, we will seek the possibility of a causal relationship between delinquency and three non-class biased theories, i.e., control, containment and differential association.

CHAPTER IV

THE FAMILY

Control theory is based upon the relationship between delinquency and the quality of the attachment (social bonds) of youth to significant others who comprise their social environment. Therefore the quality of social bonds between a boy, in our case, and his parents, school and peer group become major factors in determining whether he becomes delinquent or not. According to Hirschi (1969: 86) a central variable for control theory is attachment to parents. This chapter is devoted to an analysis of the attachments which delinquents and controls have to their parents and their family situations. The following chapters address attachments to the school and adolescent peer group.

Five variables will be examined to assess the quality of social bonds between the boys of both research groups, and their mothers and fathers. The first variable is a measure of how well the boys get along with their parents. A second variable assesses the level of communication between the boys and their parents. Third, is an indicator of the boys' perceptions of how well they feel their parents understand them. Fourth is the likelihood that the boys take their parents' advice. The final variable measures the degree of identification that the boys have with each parent. Hirschi (1969) uses two variables similar to our own in his work on control theory: intimacy of communication with parents and identification with parents.

Father-Son Relationships

Hypothesis I: There is no difference in the quality of attachment to fathers between delinquent boys and controls

It often seems that our society attributes the father with a secondary role in the nurturing of children. Earlier, we reviewed a few studies which suggested that the father does indeed play an important role in the rearing of children. Delinquents were more likely to have distant relationships with their fathers. Our study provides an added dimension to the father-son relationship. The fathers of both delinquent and control groups are college educated, hold professional or managerial positions and are employed. The Court records also reveal that the families of the delinquent boys with only a few exceptions were not experiencing economic difficulties. Thus, the fathers are good economic providers.

As noted in Chapter 2, there are seven delinquent boys who do not live with their fathers. Nevertheless, the case records of these boys contain information regarding the father-son relationships. Thus, the father-son relationships of these boys are as likely to be coded as those of the boys who live with their fathers.

Attachment between father and son is most dramatically illustrated in Table 4-1. Delinquent boys are much more likely to have poor relationships with their fathers than controls. Whereas 94 percent of the controls report a positive relationship, i.e., get along "very well" or "fairly well," with their fathers, only 20.8 percent of the

TABLE 4-1
 HOW WELL THE BOYS GET ALONG
 WITH THEIR FATHERS

How Respondent Gets Along with Father	Delinquents		Controls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very Well	3	(12.5)	29	(58.0)
Fairly Well	2	(8.3)	18	(36.0)
Not Too Well	8	(33.3)	2	(4.0)
Not Well at All	11	(45.8)	1	(2.0)
Total	24	(99.9)*	50	(100.0)

*Rounding error.

G = -0.85

Z = -6.08 (Significant at the .05 level)

delinquents have a positive relationship. Taking the negative relationships into account we find that 79.1 percent of the delinquent boys get along with their fathers "not too well" or "not well at all." On the other hand, only 6.0 percent of the controls report a negative relationship with their fathers. It is also interesting to note that the model scores for delinquents and controls are at opposite extremes. "Not well at all" is recorded for 45.8 percent of the delinquents, while 58.0 percent of the controls report a score of "very well." It is apparent that controls are much more likely, at a statistically significant level, to have a positive relationship with their fathers than are delinquents. Brief examples from the Juvenile Court records of these relationships between delinquent boys and their fathers are presented below:

- Case 1: Youth is hostile to his father and maintains a distant and strained relationship with both parents. The father admits that he does not get along with his son. Youth and father have "head on" battles. Boy may try to embarrass father in order to gain attention.
(Coded: "Not well at all.")
- Case 7: The boy feels threatened and rejected by the father. The father is very strict and punitive to his son. The father has, also, been physically abusive to his son and has left some scars on the boy.
(Coded: "Not well at all.")
- Case 24: Youth has a better, but not very good relationship with the father than with the mother. The father spends long hours at work and seldom sees his son. Due to the father's frequent absence from the home and the placement of the boy in a boarding school, the subject may have feelings of rejection.
(Coded: "Not too well.")
- Case 26: The subject seems intimidated by his father. His attachment to the father is a pathological one; the father wants the son to be dependent upon him (the father). But the father claims that the son will not confide in him. The subject has surfaced a degree of latent

anger against the father.
(Coded: "Not too well.")

These examples relate long standing relationships, not temporary or occasional situations. As we examine the examples it became evident that many of the delinquents do not have a good relationship with their fathers. The situations which constitute the father-son relationship differ from boy to boy and do not leave a pattern. A few of the boys have distant relationships, some of them are strained, others are alienated from or threatened or intimidated by their fathers. There are also feelings of rejection, and some fathers seldom see their sons. Whatever the reason, most of the delinquent boys have not developed strong or effective social bonds with their fathers. There are, of course, exceptions which will be mentioned later. Other indices of the father-son relationship follow.

Andry (1971) and Hirschi (1969) stress the importance of communication between boys and their parents. Although their measures, i.e., wording of the questionnaire items, are somewhat different than our own, we reach similar conclusions. Delinquent boys have much less communication with their fathers than controls. For example, Table 4-2 discloses that almost 92 percent of the delinquent boys and only 30 percent of the controls indicate that they are not able to talk freely with their fathers. It is interesting to note that boys from both research groups are more likely to maintain poor channels of communication with their fathers than they are to experience poor relationships with them. This does not provide a clear cut explanation for the difference between communication and relationships. One may speculate that the reasons for this difference reflects a generation gap, adoles-

TABLE 4-2

THE ABILITY OF THE BOYS TO TALK
FREELY TO THEIR FATHERS

Is the Respondent Able to Talk Freely to his Father	Delinquents		Controls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	2	(8.3)	35	(70.0)
No	22	(91.7)	15	(30.0)
Total	24	(100.0)	50	(100.0)

G = -0.93

Z = -8.32 (Significant at the .05 level)

cent rebellion and/or the process of becoming independent from parents. A few brief examples from the Juvenile Court records reveal a clearer understanding of the communication patterns delinquent boys maintain with their fathers.

Case 15: There is no communication between the subject and his father. The father-son relationship is distant and poor. Youth admits that he tries to avoid his father; he finds it difficult to live up to his father's expectations.
(Coded: "No.")

Case 16: The boy does not have much communication with the father. The father seems to escape family life by putting in long hours at his place of employment. The subject does have a somewhat better relationship with his father than with his mother, however, even this relationship is very poor.
(Coded: "No.")

Case 20. The boy has a very poor relationship with his father and is unable to talk to him. The subject resents the father's efforts of pushing him to be involved in sports. The boy and the mother report that the father has a bad temper and at times (too often) is in a bad mood. The father is also physically abusive to the boy.
(Coded: "No.")

Lines of communication between fathers and delinquent sons are in general very poor. As demonstrated in the examples, some of the delinquent boys have little, if any, communication with their fathers. For others, communication usually results in hostile confrontations. A further examination of different types of communication follows.

Another measure of communication between father and son may be found in the boys' perceptions of how well they believe their fathers understand them. As indicated in Table 4-3, delinquent boys are less likely to believe that their fathers understand them. Seventy percent of the delinquent boys compared to 22 percent of the controls do not

TABLE 4-3

INDICATIONS FROM THE BOYS THAT THEIR FATHERS UNDERSTAND THEM, THAT
THEY TAKE THEIR FATHERS ADVICE, AND IDENTIFY WITH THEIR FATHERS

Questionnaire Item and Response	Delinquents		Controls		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Respondent's Father Under-stands Him as He Really is					
Very True	2	(10.0)	15	(30.0)	G = -0.68
Somewhat True	4	(20.0)	24	(48.0)	
Not True	14	(70.0)	11	(22.0)	
Total	20	(100.0)	50	(100.0)	Z = -2.97 (Signi- ficant at the .05 level)
Respondent Takes Father's Advice Seriously					
Very True	1	(4.8)	27	(54.0)	G = -0.91
Somewhat True	7	(33.3)	21	(42.0)	
Not True	13	(61.9)	2	(4.0)	
Total	21	(100.0)	50	(100.0)	Z = -7.57 (Signi- ficant at the .05 level)
Respondent Would Like to Grow up to Be the Kind of Person His Father Is					
Very True	1	(5.0)	17	(34.0)	G = -0.79
Somewhat True	5	(25.0)	24	(48.0)	
Not True	14	(70.0)	9	(18.0)	
Total	20	(100.0)	50	(100.0)	Z = -4.18 (Signi- ficant at the .05 level)

believe that their fathers understand them. This may reflect differences between the generations, changes in fads, adolescent rebellion, etc. In any event, there remains a significant difference between the two research groups. A few examples from the Court records follow.

Case 11: The father shows a lack of warmth for his son, and there is an indication that he may hate the son. The father feels that his son is worthless unless he lives up to his expectations. The subject is degraded and treated as inferior by the father. The son feels that the father administers discipline according to the father's feelings rather than his son's behavior.
(Coded; "Not true of me.")

Case 18: The father is an alcoholic and is having an affair with another woman. He listens to no one and insists that the family comply with his demands. The children, including the subject, look down on him and have little respect for the father.
(Coded; "Not true of me.")

A significant difference between the two research groups exists for the likelihood that they take the advice of their fathers' seriously (Table 4-3). Controls are much more likely to take the advice of their fathers. As we have seen and will see below, relationships and communication between delinquent boys and fathers are generally very poor and in some cases non-existent. The taking of advice seems to imply a form of trust between individuals. The controls tend to overcome any differences and accept the advice of their fathers. The strained relationship between delinquents and their fathers also seems to be a limiting factor for invoking trust in the boys. The taking or rejection of advice may also be seen as a reaction to both the quality of a relationship and communication. The Court case records indicated that at least a few of the boys desired a better relationship with their fathers,

The final variable to be analyzed in this section is the identification of boys with their fathers. A boy's identification with his father (or other significant adult males) is an essential element to the socialization process. One of these processes is sex role identification. The quality of a boy's identification with father may be directly related to the quality of their relationship. For quality of the father-son relationship see Table 4-3 which indicates that 70 percent of the delinquents and 18 percent of the controls report a negative identification with their fathers. These results are similar to those of the first 4 variables which were tested. Delinquent boys are significantly less likely to identify with their fathers than are controls.

The quality of father-son relationships between the two research groups is examined through five independent variables. Z scores at the 5 percent level indicate that significant differences exist between the groups for all five variables. This suggests that the null hypothesis should be rejected. The signs of gamma also indicate that relationship between the dependent and independent variables are supportive of control theory. Delinquents are more likely to have negative relationships with their father than are controls.

Mother-Son Relationships

Hypothesis II; There is no difference in the quality of attachment to mothers between delinquent boys and controls.

The vast majority of controls reported a close attachment to their mothers. Sixty-two percent of the controls state that they "get

along very well" with their mothers and another 30 percent claim that they get along "fairly well" (Table 4-4). Only 8 percent indicate that the relationship with their mothers is negative. Delinquents, on the other hand, tend not to have close attachments to their mothers. Almost three-fourths (73.9 percent) of the delinquents indicate negative relationships with their mothers, divided between "does not get along too well," and "does not get along too well at all." However, 26 percent of the delinquents get along with their mothers "very well." The implications of this finding are very important. From the beginning of the socialization process, which forms within the family unit, the delinquent boys are off to a poor start. As the following excerpts from the Court attest, delinquent boys are often at a distinct disadvantage in the development of their earliest social relationships.

Case 1: The boy's relationship with the mother is similar to that of the father, i.e., strained and distant. The subject experiences rejection by the mother. The mother feels that her son is "weak willed and inadequate."

(Coded: "Not well at all.")

Case 7: The mother is lacking in the presentation of real love and affection to her son. She feels caught between her husband and her son. The mother also feels that her son should not ruin her life.

(Coded: "Not well at all.")

Case 16: Mother is an alcoholic. She does not take responsibility for her behavior; the son's behavior seems to reflect this attitude. There are expressions of resentment toward the mother. As a result, it is reported the youth reacts to these frustrations and hostilities toward the mother by acting out in the community. Although the boy does not have respect for the mother's drinking, he does have some sympathy for her.

(Coded: "Not well at all.")

Case 8: The boy indicates a very sincere, loving and affectionate relationship with the mother.

(Coded: "Very well.")

TABLE 4-4
 HOW WELL THE BOYS GET ALONG WITH
 THEIR MOTHERS

How Respondent Gets Along With Mother	Delinquents		Controls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very Well	6	(26.1)	31	(62.0)
Fairley Well	0	. . .	15	(30.0)
Not Too Well	8	(34.8)	2	(4.0)
Not Well at All	9	(39.1)	2	(4.0)
Total	23	(100.0)	50	(100.0)

G = -0.72

Z = -3.70 (Significant at the ,05 level)

As a group, delinquent boys tend to have weak attachments to their mothers. However, the mother-son situations of individual boys tend to vary. For example, the Court records reveal that one mother rejects her son, another mother feels the son is ruining her (social) life, one is not involved with her son, etc. Also, two of the mothers are alcoholics. In general, the Court data reveals that mothers of delinquent boys may reject their sons, maintain limited involvement with them, and some are overburdened with their personal problems to effectively raise their sons. As a response to their negative relationships, a few of the delinquents steal from their mothers, and a few others are verbally hostile to them. Also, one delinquent is physically abusive to his mother. Some of the delinquent boys with weak attachments to their mothers seem to retaliate against them. Many of these reactions seem to be responses to the lack of attention and affection from the mothers.

The quality of the relationship between a mother and her son tends to have a direct relationship to their quality of communication (similar to the father-son relationship). Table 4-5 makes it quite apparent that delinquent boys are much less likely than controls to have an open communication with their mothers. A lopsided 86.4 percent of the delinquent boys compared with 22 percent of the controls have poor communication with their mothers. If there are any elements to a pattern in a parent-son relationship among delinquent boys it lies within the arena of communication between mother and son. The negative relationships between mothers and sons often manifest themselves in the form of hostility and anger as is revealed in seven of the case records. Examples of this behavior are illustrated by cases

TABLE 4-5
 THE ABILITY OF THE BOYS TO TALK
 FREELY TO THEIR MOTHERS

Is the Respondent Able to Talk Freely to His Mother	Delinquents		Non-Delinquents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	3	(13.6)	39	(78.0)
No	19	(86.4)	11	(22.0)
Total	22	(100.0)	50	(100.0)

G = -0.91

Z = -7.20 (Significant at the .05 level)

16 (previously mentioned) and 26 (listed below). An example of a positive mother-son relation is also presented.

Case 26: There is little communication between the boy and his mother, and what little communication there is, is in the form of hostility. The boy has talked of hating his mother. The mother feels that she has taken the hostility that she has for the boy's father out on her son. (Coded: "No.")

Case 27: The subject has a loving relationship with his mother. After the parents divorced, the mother devoted a considerable amount of time with her children to help them during this crisis. (Coded: "Yes.")

Delinquent boys are less likely to believe that their mothers understand them than are boys in the control group (Table 4-6). Some of the mothers of delinquents, as previously stated, are rejecting or are uninvolved with their sons. Also, a few of the mothers downgraded their sons rather than understand them. It may be that the anti-social behavior of the delinquent boys is frustrating to the mother and may further deteriorate the mother-son relationship. Thus, delinquent boys do not seem to take their mothers' advice (Table 4-6). Many of the delinquent boys seem to rebel against both parents, due to the lack of attention and affection they do not receive. The following excerpts illustrate that situations.

Case 10: There is a poor relationship between the mother and her son. The mother does not seem to understand her son in general. In particular, she does not understand his learning disability. (Coded: "Not true of me" to the questionnaire item, "My mother understands me as I really am.")

Case 19: The subject views his relationship with his mother as restrictive and inhibiting. The mother is demanding and treats him in a negative manner. This relationship has made the youth very rebellious toward his mother. He often steals from her.

TABLE 4-6

INDICATIONS FROM THE BOYS THAT THEIR MOTHERS UNDERSTAND THEM, THAT
THEY TAKE THEIR MOTHERS ADVICE, AND IDENTIFY WITH THEIR MOTHERS

Questionnaire Item and Response	Delinquents		Controls		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Respondent's Mother Under- stand Him as He Really is					
Very True	4	(19.0)	13	(26.0)	G = -0.49 Z = -1.83 (Significant at the .05 level)
Somewhat True	4	(19.0)	26	(52.0)	
Not True	13	(61.9)	11	(22.0)	
Total	21	(99.9) *	50	(100.0)	
Respondent Takes Mother's Advice Seriously					
Very True	1	(6.3)	19	(38.0)	G = -0.80 Z = -4.01 (Significant at the .05 level)
Somewhat True	5	(31.3)	25	(50.0)	
Not True	10	(62.5)	6	(12.0)	
Total	16	(100.1) *	50	(100.0)	
Respondent Would Like to Grow Up to Be the Kind of Person His Mother is					
Very True	2	(11.8)	4	(8.0)	G = -0.20 Z = -0.55 (Not signifi- can at the .05 level)
Somewhat True	4	(23.5)	21	(42.0)	
Not True	11	(64.7)	25	(50.0)	
Total	17	(100.0)	50	(100.0)	

*Rounding error.

(Coded: "Not true of me" to the questionnaire item, "My mother understands me as I really am.")

Only one of the ten family-related comparisons between delinquents and controls (Table 4-6) results in a Z score which is not significant. There is no statistically significant difference between delinquents and controls in their likelihood to identify with their mothers. Most likely this has less to do with the quality of the mother-son relationship for controls than with sex identity. It would seem that boys in general prefer to identify with a male role model than a female. Otherwise the controls indicate good relationships and communication with their mothers. This is more difficult to assess for the delinquent boys since they reveal negative relationships, poor communication and little identification with both parents.

Statistically significant differences are found in four measures of attachment to mothers, i.e., how well the boys get along with their mothers and three types of communication between delinquents and controls. The only non-significant difference is found under the variable which is an indice of identification. It is believed that the identification measure is strongly influenced by feelings of sex identification and is less likely to reflect the quality of the social bond between mothers and sons than for fathers and sons. Z scores reject the null hypothesis. There is a fair amount of difference between delinquents and controls in the quality of mother-son attachment. As indicated by the signs of gamma, delinquent boys are less likely to be attached to their mothers than are controls. Thus, the direction of the relationship is also supportive of control theory.

Conclusion

Our empirical data is supportive of control theory. Delinquent boys are less likely to be attached to their parents than are boys in the control group. It is also of interest that the Juvenile Court records reveal a direct relationship to family problems and delinquent behavior. For example, one of the boy's feels like running away when family fights occur and carries the hostilities from family life into the school. Another boy commits delinquent acts when he is angry at his parents. Two of the delinquents commit delinquent acts in order to gain attention. Most interesting is the observation that three of the boys engage in delinquent activities in response to their being put in the middle of their parents' marital arguments.

We can, therefore, directly associate delinquent behavior to family problems in seven cases. There also may be similar situations in other cases which were not recorded in the case records. In Chapter 1 we mentioned that Cohen (1966) contends that deviant behavior in children may act as a warning signal that the family is not functioning to meet the emotional needs of the child. A number of cases provide evidence in support of Cohen's statement. Some of the boys reacted by committing delinquent acts when they wanted attention from their parents or were very angry at them for being caught in family fights or marital arguments. These reactions in the form of delinquency or other forms of misbehavior seem to be immature responses. However, as we have seen, many of the parents have their own personal, marital and other difficulties and have not provided emotional support to their sons nor have they taken the time to socialize them. This lack of attachment and

socialization has left the boys prone to delinquent behavior which, as will be seen, spreads to the school, peer group and the community.

Delinquent boys are less attached to their parents and in some cases there is a direct link between family problems and delinquency. Thus, as Hirschi (1969) maintains, the lack of attachment between a boy and his parents is likely to result in delinquent behavior. The degree of closeness of a boy to his parents is a factor which controls his behavior. Our data on the family is supportive of control theory for white, middle-class boys from suburban communities.

The credibility of control theory would be strengthened if it proves valid when applied to groups outside of the family. Thus, the next two chapters on the school and peer groups respectively, demonstrate this application of the theory. Since youth from an early age spend a large proportion of their time in school, behavioral and academic background should provide good indicators on the validity of control theory.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOL

According to control theory (Hirschi, 1969) our delinquent group should be less attached to the school than the control group. Since the school is a formal organization, the measures of attachment are different than those of a primary group. For example, in the previous chapter, attachments to the family are measured by the quality of interpersonal relationships, i.e., mother-son and father-son. Measures of attachment to the school are not based on interpersonal relationships. Hirschi's indices of attachment are based on abilities, performance and commitment to the school. More specifically, Hirschi suggests a causal chain of events related to the school and delinquency. First, delinquents are more likely to be academically incompetent. This relates to the lack of academic skills rather than low intelligence. Second, academic incompetence leads to low academic achievement. Third, poor achievement causes a dislike for school and a rejection of school authority. The final link in the chain is participation in delinquent acts.

Since our data is not longitudinal, it is not possible to test the causal sequence as suggested by Hirschi. However, there is sufficient information to statistically test academic performance. Some information on academic competence, and rejection or acceptance of school authority is available, but not in sufficient quantity to apply a statistical test. Finally, Hirschi measures attachment to the school in accordance to a student's attitude toward "liking" or "disliking" school. Unfortunately,

this information is not available in either source of our data. But we are able to measure a few important factors related to the academic and behavioral adjustments of the boys. In fact, measures of performance within the school setting are probably as good or better measures of attachment than is the attitude of liking or disliking school. In other words, a boy's actual adjustment to the institution of the school, where he spends a considerable amount of time within a formal setting is likely to be a more accurate indicator of attachment than attitude.

One measure of commitment to the school is the attitude toward educational expectations and aspirations. Aspirations toward educational achievement are very high for the middle-class boys and parents represented by the control group (Table 5-1). Almost all (98 percent) of the boys in the control group expect to go to college. Similarly, 98 percent of the parents of these boys expect their sons to attend college. Another questionnaire item inquires into the aspirations of the controls concerning college. As illustrated in Table 5-2, the aspirations and expectations of these boys are similar. Also, 78 percent of the control agree that they will be accepted by a "good" college, and 70 percent agree that their education will be useful later in life. The high degree of educational aspirations by the controls indicates that they are committed to the school and educational values.

Levels of academic performance are another issue. Although most 96 percent, of the controls report average or higher grades, their parents and teachers have somewhat higher expectations (Table 5-2). One-half of the controls report grades above those of average (as a note of caution, it may be that some of the controls over-estimated their actual per-

TABLE 5-1

ASPIRATIONS BY PARENTS OF CONTROLS FOR THEIR SONS FUTURE EDUCATIONAL GOALS
AND THE ASPIRATIONS OF THE BOYS IN THE CONTROL GROUP

	Aspirations of Parents For Sons in The Control Group		Expectations of Control Group		Aspirations of Controls	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Finish High School	1	(2)	1	(2)	1	(2)
Some College	2	(4)	4	(8)	2	(4)
Two-year College	1	(2)	3	(6)	2	(4)
Four-year College	40	(80)	29	(58)	29	(58)
Graduate Study	6	(12)	13	(26)	16	(32)
Total	50	(100)	50	(100)	50	(100)

TABLE 5-2

EXPECTATIONS OF GRADE RANK BY PARENTS AND TEACHERS:

ACTUAL GRADE RANK BY CONTROLS

	Grade Rank									
	Much Above Average		Above Average		Average		Below Average		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
What Parents Expect of You	15	(24)	29	(58)	9	(18)			50	(100)
What Teachers Expect of you	5	(10)	34	(68)	11	(22)			50	(100)
How Are You Doing	4	(8)	21	(42)	23	(46)	2	(4)	50	(100)

formance levels on the questionnaire). However, 82 percent of the controls reported that their parents expected them to have higher grades, and 78 percent of their teachers also have higher academic expectations of them. This does not diminish the importance of academic achievement, since there are many other aspects to adolescent life. For example, one must consider the influence of peer relationships and outside interests.¹ Also, in a statistical sense, it does not seem possible for about four-fifths of the boys to be above average, as the parents expect. In addition, the importance of achievement is reflected in attitudes which compare popularity and grades. Forty (83.3 percent) of the controls disagree with the statement that "popularity is more important than grades" (two boys did not answer this item).

White middle-class boys from suburbia, as represented by our control group, have high educational aspirations and their academic performance is at a fairly high level of achievement. For example, only 4 percent of the controls reported below average grades. In previous chapters we have seen that the boys in the control group self reported a fair amount of participation in illegal activities, but very little involvement in the juvenile justice system. It has also been demonstrated that 90 percent of the controls also have positive relationships with both parents. In fact, one of the controls who reported a low grade rank, also reported having a very negative relationship with both

¹Fifty-six percent of the controls rated association with their friends as the best part of school. The importance of these peer associations may divert some of their time from academic pursuits. This is, of course, only conjecture, since youth who are unable to maintain adequate peer relationship may also perform below their ability.

parents. In general, the boys in the control group reported a fair degree of academic success, and positive relationships with their parents.

On the other hand, boys in the delinquent group have poor records of academic performance (Table 5-3). Over three-fourths (77.3 percent) of the delinquents who have reports of grades in the case records, have below average grades. Many were actually failing most or all of their subjects. Three of the delinquents (13.6) received average grades and two of them have high academic standing.² There is no indication that any of the delinquents have less than average academic potential. Three of the boys have learning disabilities, yet one has average grades. School reports for eleven of the delinquents have information on intelligence tests, and all eleven rate normal or above average. However, nine of these boys are failing. In general, the delinquent boys all have a very low level of academic achievement. According to the Z score of -5.69, there is a significant relationship between delinquency and poor academic performance, which rejects the null hypothesis. The negative sign of the gamma coefficient is also in the direction which is supportive of control theory. There is not sufficient data to test the null hypothesis related to academic competence from either research group.

Three of the delinquents have learning disabilities. One has neurological dyslexia. These learning disabilities are not necessarily related to intelligence, but do impair an individual's learning. All

²

Two of the delinquents, Cases 11 and 16, were truant too often to receive grades. The coders were unable to agree on a score for Case 17, and Cases 18 and 24 attended private schools which did not report grades.

TABLE 5-3

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS FOR
DELINQUENTS AND CONTROLS

Respondents Level of Academic Achievement	Delinquents		Non-Delinquents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Much Above Average	1	(4.5)	4	(8.0)
Above Average	1	(4.5)	21	(42.0)
Average	3	(13.6)	23	(46.0)
Below Average	17	(77.3)	2	(4.0)
Totals	22	(99.9)*	50	(100.0)

* = Rounding error

G = -0.84

Z = -5.69 (Significant at the .05 level)

three of the boys did improve their school dispositions after their learning disabilities were diagnosed and they were placed in special programs. Some of their school difficulties resulted from the frustrations and embarrassments which they encountered due to their inability to perform on a par with most other students. Examples follow:

Case 3: Youth has average grades and participates in school athletics. He has been disruptive in class, largely due to a problem of hyperactivity and has a one-day suspension for class cutting. As a young child the boy had a serious head injury which resulted in neurological damage. An improvement in his school disposition was made after the school provided specialized counseling and individualized attention in order to remedy his learning disability. This boy has a very good relationship with both parents.
(Coded: "Average" grades.)

Case 23: This youth is also afflicted with the neurological condition of dyslexia. His grade rank is below average (his grades range from average to below average). The youth had serious behavioral problems within the public school he attended. One of his court petitions alleged he extensively damaged (with intent) school property. After placement in a special school for learning disabilities, his over-all school disposition greatly improved.
(Coded: "Below average" grades.)

Not only did the delinquents do poorly in their academic subjects, many of them also had histories of cutting class, truancy, and behavioral difficulties. In Chapter 3, we have already seen that many of the controls also cut classes. For example, 12 percent reported cutting classes "once or twice," 10 percent cut "a few times" and 12 percent cut "often." Since school and academic achievement are supposedly highly esteemed by the middle-class it is somewhat surprising that such a large percent of the controls cut classes. It was especially surprising that 12 percent cut classes "often." However, the attendance problems of the delinquent group are more serious. Fourteen (51.9 percent) of the

delinquent boys have cut classes, according to school records. Six of these fourteen boys also have records (school) for truancy. Another three boys from the delinquent group have records of truancy, but no mention of class cutting. Thus, 62.9 percent of the delinquents have records of attendance problems. It is also interesting to note that five of these delinquent boys were suspended at one time or another for their attendance problems.

Almost twice as many delinquents as controls cut at least one or two classes. Delinquent boys were also more likely to be involved in more serious histories of truancy and class cutting. At least 12 (44.4 percent) are serious truants or class cutters. In comparison, only 12 percent of the controls have cut classes "often." The delinquent boys do not show much commitment to school. They are more likely to have below average grades and avoid academic situations by cutting classes and/or truancy,

Boys from the control group not only have some participation in cutting class, many of them also reported other infractions of school ethics or behavioral standards. Over two-thirds, 70 percent, admitted to cheating on exams. Nineteen (38 percent) of the controls cheated "once or twice," 15 (30 percent) cheated "a few times," and only one (2 percent) cheated "often." Information on cheating is not available in the court records. Although most of the controls cheated, only one boy admits to making a practice of it.

Many of the boys in the control group reported that they had been involved in fist fights within the school. In addition, many also admitted that they had "bothered" teachers. For example, nineteen (38

percent) of the controls engaged in fist fights. There is no measure for frequencies of fist fights on the questionnaire. Misbehavior in the form of "giving a teacher a hard time in class" is reported by 28 (56 percent) of the controls. Frequencies of these incidents are not available on this item, either. There are, however, frequencies on the item "bothered a teacher seriously enough to get thrown out of class." One-third (34 percent) of the controls reported being "thrown out" of a class room. Ten (20 percent) of the controls were dismissed "once or twice," six (12 percent) were removed "a few times," and only one (2 percent) admitted to being "thrown out often." Finally, four (8 percent) of the controls have been suspended. Again, there are no frequencies available on this item. Although boys from the control group have committed their share of school infractions (where frequencies are available), few have been involved in many of these infractions. (See Table 5-4 for a summary of negative school dispositions for delinquents and controls.)

In addition to involvement in truancy and cutting class, delinquent boys are likely to engage in serious incidents of misbehavior within the school. School records within the court files indicate that twenty (74.1 percent) of the delinquent boys are in-school behavior problems. As the example below illustrates, these infractions range from disrupting classrooms, swearing at teachers, using drugs, setting off an explosion and causing a serious injury to another student. For the most part these incidents of misbehavior are not isolated. Many of the delinquents have long histories of disruptive behavior in the school. Attesting to the severity of the misbehavior, seven (25.9 percent) of the

TABLE 5-4

SUMMARY TABLE OF NEGATIVE SCHOOL DISPOSITIONS
FOR DELINQUENTS AND CONTROLS

Disposition	Delinquents		Controls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below Average Grades	17	(77.3)*	2	(4.0)
Cut Class	14	(51.9)	17	(34.0)
Truancy	10	(37.0)	Not Available	
Cheated on Exam	Not Available		35	(70.0)
Suspended	11	(40.7)	4	(8.0)
Expelled	4	(14.8)	Not Available	
Fist Fight in School	Not Available		19	(38.0)
Misconduct	20	(74.1)	Not Available	
Gave Teacher a Hard Time in Class	Not Available		28	(56.0)
Bothered a Teacher Seriously Enough to Get Thrown out of Class	Not Available		17	(34.0)

*Percent calculated on 22 cases where grades are available.

delinquents were suspended for acting-out in the school and four others (14.8 percent) were expelled from school. There are another four boys who were suspended for truancy, only.³ Thus, fifteen (55.5 percent) of the delinquent boys were suspended or expelled from school. Most of the delinquent boys have poor school adjustments in relation to achievement, attendance and behavior. In fact, only two of the delinquent boys are achieving well, and have good records of attendance and behavior.

Examples of poor adjustments to the school follow.

Case 4: The subject tests in the "bright normal" range of intelligence, but is only maintaining a "D" average. There are no reports of problems in grammar school, yet the high school authorities state that he had problems from "day one" (since entering 9th grade). There are reports of fighting with other students in school and class disruptions. He displays a considerable amount of hostility toward the faculty and other members of the school staff. Also, one of the subject's court petitions is for truancy and two of his friends are known to be truants.

Case 12: The scores from intelligence tests for this boy are above average. His overall records in grammar school were very good until the 8th grade, when he began to bully other students. The boy's adjustment in high school was totally unsatisfactory. His grades were below average and he had over 200 class cuts during his first two years of high school. In fact, one of his court petitions is for truancy. The subject was suspended twice and eventually expelled from public high school. He pulled a knife on one student and seriously injured another. He was also expelled from a private school for the use of marijuana.

Case 16: It was not possible to code an academic grade average for this boy. His scholastic work was very good, but his grades were also dependent upon his attendance, which was very poor. At the time of court referral, the youth was in the 9th grade. He has been a discipline problem since the 7th grade. The subject has a number of suspensions and was eventually expelled from high school. Offenses committed on school grounds include: possession of

³One boy was suspended for both truancy and misbehavior.

marijuana, theft and setting off an explosion outside of the school building.

Qualitative data from the juvenile court archives also reveal another interesting factor, many of the delinquents were placed outside the general school program(s). Previously, we mentioned three of the delinquent boys were placed in special schools or programs for learning disabilities. One of these boys was also expelled from public school for behavior problems. Two delinquent boys were placed in night school programs, after failing to adjust to the regular day school. School officials placed three of the delinquents in specialized programs for in-school behavior problems, which are separate from the general school programs. One boy attended a special school program (outside of public school, but within the school district) for treatment of hyperactivity. Placements were made for two boys in private boarding schools which specialize in youth with behavioral problems. Another three boys were placed in residential treatment centers or hospitals for psychological and behavioral problems. Finally, three of the boys were committed to the Illinois Department of Corrections. One of these latter three boys had previously been placed in a work-study program, due to a lack of motivation in the regular school program. In all, seventeen (63 percent) of the delinquent boys have been removed from the general school program for numerous reasons. At least fourteen of these boys were placed outside of the general school program largely due to their misbehavior, as demonstrated by the following excerpts:

Case 1: Youth is failing all of his subjects, although his intelligence tests are above average. He has been suspended from school for cutting over 60 classes. The subject has a hostile attitude toward school and its

authorities. As the boy states, 'school is jail . . . it's a bunch of crap with the rules and regulations'. He was eventually placed in a special program for behavior problems.

Case 7: The subject has a history of showing off and disrupting classrooms in both grammar and high schools. His only motivation in school is the threat of physical punishment from his father. A school report states that the boy is angry at his parents and other authority figures. During high school, the boy began to cut classes and failed most of his subjects. His school disposition improved greatly after he was placed in a special school program. The subject looked up to his teacher as a father figure which proved to be a turning point for the boy.

Case 24: The youth is one year behind in school and also has a long history of in-school behavioral problems. The court records are lacking details, but due to his behavior problems, the boy was placed in a number of private boarding schools for about seven years. There was a dramatic improvement in the boy's overall disposition after he was returned to his family and placed in a local, private school.

Not all of the delinquent boys have poor school dispositions. Two of them have excellent scholastic records. Comparison of the two boys does present somewhat of a paradox. One boy, Case 8, has many positive influences outside the school, i.e., relationships with parents and non-delinquent peers. The other boy, Case 18, has severely negative relationships with both parents, and his peers are involved in delinquency and drugs. The school disposition of the latter boy does not conform to most other boys from both research groups. Generally, there is a direct relationship between positive relationships with parents and satisfactory (average grades or better) academic performance.

Case 8: This young man has maintained an above average grade level and was placed on the low honor roll (at his high school). His attendance has always been excellent and he participates on a few athletic teams at school. The boy does have a history of a few fights with other students in

both grammar and high school. Future plans include attending college. Outside of two court petitions (no community adjustments), there appear to be no serious negative aspects in the subject's family life or peer associations. However, the probation officer assigned to the case stated that the family offered information in the form of 'lip service'.

Case 18: The subject is a brilliant student and ranks at the very top of his high school class. In all probability, he will complete his high school education in less than four years. The boy is highly motivated in school and is often praised by school officials. There are many negative aspects in the subject's family life and peer associations.

School adjustments of boys in the control group are relatively satisfactory when compared to those of the delinquent boys. According to their self-reported behavior, controls engaged in some cheating on examinations, cut classes, and bothered teachers. However, only a few of them indicated frequent involvement in these violations and only 8 percent have suspensions from school. For the most part controls have high aspirations for future educational attainment and have maintained average or better achievement. Only 4 percent reported that they have below average grades. Without knowledge of their attitude toward the institution of the school (whether they like it or dislike it), it is apparent that education is important to the controls and their parents. Generally, these boys seem to have sufficient control over their behavior and do not jeopardize their role in the educational system. Their performance and aspirations strongly indicate that they are attached to the school and educational process.

On the other hand, the boys represented in the delinquent group, generally maintain unsatisfactory academic and behavioral adjustments to the school. Over three-fourths of the delinquents are achieving below

average grades, 63 percent have records for class cutting and/or truancy. Also, three-fourths of the delinquents are behavior problems in the school and just over one-half have been placed in a variety of special school programs due to their behavioral problems.

There are no similarities in academic achievement and behavioral adjustments to the school between the delinquent and control groups. Differences in academic achievement between the two research groups are statistically significant. Although there is not a sufficient amount of information to statistically test competence and respect for school authority, the information which is available lies in the direction of little similarity. Finally, there is no measure of liking or disliking school (Hirschi's indice of attachment). However, the available data indicates that delinquent boys are much less committed to the school on the basis of performance and behavior than are controls. The null hypothesis is statistically rejected through the indice of academic performance. While a statistical test is not possible on the other school related variables due to missing data, such variables also suggest differences between the two groups.

In conclusion, we find a few very interesting correlations between school dispositions and the quality of the child-parent relationships. Thirteen (76.5 percent) of the seventeen delinquent boys who have below average grades also have negative relationships with both parents. One of the two boys in the control group with below average grades has negative relationships with both parents. Also, each of the four delinquents who were expelled from school, and eleven (78.6 percent) of the fourteen delinquent boys placed in programs outside of the regular school

program have poor relationships with both parents. In contrast, forty-eight (96 percent) of the controls report average or better grades, and forty-five (93.8 percent) of them have positive relationships with both parents. There is a direct relationship between weak attachments to the parents and weak attachments to the school. However, it is not possible to determine a causal sequence from the available data. For example, do weak bonds to the parents cause weak attachments to the school, or do poor attachments to the school result in poor child-parent relationships?

CHAPTER VI

THE PEER GROUP

Control theory (Hirschi, 1969) and the theory of differential association (Sutherland, 1947) have been selected to examine the relationship between delinquency and peer associations. According to Hirschi, control theory, as related to peer associations, emphasizes the following: first, delinquents are attracted to one another through similar attitudes and "stakes" in conventional society. It is believed that delinquent groups do not recruit nor necessarily influence the behavior of their members. Rather, individuals who already have low "stakes" in conformity and engage in delinquent behavior seek each other. Due to the limits of the available data, we are able to operationalize whether or not boys in the delinquent and control groups associate with delinquent peers. But, there is not sufficient information on the boys who associate with delinquent peers to indicate whether they were involved in delinquent behavior prior to their associations with delinquent peers or to determine if their delinquent behavior is influenced by peer associations. It is likewise not possible to determine the influence which non-delinquent peers have on relative conformity to conventional society.

Second, control theory stipulates that delinquents are less likely to be attached to their peers than youth with conventional standards of conformity. There is sufficient data to measure the attachment to peers for all of the boys in the control group. Unfortunately, this informa-

tion is available for only about one-half of the delinquent boys.

While a statistical test is not advisable, due to the amount of missing values on the delinquent group, it is possible to at least explore this factor.

The principal of the theory of differential association, according to Sutherland (1947), is that delinquents associate with delinquents. This factor is compatible with control theory. However, the two theories differ in that differential association assumes delinquent behavior is learned through association with delinquents. Consequently, the more one associates with delinquents, the more likely he is to become involved in delinquency. As stated above, Hirschi does not agree that delinquent behavior is learned or greatly influenced by peer associations. However, due to limitation of the data it is not possible to determine whether delinquent behavior occurs prior to associations with delinquent peers or if it results from a learning process. Thus, we are not in a position to evaluate which theory best explains delinquency among white, middle-class boys. We may only investigate the type of peer associations (are peers ". . . into trouble with the police" and/or "into the drug scene") maintained by both research groups.

Hypothesis: Delinquents are not more likely to associate with delinquent peers than are controls.

Table 6-1 clearly demonstrates that the hypothesis is rejected and that differential association plays an important role in understanding white middle-class delinquency among boys in the suburbs. As the table illustrates, only one (2 percent) of the controls reported that he associates with peers who ". . . get into trouble with the

police," and one other control associates with peers who are ". . . into the drug scene." On the other hand, the delinquents take the other extreme. Almost 85 percent of the delinquent boys associate with youth who have contacts with the police. Similarly, over 81 percent of the delinquents associate with peers who abuse drugs. The Z scores (31.65 for ". . . trouble with the police," and 21.97 for ". . . into the drug scene") are highly significant at the .05 level and reveal that delinquents are more likely to associate with delinquents than are controls. Furthermore, the extremely high gamma scores 0.99 (for both variables) and the signs also indicate that the null hypothesis should be rejected.

If the results in Table 6-1 are taken at their face value, it would seem that differential association is a most convincing theoretical explanation of white middle-class delinquency. However, some caution about the impressive explanatory powers of this theory should be taken into account. For example, the type of peers, i.e., delinquents or non-delinquents, with which one associates is just part of the theory. Another major element of differential association is the quantity of time spent with delinquents and/or non-delinquents. There is not sufficient data from either the control or the delinquent groups to test this feature of the theory. While it is quite apparent that the delinquent boys generally associate with peers who "are in trouble with the police" and/or "are into the drug scene," and controls do not have such associations; the amount of time spent with delinquent and non-delinquent peers is unknown for both groups.

Although almost all of the boys in the control group responded that they did not associate with peers who "are in trouble with the

TABLE 6-1

PEER INVOLVEMENT WITH THE POLICE AND THE DRUG SCENE

FOR DELINQUENTS AND CONTROLS

Do Peers Get Into Trouble with the Police	Delinquents		Controls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	19	(84.4)	1	(2.0)
No	3	(13.6)	49	(98.0)
Total	22	(100.0)	50	(100.0)

G = 0.99

Z = 25.26 (Significant at the .05 level)

Are Peers Into the Drug Scene?	Delinquents		Controls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	13	(81.3)	1	(2.1)
No	3	(18.8)	47	(97.9)
Total	16	(100.1)*	48	(100.0)

G = 0.99

Z = 21.56 (Significant at the .05 level)

*Rounding error.

police" nor "are into the drug scene," their peers did engage in deviant activities. For example Table 6-2 illustrates responses by boys in the control group regarding the proportion of peers who have engaged in a selected list of deviant activities. Similar to the self reported delinquent behavior by controls as reviewed in Chapter 3, many of their peers have participated in a wide-range of both hedonistic and non-hedonistic delinquent activities. Over one-half of the controls reported that at least some of their peers participated in the following non-hedonistic activities: "taken something from a store," (68 percent); "kept or used something stolen," (56 percent); and "had fist fight," (88 percent). There is also considerable involvement by peers of controls in a few hedonistic activities. Seventy percent of the controls had some peers who "drank;" 90 percent of their peers "made anonymous phone calls," and about 65 percent "deliberately damaged property."

It may be possible that peers of the control group extend pressure to limit relatively serious involvement in deviant activities which lead to police involvement. This same pressure may also limit involvement in serious drug abuse, except for that of alcohol. It is also likely that the close bonds to their parents, as reported by controls, place limits on the extent of participation in delinquent behavior. On the other hand, it is also possible that the peer group is a source of influence for deviant behavior among the boys in the control group. For example, the controls reported considerable involvement in deviant activities by themselves and their peers. Thus, we may ask, but cannot substantiate, due to the lack of information; do white middle-class peer groups influence deviant behavior and/or set limits on the extent of deviance?

Twenty three (85.2 percent) of the delinquent boys associate with

TABLE 6-2

INVOLVEMENT BY THE PEERS OF THE CONTROL GROUP IN SELECTED DEVIANT ACTIVITIES

	All of Them		Half or More		Less Than Half		None		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Took Something from a Store	1	(2)	7	(14)	26	(52)	16	(32)	50	(100)
Took at Least \$20.00			1	(2)	10	(20.4)	38	(77.6)	49	(100)
Kept/Used Something Stolen	1	(2)	4	(8)	23	(46)	22	(44)	50	(100)
Broke in to Steal			1	(2)	7	(14)	42	(84)	50	(100)
Had Fist Fight	7	(14)	10	(20)	27	(54)	6	(12)	50	(100)
Took Part in Gang Fight			2	(4.1)	9	(18.4)	38	(77.6)	49	(100.1) *
Used/Threatened Force			1	(2)	5	(10)	44	(88)	50	(100)
Sold Drugs					7	(14.6)	41	(85.4)	48	(100)
Joyriding	1	(2)			3	(6)	46	(92)	50	(100)
Reckless Driving	4	(8)	3	(6)	15	(30)	28	(56)	50	(100)
Drank Without Permission	5	(10)	13	(26)	17	(34)	15	(30)	50	(100)
Used Marijuana	1	(2.1)	3	(6.3)	13	(27.1)	31	(64.6)	48	(100.1) *
Made Anonymous Phone Call	8	(16)	16	(32)	21	(42)	5	(10)	50	(100)
Delibertely Damaged Property			6	(12.2)	26	(53.1)	17	(34.7)	49	(100)

*Rounding error

peers who are in relatively serious trouble with the police (and courts) and/or abuse drugs. Of the other four delinquents, the peers of one are not involved with the police and drugs. Another delinquent is a "loner" and has no close peer associations, and two case records have insufficient information on peer relations.

Thus, we have observed the white middle-class boys represented in the delinquent group are very likely to associate with other delinquents. It is also interesting to note that twelve of the thirteen delinquent boys who associate with peers involved in serious drug abuse also associated with peers who are involved with the police. There appears to be a close association between delinquent and drug oriented peer groups. However, the Juvenile Court records do not provide details as to whether or not the delinquent and drug oriented peers are in the same or different groups. There are seven delinquents who associate with peers involved in serious delinquent activities, but not in drugs and one delinquent boy associates with drug-abusing peers, but does not socialize with other delinquents.

Due to the limitations of the data we cannot make any conclusions concerning influences of the delinquent peer group. For example, are the boys in the delinquent group influenced by delinquent peers or do they influence their peers to engage in illegal activities? Although no conclusions are possible, the few examples which follow provide insight into the matter.

Case 6: Information from the police indicates that the youth's 'biggest problem' is his peers.

Case 9: Many of the boy's peers have been in trouble with the police; a few are wards of the Juvenile Court. The boy's peers seem to

contribute to his difficulties.

Case 27: Most of the peers of this youth are known to the police and the Juvenile Court. This boy and his peers are also into the drug scene. It is noted in the case record that the subject's peers have a negative influence over him.

Hirschi (1969) implies that there are two important factors to be considered when applying control theory to the peer group. First, is a commitment to either delinquent or conforming behavior. Accordingly, youth who associate with delinquents would not be considered as committed or attached to society. This is similar to the feature of differential association which contends that delinquents associate with delinquents. The data in Table 6-1 applies to this factor of control theory. As previously discussed, delinquents do associate with other delinquents, and controls do not associate with peers involved with the police.

A second factor of control theory is the quality of the social bonds which delinquents and controls maintain with peers. There is sufficient data on this subject in the Institute for Juvenile Research study (the control group). On the other hand, there are only thirteen case records from the Juvenile Court with sufficient information on the quality of social bonds with peers. Thus, there are too few cases with sufficient information from the delinquent group to make a credible statistical analysis. However, as limited in quantity as this information may be, it is sufficient to provide an interesting comparison.

All of the boys in the control group responded to the following questionnaire item, "Of the kids you go around with most often, how many do you consider close friends (kids you can discuss a personal problem with)." Only 8 percent responded that they are not close to any of

their peers. Most (56 percent) stated that they are close to "a few" of their peers. The remaining 36 percent responded that they are close to somewhere between "one-half" to "all" of their peers. Thus, 92 percent of the controls claimed to have at least a few close friends. The control group almost conforms to the ideal situation of non-delinquents as posed by control theory. Generally they do not associate with youth who are in "trouble with the police" or "are into the drug scene." They are also able to maintain close bonds with at least a few peers.

Many valuable insights into the quality of relationships between boys in the delinquent group and their peers are possible with as few as thirteen cases. This is possible, since eleven of the delinquents (or 40.7 percent of the total delinquent group) have poor relationships with their peers. Compared to the control group, which has 8 percent of the boys responding that they do not have any close friends, delinquents are at least five times as likely to have weak bonds with their peers. This finding is consistent with Hirschi's (1969) hypothesis. The following excerpts from the Juvenile Court records are examples of the quality of peer relationships for some of the delinquent boys:

Case 2: Some of this boy's peers are wards of the Court and he is into the drug culture. However, he does not get along well with peers. The subject is manipulative and is inconsiderate to others, including peers. He is not well liked by peers.

Case 16: At least three of his peers are involved with the court. Delinquent activities usually occur with peers. It is stated that peers are a poor influence on the subject. However, youth does not get along with peers, and has difficulties in communicating with them. Youth was not properly socialized.

Case 21: Many of the subject's peers have had contacts with the police and are involved in the drug culture. However, the subject never had any close friends,

and does not get along with his classmates.

Further analysis of the eleven delinquent boys who have weak attachments to their peers also reveals that most have weak attachments to their parents and the school. For example, nine of the boys have poor relationships with both parents and the remaining two are close to one parent. These boys fair no better in their attachments to the school. Eight have below average grades and there is no sufficient information to judge academic achievement levels for the other three. It is also noteworthy that seven of these delinquents have poor attachments to both of their parents and are performing poorly in school. Another boy has a poor relationship with his mother and has below average grades.

The boys in the delinquent group are very likely to have associations with peers who have been in trouble with the police and/or are involved in drug abuse. But they do not seem likely to have close attachments to their delinquent or non-delinquent peers. White, middle-class, delinquent, peer groups do not seem to be close-knit. In fact, the delinquent boys, in general, do not seem to be well attached to either their parents, the school or their peers. Our modest conclusion that delinquent boys do not have warm personal relationships with peers is also shared by Hirschi (1969) and Short and Strodbeck (1965).

Another important feature of the adolescent peer group is the selection of members. In an earlier reference to Kerckhoff (1972), it is stated that adolescent peer groups are likely to engage in forms of deviant behavior. Also, many adolescent peer groups set limitations on the types and seriousness of deviant acts committed by members. In

other words, the adolescent peer group establishes and enforces its own set of moral standards. It seems possible that individuals who seriously violate the moral boundaries of a particular group are likely to be excluded from membership in that group. Thus, we believe that boys with overt patterns of delinquent behavior are likely to be excluded from most adolescent peer groups on the basis of their behavior. It is also possible that the weak social bonds maintained between many of the delinquent boys, their parents, and the school have left them ill-equipped to enter into close social relationships with most other adolescents.

There is some indication that the delinquent boys are very limited in their choice of peer associations. Many of the delinquents do not seem to be accepted by most other adolescents. It seems as if the selection of peer associations by many of the delinquent boys is reduced to others with similar delinquent and drug abusing patterns of behavior. Yet, there seems to be a desire by many of the delinquent boys to be socially accepted by peers, even if they are delinquent. The excerpts listed below express the desire to be accepted:

Case 10: The subject is rejected by and alienated from many of the other students in his school. Other students consider him to be 'dumb' due to his poor academic performance (a result of a learning disability). Eventually, he began to associate with other youth who are 'angry and rejected'.

Case 15: The subject and his peers often drink and smoke marijuana. His peers often challenge him to steal. He usually gains attention from peers through his acting-out behavior. However, he is not very close to his peers and is somewhat of a loner.

Case 23: Youth seems to be a loner. He states that he has no close friends. The incident which brought him before the court, may have been partly a result of gaining attention from peers.

There are vast differences in peer relationships between the delinquent and control groups. First, it is evident that boys in the delinquent group associate with peers who are "in trouble with the police" and/or "are into the drug scene." Although the peers of many boys in the control group have been involved in deviant activities, they are not involved with the police. The theory of differential association is strongly supported by the data. However, there is one note of caution: we do not have information on the amount of time the boys from either group spend with both delinquent or relatively non-delinquent boys. Second, we found that delinquent boys were less likely to have any close friends than are controls. Finally, it seems that adolescent peer groups use behavior patterns, i.e., delinquent or non-delinquent, as a criteria of membership. Individual peer groups may participate in deviant behavior, but many also seem to set moral standards which limit the extent or seriousness of deviant activities.

Thus, white, middle-class delinquent boys from the suburbs form separate peer associations from boys not involved with the police or with the "drug culture." It seems as if the delinquent boys are rejected by relatively non-delinquent peers. It also seems that the delinquent boys do not have adequate social skills necessary to maintain good peer relationships. As we have seen in previous chapters, most of the delinquent boys have weak attachments to both their parents and the school. Controls, on the other hand, have strong attachments. Therefore, the controls are more likely to bring a history of good social relationships into the adolescent peer group than are delinquents. The serious anti-social activities of the delinquent boys may

also be seen as a liability by non-delinquent peers and serve as a source of rejection. In general, the delinquent boys experience different social situations than do boys in the control group. Delinquents tend to have weaker social bonds to the family, school and peer group. It also seems that controls have a greater stake in conventional society. This is evidenced by the fact that they and their peers are much less likely to have contacts with the juvenile justice system. Controls do commit delinquent acts, as revealed by the self reports, but they seem to limit their deviant behavior to less serious infractions of the law than those committed by the delinquent boys.

In the next chapter we will investigate the relevance of containment theory as an explanation of white middle-class delinquency. It is interesting to note that many of the factors which are important to control theory are also relevant to containment theory. There also are some differences between the two theories.

CHAPTER VII

CONTAINMENT THEORY

The final theory to be tested as a possible explanation of white middle-class delinquency among suburban boys is that of containment. Pioneered by Reckless (1961, 1967 and 1970) and others, i.e., Reckless, Dinitz and Murray (1956), Reckless, Dinitz and Kay (1967), and Dinitz, Scarpitti and Reckless (1962), the theory is based on external (outer) containment and inner containment. Essentially, external containment refers to the moral restraints exerted by primary groups, especially the family, over its members. External constraint is effective, if the members conform to the group's normative standards. Inner containment is the ability of the inner-self to conform to the constraints of outer containment.

Reckless and his co-researchers believe that the family is the major component of external containment. In this respect, containment and control theories are similar. Both theories are based upon the quality of social bonds youth hold with significant others. If the bonds are strong the group is more likely to control or contain a youth's behavior to conform to the group norms. In effect a youth with strong bonds would not be likely to jeopardize his/her relationships by violating group norms. On the other hand a youth with weak attachments has less to lose by violating the norms. In Chapter 6 we have already demonstrated that there are statistically significant differences in the quality of social bonds between delinquents and controls. Delinquent

boys have weaker attachments to their parents than control. Another index of external control which we are able to measure, is identification with group members. Delinquents were found to identify significantly less with their fathers than controls. However, both research groups have relatively low levels of identity with their mothers. It is thought that this latter variable is a measure of sex identity and it seems probable that boys would identify less with a female role model.

Inner containment is considered more important than its external counter-part in mobile, industrialized societies, according to Reckless (1970). The basis of inner containment is relative strength of the self. An important index which can be operationalized through our data is the self-concept.¹ It is assumed that delinquents have lower self-concepts than controls. The inner component of containment theory, however, is not compatible to control theory since Hirschi (1969: 86-88) gives little importance to the self as a cause or influence of delinquent behavior.

Hypothesis: There is no difference in self-concepts between delinquents and controls.

¹In addition to the studies by Reckless and his co-researchers, Jensen (1973) found that a positive self-concept is related to positive relationships between youth and their parents. Jensen and Voss (1969) also found that peer relationships have an effect on the quality of one's self-concept. Thus, both Jensen and Voss recommend that containment and differential association together provide a better causal explanation of delinquency than either theory by itself. Finally, Waldo (1967) and Freese (1972) found a direct relationship between positive self-concept and high academic achievement. These studies reveal a direct relationship between positive self-concept, and positive family relationships, peer group relationships and high academic achievement. Reckless indicates that external and inner containments are separate entities.

Before comparing the self images of the delinquent boys and controls, the measures of self-image for both groups will be discussed. First, self-images of boys in the control group were measured on a scale of nine items (Table 7-1). This scale of self-concept was devised by the Institute for Juvenile Research for the "Youth in Illinois" study. The self-image of each boy is based upon the mean score of all nine items. The mean scores are classified as either "high," "medium," or "low" self concepts.

A review of the responses to the nine questionnaire items which comprise the self-concept scale (Table 7-1) reveals that many of the control have some doubts, reservations, insecurities, etc., about themselves. For example, most of the controls (about 90 percent) wished to change "some things" about themselves, and 58 percent were afraid that someone is going to make fun of them. It does not seem very surprising that adolescents would want to make some changes about themselves, since adolescence is a transitional period from childhood to adulthood. It is also likely that pressures of scholastic achievement and acceptance by peers would cause an adolescent (or others) to become apprehensive if he thought someone would make fun of him.

Many of the controls have some concerns about their personal abilities. About one-half (51 percent) feel there are times when they cannot learn. Fifty percent also responded that they are stopped "every" time or some times when they try to get ahead. However, 73.5 percent believe that hard work is more important than good luck in achieving success. It is also noteworthy that 77.1 percent of the controls responded "not true" and the remainder responded "somewhat

TABLE 7-1

SCALE OF SELF IMAGE INDICES FOR THE BOYS OF THE CONTROL GROUP

Questionnaire Item	Very True of Me		Somewhat True of Me		Not True of Me		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
	I Really Enjoy Life	18	(36)	32	(64)			50
I Feel Tense Most of the Time	6	(12)	19	(38)	25	(50)	50	(100)
I Find Life an Endless Series of Problems with No Solutions in Sight	5	(10)	17	(34)	28	(56)	50	(100)
I am Afraid Someone is Going to Make Fun of Me	12	(24)	17	(34)	21	(42)	50	(100)
I Sometimes Feel that I Just Can't Learn	3	(6.1)	22	(44.9)	24	(49)	49	(100)
Good Luck is More Important than Hard Work for Success	1	(2)	12	(24.5)	36	(73.5)	49	(100)
Every Time I try to Get Ahead Something Stops Me	4	(8.3)	20	(41.7)	24	(50)	48	(100)
People Like Me Don't Have Much of a Chance to be Successful in Life			11	(22.9)	32	(77.1)	48	(100)
There Are Many Things About Myself I would Like to Change	18	(36.7)	26	(53.1)	5	(10.2)	49	(100)

true" to the item: "people like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life." Although many of the controls indicate some frustrations about learning and "getting ahead," they have strong feelings that they have good chances of being "successful in life."

Finally, there are three items which relate to general emotional states. Fifty percent of the controls relate that they have tense feelings (12 percent feel tense most of the time and 38 percent feel tense some of the time). Similarly, 10 percent responded "very true" and 34 percent responded "somewhat true" to the statement, "I find life an endless series of problems with no solutions in sight." However, all of the controls have at least some enjoyment of life. For example, 36 percent responded, "very true" and 64 percent responded, "somewhat true" to the item, "I really enjoy life."

In general, many of the controls are concerned about their abilities and social acceptance, and many report having some tension and problems. It appears that these white middle-class, adolescent males face many pressures and challenges in their social and academic environments. However, the frustrations, pressures, and other obstacles of life seem to be offset by strong feelings of future success and an enjoyment of life. As indicated in Table 7-2, 32 percent of the controls have a relatively high self-concept, 64 percent have a medium score and only 4 percent have a low self-concept.²

²The possible range of individual self-concept scores for boys in the control group is from 1.0 (low) to 3.0 (high). The actual range is 1.22 to 2.89 and the mean score is 2.26. The quality of self-concept is as follows: low = 1.0 to 1.54, medium = 1.6 to 2.39, and high = 2.4 to 3.0

It is not possible to relate the nine-item scale which measures self-concept for controls to boys in the delinquent group. However, there is information in the court records, mainly psychological narratives, which summarize levels of self-concept. It is possible to code self-concepts for fifteen delinquent boys as being either "high," "medium," or "low." Thus, self-concepts of boys from both research groups may be scored on a similar scale and compared. A few examples of self-concept summaries for delinquent boys follows:

Case 1: Youth has feelings of hopelessness, defeatism, inadequacy and self-depreciation. He is extremely anxious. The boy has a weak ego structure, low productive resources and will not face up to his problem. One report states that the subject acts out in an effort to reassume his masculine adequacy. He is impulsive and emotionally immature and fixated at age seven.

This young man seems to know the correct thing to do in the ethical sense, but his antagonism and hostile attitude warp his practical judgment. He has a strong need to receive affection from others. He is lonely and depressed.
(Coded: "low" self-concept)

Case 7: Youth's low self-concept is a result of being rejected by his parents. The parents with the aide of a sibling criticize and tease the subject, and use him as a scapegoat. The boy seems frustrated and depressed.
(Coded: "low" self-concept)

Case 15: This young man has a negative self-concept. He feels inferior, weak, worthless and is easily intimidated. He is immature and impulsive and seeks attention and status from peers. This acting out has tended to be hostile, destructive and sometimes sadistic.
(Coded: "Low" self-concept)

Case 22: Although the youth has been tense, and had some anger with his parents and had some feelings of insecurity, he was able to improve his situation. Improvements were made in the family and school,

and he developed a few positive outside interests. This ability to improve his situation along with the understanding of his parents is indicative of a good self-image.

(Coded: "medium" self-concept.)

Self-concepts of delinquents and controls are compared in Table 7-2. It is evident that the controls are much more likely to have medium or high self-concepts than are delinquents. The mode of self-concept scores falls within the median range, which represents almost two-thirds (64 percent) of the boys in the control group. Almost one-third (32 percent) of the controls have high self-concepts and only 4 percent have low scores. This contrasts sharply with the self-concepts of the delinquent boys. The modal category of self-concept for the delinquents is "low." Of the case records which include self-concept evaluations, 86.7 percent fall in the "low" range. Only one of the delinquents has a medium score and another has a high self-concept.

There is no similarity between self-concept scores of delinquent boys and controls. The Z score of 6.41 is significant at the .05 level, which indicates that significant differences in self-concept exist between the two groups. Also, the gamma coefficient of -0.89 verifies that a strong positive relationship exists between delinquency and low self-concept. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

As Table 7-2 illustrates, thirteen (86.7 percent) of the boys in the delinquent group (who have sufficient data on self-concept in the court records) and only two (4 percent) of the controls have poor self-concepts. As a note of interest, there was only one negative relationship among the two controls, one boy has a negative relationship with his mother. However, the delinquent boys with "low" self-concepts have

TABLE 7-2

SELF CONCEPTS OF DELINQUENTS AND CONTROLS

Self Concept of Respondents	Delinquents		Controls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	1	(6.7)	16	(32.0)
Medium	1	(6.7)	32	(64.0)
Low	13	(86.7)	2	(4.0)
Totals	15	(100.1)*	50	(100.0)

G = -0.89

Z = 6.29 (Significant at the .05 level)

*Rounding error

many weak attachments to the family, school and peers. For example, eleven of these boys have weak attachments to both parents and a twelfth delinquent has a weak attachment to the father only. Also, eleven delinquents have below average grades and ten associate with delinquent peers and/or drug abusers. In addition, eight of the delinquent boys with poor self-concepts have a combination of weak attachments to both parents, below average grades, and associate with delinquents and/or drug abusers.

Forty-eight (96 percent) of the controls and only two (13.3 percent) of the delinquents have positive self-concepts. The controls with positive self-concepts also have strong bonds to conventional society. For example, forty-two (87.8 percent) have strong attachments to both parents and the school, and do not associate with peers who are "in trouble with the police" or "into the drug scene." However, two (4.2 percent) of the controls with positive self-concepts have weak attachments to both parents, and another two have weak attachments to only one parent. Only two of the controls with positive self-concepts reported below average grades, and two associate with delinquent or drug abusing peers. In reference to the two delinquent boys with positive self-concepts, one has a negative relationship with his mother, while the other has below average grades and associates with delinquent peers.

Empirical results of this study lend support to containment theory. The most important component of the theory is inner-containment, which is measured by the quality of self-concept. The present study found that boys in the control group have significantly higher

self-concepts than the boys in the delinquent group. According to the theory, positive parental ties are, also, directly related to positive self-concepts. Our results concluded that 91.7 percent of the controls with positive self-concepts have positive relationships with both parents. On the other hand, 84.6 percent of the delinquents with negative self-concepts have weak relationships with their parents. Outer containment is not as well defined as inner containment. However, the findings of this study reveal that delinquents with poor self-concepts are more likely to associate with other delinquents and drug abusing peers than controls with positive self concepts.³ Thus, a positive self-concept may be considered an insulator from the pressures and pulls of unconventional society.

³There is also evidence that positive levels of academic achievement and associations with relatively non-delinquent peers are related to positive self-concepts. For example, 95.8 percent of the controls with positive self-concepts have average or better grades, and 95.8 percent do not associate with delinquent or drug abusing peers. Therefore, positive self-concepts are related to the quality of peer relationships and average or above average levels of academic achievement.

CHAPTER VIII

COMBINED EFFECTS OF PARENTAL RELATIONSHIPS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, PEER ASSOCIATIONS AND SELF-CONCEPT ON DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

The previous four chapters provide empirical support for three theories (control, containment and differential association) which, at least partially, provide explanations for delinquent behavior among white middle-class boys from suburbia. This support is based upon 13 independent variables which are related to delinquency (supported by their association signs of gamma and significant Z scores). Another method of explaining delinquent behavior is through a multivariate technique. The advantage of a multivariate technique is that it offers a more encompassing analysis of the adolescent social environment than is possible through a single independent variable.

Discriminant analysis is a statistical technique which is well suited to measure the combined effects of a group of variables. Its value for the purpose of this study is that discriminant analysis has the ability to determine the set of independent variables which best differentiate the delinquent and control groups. This technique may also serve as a model to predict behavior outcomes based on selected variables.¹

Data entered into the computation of a discriminant analysis includes scores for each selected, independent variable for each case

¹The discriminant analysis utilized in this chapter is adapted from The Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (cf. Nie, et al., 1975).

in both research groups. As stated previously, selection into one of the research groups is based on whether or not the subject is under court supervision, an agent of social control. All of the boys in the delinquent group are under court supervision. Boys in the control groups, with a possible exception of one, are not under such supervision. Thus, for illustrative purposes (Figures 8-1 and 8-2), delinquents are designated as group one (1), and controls as group two (2).

Careful consideration must be given to the selection of independent variables which are entered into a discriminant analysis. For this study, it is important that the theories of control, containment and differential association be represented in the selection of independent variables. Therefore, indices of the family, school, peer group and self-concept are required. However, precautions must be taken to prevent multicollinearity. For example, the two variables: "peers in trouble with the police" and "peers into the drug scene" are similar measures of peer associations. In fact, in the case of the delinquent boys, both variables refer to the same peer group(s). Thus, if both variables are entered, they would in effect measure the same phenomena twice, and artificially increase the magnitude of the effects of peer associations. Only one of the variables, "peers in trouble with the police" was selected. This item has fewer missing values than does the peer drug item. Also, all of the delinquent boys, except one (where information is available), who associate with "peers into the drug scene" also associate with "peers in trouble with the police."

Similarly, there are five variables regarding the father-son relationship which have statistically significant differences. There are only four variables which meet the above criteria for the mother-son relationship. It was thought to enter one variable for both the father-son and the mother-son relationships, since many previous studies (Chapter 1) indicate that important differences exist in the relationships with each parent. Three variables which measure: (1) the perceptions of how well the boys believe that their parents understand them; (2) whether or not they take their parents advice and (3) how closely the boys identify with their parents were not entered. These variables are the most difficult to code and have the most missing values. The variable, "How well do you get along with your father/mother," was selected over the variable, "Are you able to talk freely with your mother/father." This former variable seems to be the best measure of the social bond and is based on a scale of four possible ranks (more than the other parent-child variables).

In total, five independent variables are entered into the discriminant analysis: (1) "how well the boy gets along with his father?" (2) "how well the boy gets along with his mother?" (3) grade rank in school; (4) whether or not "peers are in trouble with the police;" and (5) the self-concept scale. The variables related to the school and self-concept are the only ones available on these subjects due to limitations of available data. These five variables are believed to represent the best combination of factors which represent the family, school, peer group and self-concept. They serve as indices through which the combined effects of control, containment and differential

association theories may be analyzed.

The stepwise selection method was chosen for its capacity to enter only those independent variables which have the highest discriminant powers into the final analysis; four of the five variables originally entered, remained. The variable which addresses the mother-son relationship is deleted because its discriminant power would provide little to the overall discriminant function. As discussed in Chapter 4, sixteen of the 17 delinquent boys, who had poor relationships with their mothers, also have poor relationships with their fathers. Although the mother-son relationship is deleted, the father-son relationship remains in the final analysis, leaving a family-related variable. One advantage of this deletion is that it eliminates the chance that the combination of mother-son and father-son variables measure a relationship which is very similar.

The final step in the analysis results in a Wilks' lambda of .0991. The Wilks' lambda measures the amount of discriminating power contained in the set of variables which remain after the final step in the analysis. Since a high scores for a Wilks' lambda is indicative of a weak discriminating power, our low score indicates that the overall discriminating power is very strong. Also, the chi-square score of 124.84 with four degrees of freedom indicates that the discriminating data is statistically significant.

The discriminant analysis computes a centroid score for each research group. A group centroid is essentially the average (mean) score of the individual cases which comprise the group. The distance

between group centroids is determined by the discriminating power derived from the independent variables which remain in the computation after the last step of the analysis. For example, if the group centroids are far apart, it would be indicative of a great discriminating power. On the other hand, centroids which are relatively close to one another reflect less powerful discriminating influences.

Classification information for each case is displayed in Figure 8-1. Beginning at the left is the case sequence number. Second are the missing values. There are no missing values for the control group. However, the delinquent group has a total of 25 missing values. Most of the missing information (12 items) is from the self-concept variable. There are also three (3) missing scores on the father-son relationship, and five (5) missing values for both grade rank and type of peer associations. We opted to retain cases with missing values. Thus, an option was selected which substitutes a missing value with the total mean for that particular independent variable.

Under "actual group:" (1) signifies membership in the delinquent group and (2) indicates membership in the control group. The category of "highest group" is based upon individual discriminant scores. Boys are classified according to which group they "fit best." For example, some delinquent boys have discriminant scores closer to the centroid of the control group than their own. Thus, their "highest group" is the control group. A series of three asterisks (***) to the left of "actual group" scores signifies that the case does not "fit" into its "actual group." P (Z/G) indicates the probability that an individual case belongs to its "highest group" according to its distance from the cen-

FIGURE 8-1

INDIVIDUAL DISCRIMINANT CLASSIFICATIONS

Case Sequence Number	Mis Val	Sel	Actual Group	Highest Probability		2nd Highest		Discriminant Scores	
				Group	P(X/G)	P(G/X)	Group		P(G/X)
1			1	1	0.7875	1.0000	2	0.0000	-7.6775
2			1	1	0.9709	1.0000	2	0.0000	-7.3715
3	1		1 ***	2	0.7027	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.5670
4	2		1 ***	2	0.0928	1.0000	1	0.0000	-0.4956
5	1		1	1	0.2007	1.0000	2	0.0000	-6.1283
6	1		1	1	0.4383	1.0000	2	0.0000	-6.6328
7	1		1 ***	2	0.0182	1.0000	1	0.0000	-1.1762
8	2		1 ***	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.9160
9	2		1	1	0.2973	1.0000	2	0.0000	-6.3658
10	1		1	1	0.1654	1.0000	2	0.0000	-6.0208
11	1		1	1	0.4130	1.0000	2	0.0000	-8.2265
12			1	1	0.7875	1.0000	2	0.0000	-7.6775
13			1	1	0.7875	1.0000	2	0.0000	-7.6775
14	1		1	1	0.4383	1.0000	2	0.0000	-6.6328
15			1	1	0.7875	1.0000	2	0.0000	-7.6775
16	1		1	1	0.4130	1.0000	2	0.0000	-8.2265
17	1		1 ***	1	0.6499	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.6391
18	1		1	1	0.8732	1.0000	2	0.0000	-7.5675
19			1	1	0.7875	1.0000	2	0.0000	-7.6775
20			1	1	0.7875	1.0000	2	0.0000	-7.6775
21	2		1	1	0.5947	1.0000	2	0.0000	-6.8759
22			1	2	0.1140	1.0000	2	0.0000	-5.8273
23	1		1 ***	2	0.0398	1.0000	1	0.0000	-0.8702
24	3		1 ***	2	0.1188	1.0000	1	0.0000	-0.3746

FIGURE 8-1

INDIVIDUAL DISCRIMINANT CLASSIFICATIONS

Case Sequence Number	Mis Val	Sel	Actual Group	Highest Probability		2nd Highest		Discriminant Scores	
				Group	P (X/G)	P (G/X)	Group		P (G/X)
25	1		1	1	0.1654	1.0000	2	0.0000	-6.0208
26	1		1 ***	2	0.0398	1.0000	1	0.0000	-0.8702
27	1		1	1	0.2796	1.0000	2	0.0000	-6.3268
28			2	2	0.5769	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.6274
29			2	2	0.6525	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.7349
30			2	2	0.4308	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.9731
31			2	2	0.6525	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.7349
32			2	2	0.8852	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.0410
33			2	2	0.6525	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.7349
34			2	2	0.2296	1.0000	1	0.0000	2.3867
35			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545
36			2 ***	1	0.0273	1.0000	2	0.0000	-5.2012
37			2	2	0.8852	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.0410
38			2	2	0.6299	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.6671
39			2	2	0.8852	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.0410
40			2	2	0.8852	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.0410
41			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545
42			2	2	0.8852	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.0410
43			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545
44			2	2	0.7317	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.8425
45			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545
46			2	2	0.9707	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.1485
47			2	2	0.4308	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.9731
48			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545

FIGURE 8-1

INDIVIDUAL DISCRIMINANT CLASSIFICATIONS

Case Sequence Number	Mis Val	Sel	Actual Group	Highest Probability		2nd Highest		Discriminant Scores	
				Group	P(X/G)	P(G/X)	Group		P G/X)
49			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545
50			2	2	0.6299	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.6671
51			2	2	0.7082	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.5595
52			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545
53			2	2	0.8852	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.0410
54			2	2	0.6299	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.6671
55			2	2	0.9707	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.1485
56			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545
57			2	2	0.5074	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.5224
58			2	2	0.7877	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.4545
59			2	2	0.4308	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.9731
60			2	2	0.8140	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.9500
61			2	2	0.9707	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.1485
62			2	2	0.7082	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.5595
63			2	2	0.9707	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.1485
64			2	2	0.3326	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.2163
65			2	2	0.9707	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.1485
66			2	2	0.4308	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.9731
67			2	2	0.3706	1.0000	1	0.0000	2.0806
68			2	2	0.8852	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.0410
69			2	2	0.4308	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.9731
70			2	2	0.4308	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.9731
71			2	2	0.9707	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.1485
72			2	2	0.5769	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.6274
73			2	2	0.4308	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.9731
74			2	2	0.3706	1.0000	1	0.0000	2.0806
75			2	2	0.6525	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.7349
76			2	2	0.9707	1.0000	1	0.0000	1.1485
77			2	2	0.7317	1.0000	1	0.0000	0.8425

Symbols Used in Plots: Symbol, Group, Label (1) = Delinquent Group; (2) Control Group.

troid. A low P (X/G) score suggests that the case may not belong to its "highest group." Finally, at the far right, the discriminant scores are the mean scores for individual cases and represent their spatial plot on the histogram (Figure 8-2).

The histogram, illustrated in Figure 8-2, locates the group centroids for the delinquents and controls. It also plots each case. The groups centroids are -7.21 for delinquents and 1.19 for controls. The distance between the group centroids is considerable attesting to the great discriminating power of the independent variables. Plots of delinquents are signified by the number (1) and controls by the number (2). There is very little overlapping of cases. In fact, if an imaginary vertical line is superimposed perpendicular to the 0.2 horizontal plane, only three delinquents would be plotted to its right and one control to its left. However, eight of the delinquents and one control do not "fit" into their "actual groups." (These exceptions will be examined later.) On the basis of the individual discriminant scores, we are able to predict "highest group" memberships for 70.4 per cent of the delinquents and an amazing 98 per cent of the controls. The combined predictability for both groups is a most satisfactory 88.3 per cent. Therefore, the four variables (father-son relationship, grade rank, peer associations and self-concept) prove to be very reliable predictors of delinquent behavior for this study.

An assessment of the nine cases which do not fall within their actual groups shows that their misplacement largely results from the great discriminating power of a single variable, type of peer association. An explanation of the extreme influence may be seen in Figure 8-3 which

displays the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients. These coefficients are similar to the beta weights obtained from multiple regression analysis and determine the relative discriminating powers of each variable. For example, peers are about twice as important as self-concept, and self-concept is about twice as important as either grade rank or the father-son relationship. The sign has no influence on the discriminating influence.

There is only one boy from the control group who is plotted relatively close to the delinquent centroid and far distant from his actual group. He is, also, the only control who reported that his peers have been in trouble with the police. The eight delinquents who did not fall into their actual group are the only ones who did not leave indications that their peers have been in trouble with the police. For example, three of the delinquents are not known to associate with peers who are in trouble with the police. Information on this variable is missing on the other five delinquents. Although the variable related to peers has a very powerful discriminating function, it does not throw the classification scheme out of proportion. If we account for the other three variables, we find that some of these deviant cases do not "fit" into their "actual" groups. A few of the other deviant cases form a small cluster of their own.

Now let us examine those cases which have predicted group classifications that deviate from their actual groups. There are only 7 (14 per cent) boys in the control group who reported one or more negative responses to the four variables used in the discriminant analysis. Five of these boys have only one negative response. Yet they remain in their predicted group classification. There are also two controls who have two

FIGURE 8-3

STANDARDIZED CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT COEFFICIENTS

Variable	Discriminant Coefficient
Grade Rank	0.2731
Get Along with Father	-0.2258
Peer Associations	1.0180
Self-Concept	0.4817

negative responses. One of the boys (case number 36) with two negative responses has a discriminant score which is closer to the delinquent centroid than that of his actual group. Thus, it is likely that he does not fit into his actual group. However, the other boy with two negative scores (case number 60) seems out of place with a discriminant score of 0.95. It is extremely close to the control group's centroid of 1.185. It would seem that this case would be more appropriate with a discriminant score which is further from its actual group's centroid in the direction toward the centroid of the delinquent group.

Discriminant scores for three of the delinquent boys, cases 3, 8, and 17, are very close to the centroid of the control group (Figures 8-1 and 8-2). The social relationship of these boys is very positive. Therefore they are more similar with the boys in the control group rather than with the other delinquent boys. One of these boys, case 8, has fewer contacts with the juvenile justice system (two court petitions and no community adjustments) than the other delinquents. The other two boys faced unusual situations. Case 3 had a severe head injury as a child which resulted in a brain abnormality. He was also very tense due to a critical illness of his father. Although there is a warm relationship between family members, they are not able to cope well with their medical problems. Finally, case 17 was influenced by a delinquent step-brother who came to live in his home soon after his mother remarried. Soon after the step-brother moved out, the delinquent behavior of case 17 ceased.

Five delinquents (case numbers 4, 7, 23, 24, and 26 with discriminant scores ranging from -0.3746 to -1.1762) fit closer to the centroid of the control group than that of their actual group. However, they form a separate cluster of their own (refer to Figure 8-2). Before proceeding

into the explanation for this occurrence, it should be noted that case number 24 is missing information on three variables. The boy was placed in a series of boarding schools, resulting in a lack of information on grades, peer associations and self-concept.

Responses to the father-son relationship, grades, and self-image by the other four boys were generally negative. For example, two of the boys scored negatively on two of these variables and two have negative scores on all three items. The reason that they are relatively closer to the control groups' centroid than their own centroid is that all of them are missing scores on the type of peer association variable. Otherwise, they would be closer to the delinquent group's centroid. The great discriminant powers of the peer association variable is responsible for placing this cluster close to the control group's centroid. The combined effects of the other variables are strong enough to pull all of the cases in this cluster slightly, but entirely, out of the large cluster of cases represented by the control group. It would seem that this cluster of delinquent boys is better suited for a position much closer to the larger cluster of delinquent boys. We are designating this small cluster of delinquents as a third group. The other two groups are the larger cluster of delinquents and the large cluster of controls. Thus, we are left with one grouping of controls and two of delinquents. The small cluster of delinquents has less in common with controls than with delinquents. This is demonstrated by their P (X/G) scores of .09, .01, .04, .12, and .04 respectively. Thus, indicating that these cases have a very low probability of actually falling in the "highest group" (the control group).

Conclusion

Discriminant analysis has proved to be a valuable technique for our study of white middle-class delinquency among suburban boys. The combined effects of four variables, i.e., father-son relationship, grade rank, peer associations and self-concept are found to have great discriminating powers which differentiate delinquents from controls. As illustrated in Figure 8-2, about 88 per cent of the boys are classified according to their actual groups. The histogram also depicts a third cluster of five delinquent boys classified under the "highest group" category as being closer to the control group's centroid, than to their own. However, there is a low probability that they actually hold membership in their "highest group." Since this small cluster falls outside of the large cluster of controls, it is designated as a second delinquent cluster. By removing case 24, which has three missing values, four additional cases may be considered as "correctly" classified. Thus, 85.2 per cent (23 cases) of the delinquents and 93.5 per cent (72 cases) of the boys from both groups are differentiated by the four independent variables.

The combined discriminating powers of the four variables, mentioned above, are most impressive in differentiating the boys in both research groups. They are also indices related to three theories, i.e., control, containment and differential association. For example, three independent variables (father-son relationship, grade rank, and peer association) which are indices of control theory account for about three-fourths of the variance or discriminating power represented by the standardized canonical discriminant coefficients (Figure 8-3). About one-third of the variance is represented by indices of containment theory (father-son relationship,

and self-concept). Finally, about one-half of the variance may be explained by differential association (peer associations). None of the three theories explains all of the variance. Thus, a multivariate or multi-theoretical formulation may provide the best explanation of white middle-class delinquency among suburban boys.

However, the results of this study must be viewed with some caution. For example, the sample sizes of both research groups are small. Information collected on the delinquent boys was transferred from a qualitative document onto a quantitative questionnaire. There are many missing values from the delinquent group. Finally, empirical data is not available to address all of the major features of each of the three theories. Although these and other difficulties exist, this study provides a valuable insight into middle-class delinquency among suburban boys. In the concluding chapter, additional comments about the data and findings are discussed along with suggestions for future studies.

CHAPTER IX

OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Our study examines serious delinquent behavior among white, middle-class boys residing in suburban communities. The major focus of our inquiry is on two major aspects of delinquency. First, is an analysis of participation in delinquent acts by middle-class boys, as compared to boys of lower-socioeconomic status, in specific offense categories, i.e., hedonistic and non-hedonistic. There is also a review of involvement by our experimental and control groups in delinquent activities. Second, is an investigation of causal factors related to middle-class delinquency. Three theories, control (Hirschi, 1969), differential association (Sutherland, 1970) and containment (Reckless, 1961, 1967 and 1970) were selected for empirical scrutiny. Selection of these three theories is based upon their applicability across socioeconomic boundaries. These theories also allow us to inquire into family, school, peer group and self-concept related variables. We also applied a multivariate technique, discriminant analysis, to test variables related to all three theories.

In our search for possible answers, we utilized available data from two sources. First, an experimental (delinquent) group was selected from archival records of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Illinois. Second, a control group was chosen from questionnaires compiled by the Institute for Juvenile Research. We placed strict definitions for inclusion into both research groups (white males, 14-16 years of age, in school, residence

in a suburban community of Chicago, and college educated fathers who are employed in professional or managerial positions). This resulted in a limited number of boys, 27 delinquents and 50 controls, who met our requirements.

Since the original data existed in two forms, qualitative and quantitative, it became necessary to develop a method of comparing the Court and I.J.R. data. This was accomplished through a modified version of the I.J.R. questionnaire. The modified questionnaire contained items which serve as indices for the test of our hypotheses. Use of this modified version required the conversion of the Court's qualitative information into quantitative form through a precise coding process.

Although we had access to very good sources of data, and were conscientious in our methodological procedures, there are some important limitations of the study. First, the numerical size of both research groups is small. However, the delinquent group represents the total number of boys meeting our criteria who were under the supervision of a probation field unit for a period of one year. Second, there is a three to four year difference between the collection of the information for the control and delinquent groups. Third, the Institute for Juvenile Research questionnaire does not have a provision to identify socioeconomic status for one-parent families headed by a mother.

Fourth, the probation officers may interject personal bias into their reports, as found by Needleman (1981). It is possible that probation officers have preconceived ideas about delinquents and their families, peers, school disposition and self-concept. Also, some probation officers emphasize some factors more than others. However, the Court records

reviewed for this study contained reports from many sources, i.e., probation officers, psychologists, social workers and school officials. We seldom found conflicting information in the case records. Similarly, there is a possibility of subjective bias on the part of a coder (transferring the Court data onto the modified questionnaire). For this reason, two persons coded each questionnaire. Their scores were in agreement on 85 percent of the items coded. The possibility of the labeling effect must also be taken into consideration for the Court cases.

Finally, there is a problem of missing information in some of the Court records. Therefore, it is not possible to code all of the questionnaire items related to the family, school, peer group and self-concept. Missing information is not problematic for boys represented in the control group.

The boys in our delinquent group have committed more serious offenses than the delinquent boys in most other studies of middle-class, suburban delinquency. Our delinquent group is comprised of boys under the supervision of an agent of social control, the Juvenile Court. The 27 boys who are represented in the delinquent group have a total of 250 official contacts with the juvenile justice system. This includes 120 community adjustments and 130 court petitions. The petitioned offenses are mainly for serious acts against property and persons, e.g., burglary, robbery, arson, battery and vandalism. Many of the petitioned offenses would be considered felonies if they were committed by an adult. It was observed that in general petitions are issued for serious offenses and community adjustments are based upon less serious infractions. The subjects of many of the other studies of middle-class delinquency (Greeley and Casey,

1963; Meyerhoff and Meyerhoff, 1964; Vaz, 1965; and Richards, Berk and Forster, 1979) seem to have committed less serious offenses.

Boys in the control group also engaged in considerable involvement in deviant activities, according to their self-reports. The involvement of the controls is similar to other studies of self-reported delinquency among middle-class boys. However, few seem to engage in frequent acts of delinquency and only 6 percent admitted to a theft of money or an object with a value of \$20.00 or more. Thus, the boys in our delinquent group engaged in much more serious delinquent behavior than the boys in our control group or those represented in other self-reported studies of middle-class boys.

Our findings contradict other studies which relate middle-class delinquency to attributes of the lower-class (Bohlke, 1961; Greeley and Casey, 1963). We did not find any evidence that the delinquent boys adopted life styles or other characteristics of the lower-class as would be assumed by the above-mentioned studies. We also refute the assumptions by Shulman (1949), Cohen and Short (1958), England (1960), and Vaz (1967) that middle-class youth are more likely to commit hedonistic than non-hedonistic acts of delinquency in comparison to youth of lower socioeconomic status. We compared self-reported hedonistic and non-hedonistic offenses of boys in our control group with white boys of lower socioeconomic status from both suburban and the City of Chicago residences. Our findings reveal that there are no statistically significant differences in self-reported hedonistic and non-hedonistic offenses between boys in the control group and boys in either of the other two groups. These assumptions are evolved from theories which attempt to explain delinquency

among lower socioeconomic populations. Our empirical findings do not support them. This does not necessarily imply that theories based on lower-class conditions are without value, but their inability to explain middle-class delinquency does cast some doubts about their credibility.

Cohen (1955: 158) offers foresight into this potential problem.

. . . from the scientific point of view, middle-class delinquency is a body of data with which any theory of juvenile delinquency must be consistent. Until this consistency can be established, middle-class delinquency remains a continual source of embarrassment to those who would defend the theory.

We sought existing theories which have the potential of explaining middle-class delinquency. As mentioned above, the theories must not be restricted to the socioeconomic situations of a particular class. An additional criteria is that the theories should include in their framework a relationship with the family, school, and/or peer group. Three theories, control (Hirschi, 1969), containment (Reckless; 1961, 1967, and 1970), and differential association (Sutherland, 1970) were selected on the basis of meeting our criteria.

Our premise that an explanation of middle-class delinquency lies in factors related to the family, school, peer group and self-concept is confirmed by the data. For example, delinquent boys are significantly less attached to both their mothers and fathers than are controls. The fact that the delinquent boys have weaker social bonds to their parents is supportive of control theory. These findings also lend support to external containment. The quality of family relationships is viewed by both Hirschi (1969) and Reckless (1970) as the most important feature of their respective theories.

Control theory recognizes the school as a factor related to delin-

quency, but it is not emphasized by either containment or differential association. The results of two school related variables reveal that delinquents are less committed to the school. First, controls are significantly more likely to have average or above average grades than the delinquents. Second, delinquents were at least five times more likely to be suspended or expelled from school, thus, they are more likely to reject school authority than controls. Poor academic performance and rejection of authority by delinquent boys indicate that they are less likely to be attached to the school.

Both control theory and the theory of differential association are partially supported by the fact that delinquents are significantly more likely to associate with delinquent and/or drug abusing peers than controls. However, one major factor which differentiates these theories cannot be tested due to limitations of the data. Differential association theory, according to Sutherland (1970), stipulates that delinquency is a behavior which is learned through group association. Hirschi (1969), on the other hand, maintains that delinquent behavior is learned before associations occur with other delinquents. In other words, delinquents are attracted to one another after the fact of their delinquent behavior. Unfortunately, we do not have information to determine whether differential association or control theory is the best explanation of middle-class delinquency.

Inner containment (Reckless: 1961, 1967 and 1970) is also supported by the data. Delinquent boys are significantly more likely to have low self-concepts than are boys in the control group. A second indice of inner containment, identification of a son to his father, results in a

similar finding, i.e., controls are more likely to identify with their fathers. Although Reckless considers that a relatively strong degree of inner containment may act as an insulator from delinquency, Hirschi denies the importance of the self as a factor related to delinquent behavior. Control theory only relates to the bonds maintained between the individual and the group. Containment theory relates to both the group and the self.

A further analysis of the theories of control, containment and differential association is conducted through a multivariate test, discriminant analysis. Discriminant analysis has the capability of calculating the amount of variance, produced by selected independent variables, between the two research groups. Care was taken in the selection of independent variables to prevent multicollinearity. The stepwise method of discriminant analysis was selected due to its ability to select the best set of variables according to their discriminating power. Four independent variables entered into the final analysis are: father-son relationship, academic performance, peer group associations and self-concept. About one-half of the total variance between the two research groups result from peer associations, about one-fourth is due to self-concept, and the remainder is almost equally shared by the father-son relationship and academic performance.

The variance explained by the four independent variables entered into the discriminant analysis reveals support for each of the three theories selected for an empirical test. For example, the three independent variables related to control theory (father-son relationship, academic performance and peer associations) account for about three-

fourths of the total variance. The single index used to test differential association (peer associations) produces about one-half of the total variance. Also, the two independent variables (father-son relationship and self-concept) combine to explain over one-third of the total variance related to containment theory. While each theory is supported by the variance of independent variables, no single theory explains all of the variance. The combination of these theories provides a better explanation of white middle-class delinquency than any theory by itself. We, also, found that over 93 percent of the boys from both research groups are differentiated by the discriminating power provided by the four independent variables.

Research Recommendations

Our recommendations for future research on delinquent behavior begin with a few methodological considerations. One concern is the process used to define delinquent and non-delinquent groups. This is often accomplished through an analysis of self-reported delinquency. The problem with this method is that the items often reflect petty offenses or behavior not legally defined as a crime, e.g., cheating on an exam. There is a likelihood that the resulting categories of delinquency participation will not differ much in seriousness of offenses. Therefore, if there is little difference in the dependent variable, significant differences in the independent variable(s) are, also, improbable.

When self-reported data is used, we recommend that well defined items of both serious and less serious delinquent behavior be included. There should be a definite time frame during which the self-reported acts occurred, e.g., during the past year or past two years. This would

eliminate the reporting of acts which occurred at a very young age. It would also be beneficial to devise a numerical scale for the number of self-reported acts rather than vague categories of "a few times" or "often." Finally, if a self-reported study classifies few, if any, serious offenders, it may prove profitable to seek the subjects for the experimental group from an agency of social control. Serious offenders represent a small proportion of the adolescent population and they may not be randomly distributed in the population. We found this to be a valuable technique.

Another recommendation is to develop a survey instrument which contains indices related to a variety of theoretical orientations. The instrument should also include a sufficient number of indices to test the various components of individual theories. If this is accomplished, it may be possible to discover both the strong and weak aspects of a theory. One of the findings of this study is that the combination of theoretical elements provided a stronger explanation of delinquent behavior than any one theory. Also, as stated below, we are not able to clarify some of the theoretical assumptions due to a lack of information. Finally, a method needs to be capable of interrelating the family, school, peer group and self-concept variables.

In order to accomplish these goals we may have to become more creative in our methodological procedures. For example, a more effective methodology may require a longitudinal technique, combined use of quantitative and qualitative data, and the collection of data from youth, parents, schools, etc. A thorough analysis of the interrelationships between variables and an examination of social process are likely to

necessitate tedious methodological procedures. It also may be profitable to refine our instruments and their quantifiable scales.

Although our study resulted in some interesting findings, it also left a few important theoretical assumptions unanswered. Each of the three theories has limitations. The discriminant analysis revealed that no one of the three theories is able to explain all of the variance between the dependent variables. For example, containment theory emphasizes the family as the most important factor of external containment, but it does not stress the influence of the school or the peer group. On the other hand, differential association and control theories do not explain the importance of self-concept. In fact, Hirschi (1969) does not believe that the influences of the self have any importance to the cause of delinquency. The data related to self-concept in our study does not support Hirschi's belief.

Unfortunately, our data does not allow us to examine sequences of events. For example, it would be of interest to determine if weak attachments to the family precede poor academic performance and association with delinquents. On the other hand, it may be that poor academic performance and association with delinquent peers leads to weak attachments to the parents. The sequence of events is most important in the determination of whether differential association or control theory is a better explanation of association with delinquent peers. As discussed earlier, control theory states that delinquent behavior is acquired previous to association with delinquent peers. On the other hand, differential association theory assumes that delinquent behavior is learned through association with delinquents. It would be of value to examine

the order of these events in future research designs.

The discriminant analysis also reveals that the type of peer associations are responsible for more variation, about one-half, than any of the other independent variables. We have some questions, as does Hirschi, about the magnitude of this variable. For example, boys with weak attachments to the family and/or the school may be more limited in their choice of peer associations than boys with strong attachments. It may be that most youth do not desire to associate with other youth who participate in serious delinquent behavior. From another point of view, it may also be that relatively more serious delinquent behavior and associations with other delinquents are both the result of weak attachments to the family and/or the school. These issues need to be clarified before it is possible to more fully evaluate the role of the peer group and its relationship to delinquency.

Policy Recommendations

We conclude with a few comments on social policy. First, there is a concern regarding the content and utility of the case records. Although only juvenile court records were examined for this study, they usually contained materials submitted by non-court sources, i.e., school officials, social workers, counselors and psychologists from the public and private sectors. The individual documents are quite lengthy, and the review of a single family record requires a fair amount of time. As mentioned earlier, there were few contradictions between the different sources of information. In fact, the variety of sources seemed to improve the credibility of the information.

However, there are lapses in the consistency of the quality of

information in many of the case records. The recorders may emphasize some factors and provide inconsequential information on others. This may be the result of preconceived ideas on the cause of delinquency by the recorder, as suggested by Needleman, (1981) or reflect difficulties in obtaining the information. Concern rests on the absence or incompleteness of data on major social and psychological factors which numerous research studies relate to the cause of delinquent behavior. We found much of the information to be of value for research purposes, but inconsistencies in the quality of information should not be overlooked.

Improvements in the quality and consistency of information collected by social service agencies would serve two major purposes. First, the development of treatment plans would be enhanced through a more comprehensive social assessment of clients and their social environment. If one or more major factors attributed to the probable cause of delinquency are not examined, treatment plans may not reflect the exact nature of the problem. We observed that in some cases the recommendations or treatment plans and the actual treatment did not correspond with the social assessment. For example, parent-child relationships were often cited as being problematic, but parents were less likely to be included in counseling or therapy programs than their sons. The case records may prove more valuable by developing a more concise and comprehensive assessment with an improved linkage to both treatment plans and the actual treatment.

Second, social service records have a definite value for research into the etiology of delinquency and for the evaluation of therapeutic programs. As stated earlier, many questions need to be answered before

we better understand the causes of delinquent and other forms of deviant behavior. There are also concerns about evaluating social programs. Much of the attention tends to be on the number of persons serviced and compliance with administrative requirements. There seems to be relatively little focus on the quality of services. It would be of interest to evaluate which methods are most successful and what makes them work. On the other hand, it is also necessary to assess which techniques are not very successful.

In keeping with the recent interest in applied sociology, it would prove beneficial to build a closer relationship between the research and social service communities. By working together we may facilitate an increased understanding of delinquent behavior and improve the quality of social service methods. This may require the removal of misconceptions, stereotypes and apprehensions on the parts of researchers and social service personnel, but this relationship is long overdue. Hopefully, the greatest benefactors will be our young people and their families.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ageton, Suzanne S. and Delbert S. Elliott
1974 "The effects of legal processing on delinquent orientations."
Social Problems 22: 87-100.
- Akers, Ronald L.
1964 "Socioeconomic status and delinquent behavior; a retest."
The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 4; 38-46.
- Allen, Donald E. and Harjit Sandhu
1967 "A comparative study of delinquents and non-delinquents:
family affect, religion, and personal income." Social
Forces 46: 263-69.
- Andry, Robert G.
1971 Delinquency and Parental Pathology. London: Staples Press.
- Bandurka, Albert and Richard H. Walters
1959 Adolescent Aggression: A Study of the Influence of Child
Training Practices and Family Interrelationships. New
York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Becker, Howard S.
1963 Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. Glencoe,
Illinois: The Free Press.
- Bennett, Ivy
1960 Delinquent and Neurotic Children. New York: Basic Books,
Incorporated.
- Biller, Henry B.
1970 "Father absence and the personality development of the male
child." Developmental Psychology 2: 181-201.
- Bohlke, Robert H.
1961 "Social mobility, stratification inconsistency and middle-
class delinquency." Social Problems 8: 351-63.
- Bowerman, Charles E. and Stephen J. Bahr
1973 "Conjugal power and adolescent identification with parents."
Sociometry 36: 366-77.
- Box, Steven and Julienne Ford
1971 "The facts don't fit; on the relationship between social class
and criminal behaviour." The Sociological Review 19: 31-52.

Braithwaite, John

- 1981 "The myth of social class and criminality reconsidered,"
American Journal of Sociology 46: 36-57.

Burt, Sir Cyril

/1925/

- 1965 The Young Delinquent. London: University of London Press, Ltd.

Bytheway, W. R. and D. R. May

- 1971 "On fitting the 'facts' of social class and criminal behaviour;
a rejoinder to Box and Ford," The Sociological Review 19:
585-607.

Chilton, Roland J.

- 1967 "Middle-class delinquency and specific offense analysis."
Pp. 91-101 in Edmond W. Vaz (ed.), Middle-Class Juvenile
Delinquency. New York: Harper and Row,

Chilton, Roland J. and Gerald E. Markle

- 1972 "Family disruption, delinquent conduct and the effect of sub-
classification." American Sociological Review 37: 93-99.

Cicourel, Aaron V.

- 1968 The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice. New York:
John Wiley.

Clelland, Donald and Timothy J. Carter

- 1980 "The new myth of class and crime." Criminology 18: 319-36.

Cloward, Richard A. and Lloyd E. Ohlin

- 1966 Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs.
New York: The Free Press.

Cohen, Albert K.

/1955/

- 1971 Delinquent Boys, The Culture of the Gang. New York: The
Free Press.

/1957/

- 1967 "Middle-class delinquency and the social structure." From
a paper read at the annual meeting of the American Sociological
Association in August. Pp. 203-07 in Edmund W. Vaz (ed.),
Middle-Class Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Harper and Row.

- 1966 Deviance and Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
Prentice-Hall, Incorporated.

Cohen, Albert K. and James F. Short, Jr.

- 1958 "Research in delinquent subcultures," Journal of Social
Issues 14: 20-36.

- Conger, John Janeway and Wilber B. Miller
1966 Personality, Social Class, and Delinquency. New York; John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.
- Dinitz, Simon, Frank P. Scarpitti, and Walter C. Reckless
1962 "Delinquency vulnerability; a cross group and longitudinal analysis." American Sociological Review 27: 515-17.
- Doleschal, Eugene
1970 "Hidden crime." Crime and Delinquency Literature 2; 546-72.
- Douglas, J.W.B., J.M. Ross, W.A. Hammond, and D.G. Mulligan
1966 "Delinquency and social class." British Journal of Criminology 6: 294-302.
- Eisner, Victor
1969 The Delinquency Label: The Epidemiology of Juvenile Delinquency. New York; Random House.
- Elliott, Delbert S.
1966 "Delinquency, school attendance and dropout." Social Problems 13: 307-14.
- Elliott, Delbert S. and Suzanne S. Ageton
1980 "Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency." American Sociological Review 45: 95-110.
- Elliott, Delbert S, and Harwin L. Voss
1974 Delinquency and Dropout. Lexington, Massachusetts; Lexington Books.
- Empey, LaMar T. and Steven G. Lubeck with Ronald L. LaPorte
1971 Explaining Delinquency. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company.
- England, Ralph W. Jr.
1960 "A theory of middle class juvenile delinquency." The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 50: 535-40.
- Ennis, Phillip H.
1970 "Crime, victims, and the police." Pp. 74-81 in Marvin E. Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz and Norman Johnson (eds.), The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. New York; John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.
- Fannin, Leon F. and Marshall B. Clinard
1965 "Differences in the conception of self as a male among lower and middle class delinquents." Social Problems 13; 205-14.

Farley, Reynolds

- 1976 "Components of suburban population growth." Pp. 3-37 in B. Schwartz (ed.), *The Changing Face of the Suburbs*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Farrington, D.P. and D.J. West

- 1971 "A comparison between early delinquents and young aggressives." *The British Journal of Criminology* 11: 341-58.

Frease, Dean E.

- 1972 "The schools, self-concept and juvenile delinquency." *The British Journal of Criminology* 12: 133-46.
- 1973 "Delinquency, social class, and the schools." *Sociology and Social Research* 57: 443-59.
- 1973a "Schools and delinquency; some intervening processes." *Pacific Sociological Review* 16: 426-48.

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss

- 1968 *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck

- 1950 *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gold, Martin

- 1963 *Status Forces in Delinquent Boys*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
- 1970 "Undetected delinquent behavior." Pp. 82-100 in Marvin E. Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz, and Norman Johnston (eds.), *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.

Greeley, Andrew and James Casey

- 1963 "An upper middle class deviant gang." *The American Catholic Sociological Review* 24: 33-41.

Grinnell Richard M. , Jr. and Sheryl A. Chambers

- 1979 "Broken homes and middle-class delinquency: a comparison." *Criminology* 17: 395-400.

Hall, Nason E. and Gordon P. Waldo

- 1967 "School identification and delinquency proneness." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 4: 231-42.

Hennessy, Michael, Pamela J. Richards and Richard A. Berk

- 1978 "Broken homes and middle-class delinquency; a reassessment." *Criminology* 15: 505-28.

- Hindelang, Michael J,
 1973 "Causes of delinquency; a partial replication and extension,"
 Social Problems 20; 471-87.
- Hindelang, Michael J., Travis Hirschi, and Joseph G. Weis
 1979 "Correlates of delinquency; the illusion of discrepancy
 between self-report and official measures." American
 Sociological Review 44; 995-1014.
- Hirschi, Travis
 1969 Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, California; University of
 California Press.
- Hunt, Larry L. and Janet G. Hunt
 1975 "Race and the father-son connection; the conditional
 relevance of father absence for the orientations and
 identities of adolescent boys." Social Problems 23; 35-51.
- Institute for Juvenile Research, Illinois Department of Mental Health
 1975 "Youth and society in Illinois: technical appendix."
 Chicago: Multilith Monograph.
- 1975a "Youth and society in Illinois: adolescent automobile
 violations." Chicago: Multilith Monograph.
- 1975b "Youth and society in Illinois: adolescent drug use."
 Chicago: Multilith Monograph.
- 1975c "Youth and society in Illinois: adolescent impropriety."
 Chicago: Multilith Monograph.
- 1975d "Youth and society in Illinois: adolescent theft." Chicago:
 Multilith Monograph.
- 1975e "Youth and society in Illinois: adolescent violence."
 Chicago: Multilith Monograph.
- 1975f "Youth and society in Illinois: youth and community in
 Illinois: the local context of delinquent behavior." Chicago:
 Multilith Monograph.
- Jensen, Gary F.
 1972 "Parents, peers, and delinquent action; a test of differential
 association perspective." American Journal of Sociology 78,
 562-75.
- 1973 "Inner containment and delinquency." Journal of Criminal Law
 and Criminology 64: 464-70.

- Johnson, Doyle Paul and Ira J. Silverman
 1975 "Lower vs. middle class juvenile delinquency; do the same theories apply to both?" Paper read at the 1975 meetings of the Midwest Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Kasarda, John D. and George Y. Redfearn
 1975 "Differential patterns of city and suburban growth in the United States." *Journal of Urban History* 2: 43-66.
- Kelly, Delos H. and William T. Pink
 1973 "School commitment, youth rebellion, and delinquency." *Criminology* 10: 473-85.
- Kerckhoff, Alan C.
 1972 *Socialization and Social Class*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; Prentice-Hall, Incorporated.
- Kerlinger, Fred N.
 1973 *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. New York; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated.
- Kitsuse, John I. and Aaron V. Cicourel
 1962 "The high school's role in adolescent status transition." In B. J. Chandler, Lindley J. Stiles and John I. Kitsuse (eds.), *Education in Urban Society*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.
- Kohn, Melvin L.
 1973 *Class and Conformity; A Study in Values*. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.
- Kvaraceus, William C. and Walter B. Miller.
 1959 *Delinquent Behavior, Culture and the Individual*, Vol. 1, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States.
- 1967 "Norm-violating behavior in middle-class culture. Pp. 233-31 in Edmond W. Vaz (ed.), *Middle-Class Delinquency*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Larson, Lyle E.
 1972 "The relative influence of parent-adolescent affect in predicting the salience hierarchy among youth." *Pacific Sociological Review* 15: 83-102.
- Lemert, Edwin M.
 1951 *Social Pathology*. New York; McGraw-Hill.
- 1967 "The juvenile court--quest and realities." Pp. 91-106 in *President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Lichter, S.O., E. B. Rapien, F. M. Seibert and M. A. Sklansky
/1962/
 1968 The Drop-Outs; A Treatment Study of Intellectually Capable Students who Drop Out of High School. New York: The Free Press.
- Linden, Eric and James C. Hackler
 1973 "Affective ties and delinquency." Pacific Sociological Review 16; 27-46.
- Long, Larry H. and Paul C. Glick
 1976 "Family patterns in suburban areas: recent trends." Pp. 39-67 in B. Schwartz (ed.), The Changing Face of the Suburbs. Chicago; University of Chicago Press.
- Lynn R. and I. E. Gordon
 1962 "Maternal attitudes to child socialization; some social and natural differences." The British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology 1; 52-55.
- McCord, Joan and William McCord
 1970 "The effects of parental role model on criminality." Pp. 205-13 in Neil J. Smelser and William T. Smelser (eds.), Personality and Social Systems. New York; John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.
- McCord, Joan, William McCord and Emily Thurber
 1962 "Some effects of paternal absence on male children." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 64; 361-69.
- McCord, Joan, William McCord and Irving K. Zola
 1959 Origins of Crime. New York; Columbia University Press.
- Martin, John M., Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, and Robert E. Gould
 1970 The Analysis of Delinquent Behavior: A Structural Approach. New York: Random House.
- Matza, David
 1964 Delinquency and Drift. New York; John Wiley and Sons.
- Matza, David and Gresham M. Sykes
 1961 "Juvenile delinquency and subterranean values," American Sociological Review 26: 712-19.
- Merton, Robert K.
/1957/
 1964 Social Theory and Social Structure. Rev. and Enl. Ed, Glencoe, Illinois; The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Meyerhoff, Howard L. and Barbara G. Meyerhoff
 1964 "Field observations of middle-class gangs." Social Forces 42: 328-36.

Miller, Walter B.

- 1970 "Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency." Pp. 351-63 in Marvin E. Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz, and Norman Johnson (eds), *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Monahan, Thomas P.

- 1957 "Family status and the delinquent child; a reappraisal and some new findings." *Social Forces* 35: 250-58.

Needleman, Carolyn

- 1981 "Discrepant assumptions in empirical research; the case of juvenile court screening." *Social Problems* 28: 247-62.

Neumeyer, Martin H.

- 1961 *Juvenile Delinquency in Modern Society*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Nye, Ivan E., James F. Short, Jr., and Virgil J. Olson

- 1958 "Socioeconomic status and delinquent behavior." *The American Journal of Sociology* 63: 381-89.

Parsons, Talcott

- 1970 *Social Structure and Personality*. London: The Free Press

Peterson, Donald R. and Wesley C. Becker

- 1965 "Family interaction and delinquency." Pp. 63-99 in Herbert C. Quay (ed.), *Juvenile Delinquency; Research and Theory*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Incorporated.

Piliavin, Irving and Scott Briar

- 1964 "Police encounters with juveniles." *American Journal of Sociology* 70: 206-14.

Polk, Kenneth

- 1969 "Class, strain and rebellion among adolescents." *Social Problems* 17: 214-24.

Polk, Kenneth, Dean Frease and F. Lynn Richmond

- 1974 "Social class, school experience, and delinquency." *Criminology* 12: 84-96.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice

- 1967 *Task Force Report; Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Rapp, Don W.

- 1961 "Childrearing attitudes of mothers in Germany and the United States." *Child Development* 32 (reprint 1966): 669-78.

- Reckless, Walter C.
 1961 "A new theory of delinquency and crime," Federal Probation 25; 42-46.
- 1967 The Crime Problem. (4th edition) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- 1970 "Containment theory." Pp. 401-05 in Marvin E. Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz and Norman Johnson (eds.), The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.
- Reckless, Walter C. and Simon Dinitz
 1967 "Pioneering with self-concept as a vulnerability factor in delinquency." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 58: 515-23.
- Reckless, Walter C., Simon Dinitz and Barbara Kay
 1957 "The self component in potential delinquency and potential non-delinquency." American Sociological Review 22: 566-70.
- Reckless, Walter C., Simon Dinitz, and Ellen Murray
 1956 "Self concept as an insulator against delinquency." American Sociological Review 21: 744-46.
- Rhodes, A. Lewis and Albert J. Reiss, Jr.
 1969 "Apathy, truancy and delinquency as adaptations to school failure." Social Forces 48: 12-22.
- Richards, Pamela, Richard A. Berk, and Brenda Forster
 1979 Crime as Play: Delinquency in a Middle Class Suburb. Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Robins, Lee N.
 1966 Deviant Children Grown Up; A Sociological and Psychiatric Study of Sociopathic Personality. Baltimore, Maryland: The Williams and Wilkins Company.
- Rosenberg, Morris
 1965 Society and the Adolescent Self Image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenthal, Maurice J.
 1962 "The syndrome of the inconsistent mother." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 32: 637-44.
- Schulman, Robert E., Donald J. Schoemaker, and Irvin Moelis
 1962 "Laboratory measurement of parental behavior," Journal Consulting Behavior 26: 109-14.

- Scott, Joseph W. and Edmund W. Vaz
 1963 "A perspective on middle-class delinquency." The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science 29; 324-35.
- Shanley, Fred J.
 1967 "Middle-class delinquency as a social problem." Sociology and Social Research 51; 185-98.
- Shaw, Clifford R.
/1930/
 1968 The Jack-Roller, A Delinquent Boy's Own Story. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- /1931/
 1966 The Natural History of a Delinquent Career. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay
/1942/
 1969 Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shulman, Harry Manuel
 1949 "The family and juvenile delinquency," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 261: 21-31.
- Short, James F. Jr. and Fred L. Strodbeck
 1965 Group Process and Gang Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sieber, Sam M.
 1973 "The integration of fieldwork and survey methods." American Sociological Review 78; 1335-59.
- Stinchcombe, Arthur L.
 1964 Rebellion in a High School. Chicago; Quadrangle Books, Incorporated.
- Sutherland, Edwin H.
 1970 "Differential association." Pp. 208-10 in Marvin E. Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz and Norman Johnson (eds.), The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. New York; John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.
- Sykes, Gresham and David Matza
 1957 "Techniques of neutralization: a theory of delinquency," American Sociological Review 22; 664-70.
- Tatsuoka, Maurice M.
 1970 Discriminate Analysis; The Study of Group Differences. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

- Thrasher, Frederic M.
 /1927/
 1966 The Gang. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tittle, Charles R. and Wayne J. Villemez
 1977 "Social class and criminality," Social Forces 56: 474-502.
- Tittle, Charles R., Wayne J. Villemez and Douglas A. Smith
 1978 "The myth of social class and criminality; an empirical assessment of the empirical evidence." American Sociological Review 43: 643-56.
- Tobias, Jerry J.
 1970 "The affluent suburban male delinquent," Crime and Delinquency 16: 273-79.
- Toby, Jackson
 1957 "The differential impact of family disorganization." American Sociological Review 22: 505-12.
- Vaz, Edmund W.
 1965 "Middle-class adolescents: self-reported delinquency and youth culture activities," The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 2: 52-72.
 1967 "Juvenile delinquency in the middle-class youth culture." Pp. 131-47 in Edmund W. Vaz (ed.), Middle-class Juvenile Delinquency. New York; Harper and Row.
- Venezia, Peter S.
 1971 "Delinquency prediction; a critique and a suggestion." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 8: 108-17.
- Vogel, William and Carl G. Lauterbach
 1963 "Relationships between normal and disturbed sons' percepts of their parents' behavior, and personality attributes of the parents and sons." Journal of Clinical Psychology 19: 52-56.
- Voss, Harwin L.
 1966 "Socio-economic status and reported delinquent behavior." Social Problems 13: 314-24.
 1969 "Differential association and containment theory; a theoretical convergence." Social Forces 47: 381-91.
- Webb, Eugene J., et. al.
 1973 Unobtrusive Measures; Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago; Rand McNally and Company.

Weinberg, S, Kirson

1964 "Juvenile delinquency in Ghana; a comparative analysis of delinquents and non-delinquents." *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Political Science* 55: 471-81.

1960 *Social Problems in Our Time*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated.

Wiatrowski, Michael D., David B. Griswold, and Mary K. Roberts

1981 "Social control theory and delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 46: 525-41.

Wilkinson, Karen

1974 "The broken family and juvenile delinquency: scientific explanation or ideology?" *Social Problems* 21: 726-39.

Willie, Charles V.

1967 "The relative contribution of family status and economic status to juvenile delinquency." *Social Problems* 14: 326-35.

Winch, Robert F.

1962 *Identification and Familial Determinants*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Incorporated.

Yablonsky, Lewis

1962 *The Violent Gang*. New York: Macmillan Company.

APPENDIX A

October, 1971

Survey 101

The Institute for Juvenile Research has asked the Institute for Social Action, a research organization, to survey the attitudes and opinions of young people in the State of Illinois.

You are one of over 3,000 youth in 40 counties in Illinois chosen by scientific probability sampling methods to participate in this study.

The questionnaire will take about 40 minutes to fill out. Please answer the questions as frankly and accurately as you can. Your answers will be absolutely confidential. When you have completed the questionnaire, the interviewer will place it in an envelope, seal it, and return it immediately to the Institute for Social Action office.

Almost all of the questions can be answered by drawing a circle around one or more numbers in the right-hand margins of the questionnaire. For example:

Your age at your last birthday? (CIRCLE ONE)

- 14 1 (6)
- 15 2
- 16 ③
- 17 4
- 18 5

Ignore these numbers.
For office use.

OR

Are you currently attending school?

- Yes No
- 1 ② (7)

After most questions there are instructions in parentheses. Please follow these instructions closely as they are very important.

If the instruction says "(CIRCLE ONE)," draw a circle around only one number--the number next to the answer (or below the answer) that comes closest to your answer. Sometimes no answer will be exactly your answer, or sometimes more than one answer will seem to apply. Always pick the one answer that comes closest to your answer.

If the instruction says "(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER IN EACH COLUMN)" or "(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE)," please look to see that you have circled one and only one number in each of the appropriate lines or columns.

Please fill in an answer for every question.

Thank you very much for your help.

1 2	3 4	5 6	7 8	9 10	11	12	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Cty	Twp	Sub	Seg	HU	P	R	

13-16

First, we would like to ask about you and your school.

1A. Which of the following best describes your school?
(CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- (7) Public 1 (17)
Catholic parochial 2
Other parochial 3
Other private 4

1B. Is your school coeducational or is it an all-boys or all-girls school?

- (8) Co-educational 1 (18)
All boy/All girl 2

2. What kind of college do you attend?
(CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- (9) Two-year community college 1 (19)
Four-year college 2
I do not attend college 3

3. Which of the following best describes your school program?
(CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- (10) General 1 (20)
College preparatory 2
Commercial or business 3
Vocational 4
Agriculture 5
Industrial arts 6
Other 7

4. How much education would you like to get before you complete your education?
(CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- (11) Don't want to finish high school 1 (21)
Want to finish high school 2
Want some college (don't want a degree) . . . 3
Want to finish a 2-year community college . . 4
Want to finish a four-year college 5
Want to attend graduate or professional school after college 6

5. How much education do you actually expect to get before you complete your education?

- (12) Don't expect to finish high school 1 (22)
Expect to finish high school 2
Expect some college (don't expect a degree) 3
Expect to finish a two-year community college 4
Expect to finish a four-year college 5
Expect to attend graduate or professional school after college 6

6. How much education do your parents expect you to get before you finish school?
(CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- (13) Don't expect me to finish high school . . . 1 (23)
Expect me to finish high school 2
Expect me to get some college (not a degree) 3
Expect me to finish a two-year community college 4
Expect me to finish a four-year college . . 5
Expect me to attend graduate or professional school after college 6

7. Here are some questions about being a student.
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE FROM A TO D)

- (14) A. How well do your parents expect you to do at school? Do they expect you to be 1 2 3 4 (24)
- (15) B. What about most of your teachers? Where do most of them expect you to be? 1 2 3 4 (25)
- (16) C. How well have you actually been doing at school? In terms of grades where do you rank? 1 2 3 4 (26)
- (17) D. How about your friends at school? In terms of grades, where do most of them rank? 1 2 3 4 (27)

8. Have any of the following things happened to you in school? Have you ever . . .
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A TO G)

- | | Yes | No | |
|---|-----|----|------|
| (18) A. Had a fist fight with another student in school | 1 | 2 | (28) |
| (19) B. Known a teacher well enough to discuss a personal problem | 1 | 2 | (29) |
| (20) C. Been suspended from school | 1 | 2 | (30) |
| (21) D. Been praised by a teacher in front of class for doing good work | 1 | 2 | (31) |
| (22) E. Had a teacher who had it in for you . . | 1 | 2 | (32) |
| (23) F. Had someone try to take money away from you | 1 | 2 | (33) |
| (24) G. Given a teacher a hard time in class . | 1 | 2 | (34) |

9A. How many of the kids you spend time with have ever done the following:

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a TO c)

	All of them	More than half of them	Less than half of them	None of them	
(25) a. Cheated on an exam at school or turned in work that was not his/her own	1	2	3	4	(35)
(26) b. Stayed away from school for at least part of a day, just to take off	1	2	3	4	(36)
(27) c. Bothered a teacher seriously enough to get thrown out of class	1	2	3	4	(37)

9B. How often have you ever done any of the following:

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a TO c)

	Never	Once or twice	A few times	Often	
(28) a. Cheated on an exam at school or turned in work that was not your own	1	2	3	4	(38)
(29) b. Stayed away from school for at least part of a day, just to take off	1	2	3	4	(39)
(30) c. Bothered a teacher seriously enough to get thrown out of class	1	2	3	4	(40)

10A.

	None	One	Three	Two	Four or More	
(31) How many high school sport teams have you played on?	1	2	3	4	5	(41)

10B.

	None	One	Three	Two	Four or More	
(32) How many other clubs and organizations have you joined in high school?	1	2	3	4	5	(42)

11. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A TO N)

	Agree	Disagree	
(33) A. A lot that I learn in class will be useful to me in later years	1	2	(43)
(34) B. Being with my friends is the best part of school	1	2	(44)
(35) C. School rules and regulations are too strict	1	2	(45)
(36) D. Going away to college will be too expensive for most of the kids who live around here	1	2	(46)
(37) E. It's better to be popular than to get good grades	1	2	(47)
(38) F. Students should have more to say about how the school is run	1	2	(48)
(39) G. Most kids who live around here would have trouble being accepted by a good college	1	2	(49)
(40) H. Most kids in school are the same race as I am	1	2	(50)
(41) I. Boys have to be good athletes if they want to be popular in my school	1	2	(51)
(42) J. Boys have to have a car to drive if they want to be popular in my school	1	2	(52)
(43) K. Girls have to have the right clothes if they want to be popular in my school	1	2	(53)
(44) L. If you haven't given teachers a bad time in class, it will be easy to get into college	1	2	(54)
(45) M. A college degree will make people respect you	1	2	(55)
(46) N. A college degree is a sure ticket to a good paying job	1	2	(56)

(47) 12. Thinking ahead to when you are about thirty, if you could do whatever you wanted to, what kind of work would you like to be doing then?
(PLEASE DESCRIBE IN DETAIL) (57-58)

(48) 13. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Agree	Disagree	
(49) A. Most kids around here will have good paying jobs when they are adults	1	2	(59)
(50) B. Around here a lot of men are unemployed or working for very little money	1	2	(60)
(51) C. Around here it's hard to make much money without doing something that is against the law	1	2	(61)
(52) D. In this area, there are some adults who make their living by doing things that are against the law	1	2	(62)
E. There are adults around here who help young people make money illegally	1	2	(63)

14. Can you talk freely to your father and mother about your personal feelings?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH PARENT)

	Yes	No	
(53) Father	1	2	(64)
(54) Mother	1	2	(65)

15. How do you get along with your father and mother?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH PARENT)

	Very well	Fairly well	Not too well	Not well at all	
(55) Father	1	2	3	4	(66)
(56) Mother	1	2	3	4	(67)

16. Compared to when you were younger, how do you get along with your parents now?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH PARENT)

	Better now	Worse now	Same	
(57) Father	1	2	3	(68)
(58) Mother	1	2	3	(69)

17. How well do your mother and father get along with each other?
(CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

	Very well	Fairly well	Not too well	Not well at all	
(59) 1	2	3	4	(70)	

18. How often do you do each of the following activities with your father and mother?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER IN EACH ROW A TO E)
(If parents divorced or one or both are deceased, please answer for parent or parent substitute with whom you live.)

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
(60) A. Go to movies or sporting events . . .	1	2	3	4	(71)
(61) B. Go shopping	1	2	3	4	(72)
(62) C. Visit family, friends and relatives	1	2	3	4	(73)
(63) D. Work on hobbies or play games	1	2	3	4	(74)
(64) E. Participate in sports activities (bowling, hunting, fishing, etc.)	1	2	3	4	(75)

19. How much do these statements apply to you?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A THROUGH L.)

	Very true of me	Somewhat true of me	Not true of me	
(65) A. I would like to grow up to be the kind of person my mother is	1	2	3	(5)
(66) B. My mother understands me as I really am	1	2	3	(6)
(67) C. My mother has a sense of humor	1	2	3	(7)
(68) D. It is important for me to please my mother	1	2	3	(8)
(69) E. I take my mother's advice seriously	1	2	3	(9)
(70) F. My mother doesn't understand the world we live in now . . .	1	2	3	(10)
(71) G. I would like to grow up to be the kind of person my father is	1	2	3	(11)
(72) H. My father understands me as I really am	1	2	3	(12)
(73) I. My father has a sense of humor	1	2	3	(13)
(74) J. It is important for me to please my father	1	2	3	(14)
(75) K. I take my father's advice seriously	1	2	3	(15)
(76) L. My father doesn't understand the world we now live in . . .	1	2	3	(16)

20. What about the discipline in your home?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH ITEM FROM A THROUGH C)

Very Often Fairly often Once in a while Hardly ever Never

- A. How often do your
(77) parents criticize you or put you down . . . 1 2 3 4 5 (17)
- B. When you were in the
(78) 5th or 6th grade, how often would your parents spank or whip you when you did something they considered wrong? 1 2 3 4 5 (18)
- C. When your parents insist that you do something, do they explain the reason? 1 2 3 4 5 (19)

21. If you did any of the things listed below, how would your parents handle it?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR ITEMS A THROUGH C)

- A. If you got into trouble with the police:
(80) a. It wouldn't bother them 1 (20)
b. It would bother them, but they would ignore it 2
c. Talk to you about it 3
d. Get angry or threaten to punish you 4
e. Punish you, but not physically 5
f. Hit, spank, or other physical punishment 6
- B. If you openly defied your parents:
(81) a. It wouldn't bother them 1 (21)
b. It would bother them, but they would ignore it 2
c. Talk to you about it 3
d. Get angry or threaten to punish you 4
e. Punish you, but not physically 5
f. Hit, spank, or other physical punishment 6
- C. If your parents found some marijuana (pot) in your room:
(82) a. It wouldn't bother them 1 (22)
b. It would bother them, but they would ignore it 2
c. Talk to you about it 3
d. Get angry or threaten to punish you 4
e. Punish you, but not physically 5
f. Hit, spank, or other physical punishment 6
- (1) Regardless of what your parents would do at the time, would they report you to the police?
(83) Yes No
1 2 (23)

22. If you were accused of doing something wrong at school, but you denied it . . .

Yes No

- (84) A. Would your parents believe you side of the story? 1 2 (24)
- (85) B. Would your parents go to school to defend you? 1 2 (25)

23. If you were accused of doing something wrong by the police, but you denied it . . .

Yes No

- (86) A. Would your parents believe your side of the story? 1 2 (26)
- (87) B. Would your parents go to the police station to defend you 1 2 (27)

24. Families differ in the rules they make for their children. In your home, are there any rules for you about . . .

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A THROUGH I)

Yes No

- (88) A. Regular duties or chores around the house 1 2 (28)
- (89) B. Week night curfews 1 2 (29)
- (90) C. Weekend night curfews 1 2 (30)
- (91) D. Rules about studying or homework for school, certain hours, etc. . . . 1 2 (31)
- (92) E. Parents having to meet and approve your friends 1 2 (32)
- (93) F. How you wear your hair 1 2 (33)
- (94) G. The way you dress 1 2 (34)
- (95) H. Use of cars 1 2 (35)
- (96) I. Your parents knowing where you are 1 2 (36)

25. How fair are your parents in enforcing these rules?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

Fair most of the time Sometimes fair and sometimes unfair Unfair most of the time

- (97) 1 2 3 (37)

26. Are you allowed to make your own decisions about things that are important to you?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never

- (98) 1 2 3 4 5 (38)

(99) 27. Considering the rules in your family, again would you say your parents are as fair to you as they are to your brother(s) and sister(s)?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

Yes No I have no brothers or sisters
1 2 3 (39)

(100) 28. Can you talk freely to any of your brothers and sisters about your personal feelings?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

Yes No I have no brothers or sisters
1 2 3 (40)

(101) 29. Have any of your brothers or sisters been in trouble with the police?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

Yes No I have no brothers or sisters
1 2 3 (41)

(102) 30. Who provides most of your spending money?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

My parents Myself Both equally
1 2 3 (42)

(103) 31. Generally, how much spending money do you have each week? (Don't include school carfare and lunch money.)

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

0-1	2-3	4-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(43)

(104) 32. How much money do most of your friends have per week?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

More than I do Same as I do Less than I do
1 2 3 (44)

(105) 33. During the past two months, how many record albums or tapes have you purchased?

None One Two Three Four Five Six Seven or more
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (45)

34. What kind of music do you like most? (CIRCLE ONE)

- (106) a. Classical and Semi-classical 1 (46)
b. Musical comedies or movie scores, smooth pop music 2
c. Country and Western 3
d. Folk music 4
e. Rock 5
f. Jazz or Blues 6

(107) 35. On the average, how much time do you spend listening to music each day?

- a. Four or more hours 1 (47)
b. Three hours 2
c. Two hours 3
d. One hour 4
e. Less than one hour a day 5

36. How often in the past year have you gone to the movies?

- (108) a. Once a week or more 1 (48)
b. Two or three times a month 2
c. About once a month 3
d. About once every two months 4
e. Less than once every two months 5
f. Not at all 6

37. On the average, how much television do you watch?

- (109) a. More than two hours a day 1 (49)
b. One to two hours a day 2
c. Less than one hour a day 3
d. Three to four hours a week 4
e. One to two hours a week 5
f. Less than one hour a week 6

38. How many kids do you generally go around with?

(110) (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

One Three Five Seven Over
None or two or four or six or eight eight
1 2 3 4 5 6 (50)

39. Of the kids you go around with most often, are most of them

- (111) (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)
a. Older than you are 1 (51)
b. About the same age as you 2
c. Younger than you are 3

40. How much of your free time do you spend together with the kids you hang around with?

- (112) (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)
a. Most of my free time 1 (52)
b. Some of my free time 2
c. Very little of my free time 3

41. Where are you most likely to get together with the kids you hang around with? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (113) a. My home 11 (53 54)
b. Someone else's home 12
c. At school (outside school hours) 13
d. On the street 14
e. At a church 15
f. At a pool hall 16
g. At a drug store 17
h. At a drive-in or restaurant 18
i. In a park or field house 21
j. Driving around 22
k. Other (SPECIFY) 23

42. How much of your free time is spent without adult supervision—that is, where you and your friends can do pretty much what you want?

- (114) (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)
a. Most of my free time 1 (55)
b. Some of my free time 2
c. Very little of my free time 3

43. Groups of kids can be described differently. Can the following statements be used to describe most of the kids you run around with?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH ITEM)

		Yes	No	
(115)	A. Wear new styles in clothing	1	2	(56)
(116)	B. Ready to fight	1	2	(57)
(117)	C. Know what's going on in the world of rock music	1	2	(58)
(118)	D. Think it's important to get good grades	1	2	(59)
(119)	E. Involved in school social life	1	2	(60)
(120)	F. Get into trouble with the police	1	2	(61)
(121)	G. Like the long hair, beards, etc., look	1	2	(62)
(122)	H. Interested in cars or motorcycles	1	2	(63)
(123)	I. Into the drug scene	1	2	(64)
(124)	J. Interested in sports	1	2	(65)
(125)	K. Like to stir up a little excitement	1	2	(66)
(126)	L. Concerned about social and political issues	1	2	(67)

44. People have different ideas about what it is to be a man or a woman, as you can see in the following statements they have made. Do you agree or disagree with these statements?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A TO E.)

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
(127)	A. Husbands and wives should share both the jobs of breadwinner and of raising children	1	2	3	4	(68)
(128)	B. It is natural for women to want to be taken care of by men	1	2	3	4	(69)
(129)	C. There ought to be many more opportunities for women to take leadership positions in politics and business	1	2	3	4	(70)
(130)	D. I wouldn't want a woman boss	1	2	3	4	(71)
(131)	E. It's better for girls to try to be agreeable than to speak their own minds	1	2	3	4	(72)

45. Of the kids you go around with most often, how many do you consider close friends (kids you can discuss a personal problem with)?

(132)

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

a. None of them	1	(73)
b. Only a few of them	2	
c. About half of them	3	
d. Almost all of them	4	
e. All of them	5	

46. Are you "dating"?

(133)

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

a. I do not "date" or go out with a group of boys and girls	1	(74)
b. I do not "date" but go out with a group of boys and girls	2	
c. I am "dating" several people	3	
d. I am "dating" one person, but not steadily	4	
e. I am "going steady" or "dating" one person steadily	5	
f. I am engaged	6	
g. OR I am married	7	

47. On the average, how often do you "date" (IF YOU DON'T DATE: How often do you go out with a group of boys and girls)?

(134)

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

a. Three or more times a week	1	(75)
b. Once or twice a week	2	
c. Once or twice a month	3	
d. Less than once a month	4	
e. Do not date or go out with a group of boys and girls	5	
f. OR I am married	6	

48. How many different persons have you dated during the last twelve months?

(135)

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

a. None	1	(76)
b. One	2	
c. Two or three	3	
d. Four to seven	4	
e. Eight or more	5	
f. OR I am married	6	

49. How old do you want to be when you get married (IF YOU ARE ALREADY MARRIED: How old were you when you got married)?

(136)

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

a. I do not expect to get married	1	(77)
b. Sixteen or younger	2	
c. Seventeen, eighteen or nineteen	3	
d. Twenty to twenty-two	4	
e. Twenty-three to twenty-five	5	
f. Twenty-six or older	6	

50. A. How important is it to you to marry someone of your own ethnic (nationality) group?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (137) a. Very important 1 (78)
 b. Somewhat important 2
 c. Not too important 3
 d. Not important at all 4

B. How important is it to you to marry someone of your own religious group? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (138) a. Very important 1 (5) Start Deck 3
 b. Somewhat important 2
 c. Not too important 3
 d. Not important at all 4

51. How many children do you want to have?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (139) a. None 1
 b. One 2
 c. Two 3
 d. Three 4
 e. Four 5
 f. Five or more 6

52. Generally speaking, how do you get along with members of the opposite sex? Would you say you are . . . (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (140) a. Relaxed and comfortable 1 (7)
 b. Relaxed and comfortable, but not as comfortable as with members of my own sex 2
 c. I have some difficulty 3
 d. I have a great deal of difficulty 4

53. Compared to most of your friends, would you say that your attitudes towards sex are more liberal, more conservative, or about the same? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (141) a. More liberal than most friends 1 (8)
 b. More conservative than most friends 2
 c. About the same as most friends 3

54. Regardless of how much or how little sexual experience you've had, compared to most of your friends, would you say that you've had more sexual experience, less sexual experience, or about the same amount of sexual experience as most of them? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (142) a. More sexual experience 1 (9)
 b. Less sexual experience 2
 c. About the same amount of sexual experience 3

55. Answer questions A and B.

A. Different people have different ideas about what is proper behavior with reference to sex. When do you think it is all right for a BOY of your own age to do the following things?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER IN EACH SECTION)

- 1) Light petting:
 (143) a. Not before marriage 1 (10)
 b. If engaged to be married 2
 c. If in love but not engaged 3
 d. If feel strong affection but not in love 4
 e. If both want it even if their relationship is casual 5

- 2) Heavy petting:
 (144) a. Not before marriage 1 (11)
 b. If engaged to be married 2
 c. If in love but not engaged 3
 d. If feel strong affection but not in love 4
 e. If both want it even if their relationship is casual 5

- 3) Sexual intercourse:
 (145) a. Not before marriage 1 (12)
 b. If engaged to be married 2
 c. If in love but not engaged 3
 d. If feel strong affection but not in love 4
 e. If both want it even if their relationship is casual 5

B. Now about GIRLS. When do you think it is all right for a GIRL of your own age to do the following things?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER IN EACH SECTION)

- 1) Light petting:
 (146) a. Not before marriage 1 (13)
 b. If engaged to be married 2
 c. If in love but not engaged 3
 d. If feel strong affection but not in love 4
 e. If both want it even if their relationship is casual 5

- 2) Heavy petting:
 (147) a. Not before marriage 1 (14)
 b. If engaged to be married 2
 c. If in love but not engaged 3
 d. If feel strong affection but not in love 4
 e. If both want it even if their relationship is casual 5

- 3) Sexual intercourse:
 (148) a. Not before marriage 1 (15)
 b. If engaged to be married 2
 c. If in love but not engaged 3
 d. If feel strong affection but not in love 4
 e. If both want it even if their relationship is casual 5

56. How old were you the first time you engaged in . . . (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER IN A, B, AND C)

Age							
12 or younger	13	14	15	16	17	18	Have it done it yet

- (149) A. Light petting: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (16)
 (150) B. Heavy petting: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (17)
 (151) C. Sexual intercourse: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (18)

57. How do you feel about the following statements people have made about sex?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A TO H)

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

- (152) A. People who have a lot of sex before marriage make better marriage partners 1 2 3 4 (19)
- (153) B. I would not remain friends with someone I found was a homosexual 1 2 3 4 (20)
- (154) C. A girl who goes to bed with a boy before marriage will lose his respect . . . 1 2 3 4 (21)
- (155) D. Most homosexuals are mentally disturbed 1 2 3 4 (22)
- (156) E. Homosexuals should be excluded from regular society 1 2 3 4 (23)
- (157) F. Sexual intercourse without marriage is unnatural 1 2 3 4 (24)
- (158) G. There is an element of homosexuality in all of us 1 2 3 4 (25)
- (159) H. Being too preoccupied with sex is a sign of being mentally unbalanced . . 1 2 3 4 (26)

58. Have you ever had a program or class at school which covered the following topics? Yes No

- (160) A. Human reproduction 1 2 (27)
- (161) B. Birth Control 1 2 (28)
- (162) C. Masturbation 1 2 (29)
- (163) D. Venereal Disease 1 2 (30)
- (164) E. Homosexuality 1 2 (31)

59. Now let's talk about cars and motorcycles . . . (CIRCLE YES OR NO FOR EACH STATEMENT)

Yes No

- (165) A. I have a motorcycle 1 2 (32)
- (166) B. I have my own car 1 2 (33)
- (167) C. I have access to a car 1 2 (34)
- (168) D. Most of my friends have cars . . 1 2 (35)
- (169) E. Most of my friends have motorcycles 1 2 (36)
- (170) F. I work on my car 1 2 (37)
- (171) G. Most of my friends work on their cars 1 2 (38)
- (172) H. I spend a lot of time at drag and sprint races 1 2 (39)
- (173) I. I have a driver's license or learning permit 1 2 (40)
- (174) J. Most of my friends have driving licenses or learning permits . . 1 2 (41)

60. A. How many of the kids you spend time with have ever done the following:

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - h.)

All of them More than half of them Less than half of them None of them

- (175) a. Driven a car without a driver's license or permit . . 1 2 3 4 (42)
- (176) b. Rode around in a car that was stolen for the ride 1 2 3 4 (43)
- (177) c. Driven a car too fast or recklessly 1 2 3 4 (44)
- (178) d. Stripped someone else's car of parts to use or sell 1 2 3 4 (45)
- (179) e. Drank beer, wine or liquor with parent's permission 1 2 3 4 (46)
- (180) f. Drank beer, wine or liquor without parent's permission 1 2 3 4 (47)
- (181) g. Bought beer, wine or liquor 1 2 3 4 (48)
- (182) h. Drank enough to get drunk 1 2 3 4 (49)

B. How often have you ever done any of the following: (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - h)

Never Once or twice A few times Often

- (183) a. Driven a car without a driver's license or permit . . 1 2 3 4 (50)
- (184) b. Rode around in a car that was stolen for the ride 1 2 3 4 (51)
- (185) c. Driven a car too fast or recklessly 1 2 3 4 (52)
- (186) d. Stripped someone else's car of parts to use or sell 1 2 3 4 (53)
- (187) e. Drank beer, wine or liquor with parent's permission 1 2 3 4 (54)
- (188) f. Drank beer, wine or liquor without parent's permission 1 2 3 4 (55)
- (189) g. Bought beer, wine or liquor 1 2 3 4 (56)
- (190) h. Drank enough to get drunk 1 2 3 4 (57)

61. How often do you smoke cigarettes?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (191) a. Don't smoke 1 (58)
 b. Only smoked once or twice ever 2
 c. Only once in a while 3
 d. A few cigarettes a day 4
 e. Less than a pack a day 5
 f. A pack a day or more 6

62. There are a lot of different views on drugs. Do you agree or disagree with the following opinions?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE FROM A TO M.)

- | | Agree | Disagree | |
|--|-------|----------|------|
| (192) A. If you can't sleep, it's OK to take a sleeping pill without a doctor's prescription | 1 | 2 | (59) |
| (193) B. It's all right to smoke a little marijuana (grass) from time to time at parties | 1 | 2 | (60) |
| (194) C. I would like a safe pill that would always make me happy | 1 | 2 | (61) |
| (195) D. Speed can wreck the body | 1 | 2 | (62) |
| (196) E. Most people use marijuana just because it's fun | 1 | 2 | (63) |
| (197) F. An LSD trip is a good way to learn about yourself | 1 | 2 | (64) |
| (198) G. You can stop using marijuana any time you want to | 1 | 2 | (65) |
| (199) H. Drugs can mess up your mind | 1 | 2 | (66) |
| (200) I. Marijuana leads to stronger drugs | 1 | 2 | (67) |
| (201) J. If a person takes LSD, his children might be born with deformities | 1 | 2 | (68) |
| (202) K. If a person has a lot of big problems, it's all right to take drugs to forget them | 1 | 2 | (69) |
| (203) L. If a person has will power, he can take heroin and stop when he wants to | 1 | 2 | (70) |
| (204) M. Laws against using marijuana are too strict | 1 | 2 | (71) |

63. How much have you heard about drugs from each of the following sources?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE FROM A TO D.)

- | | A great deal | Some | A little | None | |
|---|--------------|------|----------|------|------|
| (205) A. From my family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (72) |
| (206) B. From the people I hang around with | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (73) |
| (207) C. From school classes and school drug programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (74) |
| (208) D. From the T.V., radio, newspapers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (75) |

(1) Do you feel that they knew what they were talking about?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH ITEM)

- | | Yes | No | No information from source | |
|--|-----|----|----------------------------|------|
| (209) A. My family | 1 | 2 | 3 | (76) |
| (210) B. The people I hang around with | 1 | 2 | 3 | (77) |
| (211) C. School classes and school drug programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | (78) |
| (212) D. T.V., radio, newspapers | 1 | 2 | 3 | (79) |

64. A. How many of the kids you spend time with have ever done the following:

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - h)

- | | All of them | More than half of them | Less than half of them | None of them | Start Dec |
|---|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------|
| (213) a. Used Glue, Gas or other inhalants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (5) |
| (214) b. Used marijuana or hashish (grass, pot, hash) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (6) |
| (215) c. Used LSD, mescaline or other psychedelics | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (7) |
| (216) d. Used heroin (smack) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (8) |
| (217) e. Used microzine (figaro) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (9) |
| (218) f. Used downers or barbituates (without a prescription) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (10) |
| (219) g. Used methedrine (speed) or other uppers or amphetamines (without a prescription) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (11) |
| (220) h. Sold any of the drugs listed above | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (12) |

B. How often have you ever done any of the following:

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE o - h)

- | | Never | Once or twice | A few times | Often | |
|---|-------|---------------|-------------|-------|------|
| (221) a. Used glue, gas or other inhalants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (13) |
| (222) b. Used marijuana or hashish (grass, pot, hash) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (14) |
| (223) c. Used LSD, mescaline or other psychedelics | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (15) |
| (224) d. Used heroin (smack) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (16) |
| (225) e. Used microzine (figaro) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (17) |
| (226) f. Used downers or barbituates (without a prescription) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (18) |
| (227) g. Used methedrine (speed) or other uppers or amphetamines (without a prescription) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (19) |
| (228) h. Sold any of the drugs listed above | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (20) |

64. C. IF YOU HAVE NEVER TRIED MARIJUANA: Do you think you might try it someday?

- | Yes | No | |
|-----|----|------|
| 1 | 2 | (21) |

65. How would you rate your parents and yourself, politically?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR YOURSELF AND ONE FOR EACH PARENT.) (230) (231) (232)

	(22) I am	(23) My mother is	(24) My father is
a. Radical	1	1	1
b. Very liberal	2	2	2
c. Moderately liberal	3	3	3
d. Moderately conservative	4	4	4
e. Very conservative	5	5	5

66. Regardless of how you rated yourself and your parents in the last question, how do your views compare to theirs? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH PARENT.)

	(233) Compared to my mother I am	(234) (235) Compared to my father I am
a. More liberal	1	1
b. The same	2	2
c. More conservative	3	3

67. Do your parents usually vote Democratic or Republican?

(235)	Democratic	1	(27)
	Republican	2	
	Other	3	
	I don't know	4	

68. Given below are statements on various social issues about which everyone has opinions. Indicate how you feel about each statement.

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE FROM A TO N)
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

(236) A.	It is up to the government to make sure that everyone has a secure job and a good standard of living	1	2	3	4	(28)
(237) B.	The government isn't doing enough to make the streets safe to walk on	1	2	3	4	(29)
(238) C.	All children of welfare families should be put to work full time when they are 16	1	2	3	4	(30)
(239) D.	Too many people get away with preaching violence and rebellion	1	2	3	4	(31)
(240) E.	All jobs should pay about the same	1	2	3	4	(32)
(241) F.	The rate of change in race relations in this country is too slow	1	2	3	4	(33)
(242) G.	Only daydreamers think that you can improve people by government programs and social reform	1	2	3	4	(34)

68 H. People on welfare should receive no more than the basic necessities 1 2 3 4 (35)

(244) I. A strong person will make out no matter what happens; a weak person will fail no matter how much we spend on him 1 2 3 4 (36)

(245) J. Before the black people can expect full equality, they must first earn the white man's respect 1 2 3 4 (37)

(246) K. The best in higher education should be for those whose parents planned and saved 1 2 3 4 (38)

(247) L. Racial integration to date has been more show than reality 1 2 3 4 (39)

(248) M. The courts don't let the police do their job 1 2 3 4 (40)

(249) N. Civil rights demonstrations do more harm than good for the black people's cause 1 2 3 4 (41)

69. How would you respond in each of the following situations: (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR A AND B)

(250) A.	A popular and competent school teacher was fired for her unpopular views	1	(42)
	a. I would do nothing	1	
	b. I would do nothing because we must respect the authorities	2	
	c. I would sign a petition to the authorities to oppose the action	3	
	d. I would join in demonstrations directed at the authorities	4	
	e. I would participate in acts of civil disobedience	5	
(251) B.	A local industry was granted a long-term delay by the local government in developing anti-pollution programs	1	(43)
	a. I would do nothing	1	
	b. I would do nothing because we must respect the authorities	2	
	c. I would sign a petition to the authorities to oppose the action	3	
	d. I would join in demonstrations directed at the authorities	4	
	e. I would participate in acts of civil disobedience	5	

70. Have you ever taken part in:
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR A, B & C)

	Yes	No		
(252) A.	A civil rights demonstration	1	2	(44)
(253) B.	An anti-war demonstration	1	2	(45)
(254) C.	A school related demonstration	1	2	(46)

71. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following items?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER IN EACH ROW FROM A TO H)
- | | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|------|
| (255) A. You can't trust anyone over 30 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (47) |
| (256) B. There is a revolution coming in America . . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (48) |
| (257) C. There are too many chemicals in our food | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (49) |
| (258) D. I would be comfortable living in a commune . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (59) |
| (259) E. Computers are running our lives | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (51) |
| (260) F. Adults put too much stress on material things | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (52) |
| (261) G. There are no just wars | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (53) |
| (262) H. Most adults don't know how to enjoy themselves | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (54) |

72. How well do each of the following statements describe you?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER IN EACH ROW FROM A TO I)
- | | Very true of me | Somewhat true of me | Not true of me | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|------|
| (263) A. When I get very angry at a person, I let him or her know it | 1 | 2 | 3 | (55) |
| (264) B. I really enjoy life . . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | (56) |
| (265) C. I feel tense most of the time | 1 | 2 | 3 | (57) |
| (266) D. My feelings are easily hurt | 1 | 2 | 3 | (58) |
| (267) E. When I decide to do something, I do it . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | (59) |
| (268) F. I am concerned about social and political issues | 1 | 2 | 3 | (60) |
| (269) G. I find life an endless series of problems with no solutions in sight | 1 | 2 | 3 | (61) |
| (270) H. I am afraid someone is going to make fun of me | 1 | 2 | 3 | (62) |
| (271) I. I tend to do things even if there is some danger in them | 1 | 2 | 3 | (63) |

- (272) J. I sometimes feel that I just can't learn 1 2 3 (64)
- (273) K. Good luck is more important than hard work for success 1 2 3 (65)
- (274) L. Every time I try to get ahead, something stops me 1 2 3 (66)
- (275) M. People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life 1 2 3 (67)
- (276) N. There are many things about myself I'd like to change 1 2 3 (68)

73. A. Have you ever had an emotional problem for which you needed help?
- (277) Yes 1 (69)
No 2 (70)

- (278) B. Did you try to get help?
- Yes 1 (70)
No 2

- (279) C. Where did you go for help?
- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------|
| Psychiatrist | 1 | (71) |
| Psychologist | 2 | |
| Social worker | 3 | |
| Family physician | 4 | |
| Clergyman | 5 | |
| School counselor | 6 | |
| Other (specify) _____ | 7 | |
| Had no problem | 8 | |

- (280) D. If you had an emotional problem now, would you know where to go for help?
- Yes 1 (71)
No 2

74. A. Generally, how do you feel these days - would you say you're very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?
- (281) Very happy 1 (72)
Pretty happy 2
Not too happy 3

- (282) B. All things considered, would you say you're happier now or unhappier compared to the way you felt a few years ago?
- Happier now 1 (73)
Unhappier now 2
About the same 3

Start Deck 5

75. A. How many of the kids you spend time with have ever done the following:

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - m)

	All of them	More than half of them	Less than half of them	None of them	
(283) a. Made an anonymous phone call just to annoy someone	1	2	3	4	(5)
(284) b. Ran away from home	1	2	3	4	(6)
(285) c. Deliberately damaged private or public property	1	2	3	4	(7)
(286) d. Taken little things without permission from home or school	1	2	3	4	(8)
(287) e. Taken something small from a store	1	2	3	4	(9)
(288) f. Taken at least \$20, or something worth at least \$20, that did not belong to them	1	2	3	4	(10)
(289) g. Kept or used something that they knew had been stolen	1	2	3	4	(11)
(290) h. Broken into someone's home or a store or some other place, in order to steal something	1	2	3	4	(12)
(291) i. Had a fist fight with another person	1	2	3	4	(13)
(292) j. Taken part in a gang fight	1	2	3	4	(14)
(293) k. Carried any kind of weapon—gun, knife, razor, etc.—in case they had to use it against another person	1	2	3	4	(15)
(294) l. Used a weapon in a fight—a brick, knife, razor, or anything else	1	2	3	4	(16)
(295) m. Used force or threatened to use force to get money from another person	1	2	3	4	(17)

B. How often have you ever done any of the following:
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - m)

	Never	Once or twice	A few times	Often	
(296) a. Made an anonymous phone call just to annoy someone	1	2	3	4	(18)
(297) b. Run away from home	1	2	3	4	(19)
(298) c. Deliberately damaged private or public property	1	2	3	4	(20)
(299) d. Taken little things without permission from home or school	1	2	3	4	(21)
(300) e. Taken something small from a store	1	2	3	4	(22)
(301) f. Taken at least \$20, or something worth at least \$20, that did not belong to you	1	2	3	4	(23)
(302) g. Kept or used something that you knew had been stolen	1	2	3	4	(24)
(303) h. Broken into someone's home or a store or some other place, in order to steal something	1	2	3	4	(25)
(304) i. Had a fist fight with another person	1	2	3	4	(26)
(305) j. Taken part in a gang fight	1	2	3	4	(27)
(306) k. Carried any kind of weapon—gun, knife, razor, etc., in case you had to use it against another person	1	2	3	4	(28)
(307) l. Used a weapon in a fight—a brick, knife, razor, or anything else	1	2	3	4	(29)
(308) m. Used force or threatened to use force to get money from another person	1	2	3	4	(30)

76. What do you think the authorities should do to a young person who does the following things? Should they do nothing, should they give a police warning and release the young person, should the authorities insist the youngster be given treatment or counseling while living at home, or should the authorities insist the young person be jailed?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - p)

		Police warning and release	Treatment or counseling	Jail	
(309)	a. Runs away from home	1	2	3	4 (31)
(310)	b. Takes something small from a store	1	2	3	4 (32)
(311)	c. Takes at least \$20 or something worth at least \$20 that doesn't belong to him or her	1	2	3	4 (33)
(312)	d. Has a fist fight with another person	1	2	3	4 (34)
(313)	e. Uses a weapon in a fight—a brick, a knife, razor, or anything else	1	2	3	4 (35)
(314)	f. Uses force or threatens to use force to get something from another person	1	2	3	4 (36)
(315)	g. Rides around in a car that that was stolen for the ride	1	2	3	4 (37)
(316)	h. Strips someone else's car for parts to use or sell	1	2	3	4 (38)
(317)	i. Drinks beer, wine or liquor without parental permission	1	2	3	4 (39)
(318)	j. Drinks enough to get drunk	1	2	3	4 (40)
(319)	k. Places a bet with a gambler	1	2	3	4 (41)
(320)	l. Uses marijuana or hashish	1	2	3	4 (42)
(321)	m. Uses LSD, or another psychedelic drug	1	2	3	4 (43)
(322)	n. Uses heroin	1	2	3	4 (44)
(323)	o. Sells drugs	1	2	3	4 (45)
(324)	p. Stays away from school for at least part of a day just to take off . .	1	2	3	4 (46)

77. How about most adults? What do you think most adults would think the authorities should do to a young person who does each of these things? Would most adults think the authorities should do nothing, they should give a police warning and release the young person, the authorities should insist the youngster be given treatment or counselling while living at home, or the authorities should insist the youngster be jailed?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - p)

		Police warning and release	Treatment or counseling	Jail	
(325)	a. Runs away from home	1	2	3	4 (47)
(326)	b. Takes something small from a store	1	2	3	4 (48)
(327)	c. Takes at least \$20 or something worth at least \$20 that doesn't belong to him or her	1	2	3	4 (49)
(328)	d. Has a fist fight with another person	1	2	3	4 (50)
(329)	e. Uses a weapon in a fight—a brick, a knife, razor, or anything else	1	2	3	4 (51)
(330)	f. Uses force or threatens to use force to get something from another person	1	2	3	4 (52)
(331)	g. Rides around in a car that was stolen for the ride	1	2	3	4 (53)
(332)	h. Strips someone else's car for parts to use or sell	1	2	3	4 (54)
(333)	i. Drinks beer, wine or liquor without parental permission	1	2	3	4 (55)
(334)	j. Drinks enough to get drunk	1	2	3	4 (56)
(335)	k. Places a bet with a gambler	1	2	3	4 (57)
(336)	l. Uses marijuana or hashish	1	2	3	4 (58)
(337)	m. Uses LSD or another psychedelic drug	1	2	3	4 (59)
(338)	n. Uses heroin	1	2	3	4 (60)
(339)	o. Sells drugs	1	2	3	4 (61)
(340)	p. Stays away from school for at least part of a day just to take off . .	1	2	3	4 (62)

78. Have any of these things ever happened to you or anyone in your family?

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A TO I)

Yes No

- (341) A. Have you ever received an anonymous phone call that was made just to annoy you 1 2 (63)
- (342) B. Has someone ever used a weapon against you in a fight 1 2 (64)
- (343) C. Have you ever had to give money to a person who used force or threatened to use force against you? 1 2 (65)
- (344) D. Has your car, or your family's car ever been stolen for a joy ride? 1 2 (66)
- (345) E. Has your car, or your family's car, ever been stripped for parts? 1 2 (67)
- (346) F. Have little things ever been stolen from you at school? 1 2 (68)
- (347) G. Has \$20, or something worth at least \$20, ever been stolen from you? 1 2 (69)
- (348) H. Has your home ever been broken into? . . . 1 2 (70)
- (349) I. Has anyone ever tried to sexually molest you? 1 2 (71)

End Deck 5

Start Deck 6

79. How would you describe most policemen around here? Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Agree Disagree

- (350) A. The police are around when you need them 1 2 (5)
- (351) B. The police are unfair to teenagers 1 2 (6)
- (352) C. You can trust most policemen 1 2 (7)
- (353) D. Most policemen are on the take (receiving graft) 1 2 (8)
- (354) E. Most policemen do a good job 1 2 (9)
- (355) F. The police bother teenagers who haven't done anything wrong 1 2 (10)
- (356) G. The police know what kids are getting into around here 1 2 (11)
- (357) H. Most policemen like teenagers 1 2 (12)
- (358) I. Policemen go easy on kids whose families have money 1 2 (13)

80. Here are some questions about the police and the courts.

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION FROM A TO D.)

Once A
or few
Never twice times Often

- (359) A. How many times have you been stopped by the police and warned about doing something wrong when you hadn't done anything wrong at all? 1 2 3 4 (14)
- (360) B. How many times have you been brought to a police station for doing something wrong, and then been released without ever going to court? 1 2 3 4 (15)
- (361) C. How many times have you appeared before a juvenile court for an unofficial hearing (where it didn't become part of your permanent record)? 1 2 3 4 (16)
- (362) D. How many times have you appeared before a juvenile court for an official hearing (where it did become part of your permanent record)? 1 2 3 4 (17)

81. Do you know where you can place a bet with someone who makes his living from gambling?

Yes No

- (363) A. On a professional sporting event (football, basketball, world series, etc.) 1 2 (18)
- (364) B. On a policy or numbers game 1 2 (19)

82. How often have you placed a bet with a gambler on:

- (365) A. A professional sporting event -
 Never 1 (20)
 Once or twice 2
 At least a few times 3
 Very often 4
- (366) B. On a numbers game, etc. -
 Never 1 (21)
 Once or twice 2
 At least a few times 3
 Very often 4

Finally, we have just a few more questions about you.

- (367) 83. With whom are you living now? (CIRCLE ONE)
- Mother and father 1 (22)
 - Mother and stepfather 2
 - Father and stepmother 3
 - Mother only 4
 - Father only 5
 - Other relative 6
 - Other (friend) 7

- (368) 84. How long have you lived in this city (town)? (CIRCLE ONE)
- 1 year 1 (23)
 - 2 to 4 years 2
 - 5 to 8 years 3
 - Over 8 years 4
 - All my life 5

- (369) 85. In what kind of place did you live most of the time up to your 14th birthday? (CIRCLE ONE)
- On a farm or ranch 1 (24)
 - In the country, but not on a farm or ranch 2
 - In a town or small city 3
 - In a medium sized city 4
 - In a large city 5
 - In the suburb of a large city 6

- (370) 86. What ethnic (nationality) group are you a member of? (25-26)
-

- (371) 87. How many of your close friends are members of your ethnic group? (CIRCLE ONE)
- All 1 (27)
 - Most 2
 - Some 3
 - Few 4
 - None 5

- (372) 88. In what religion were you raised? (CIRCLE ONE)
- Catholic 1 (28)
 - Protestant 2
 - Jewish 3
 - Other 4
 - No religion 5

89. How frequently do you go to religious services or other activities sponsored by religious organizations? (CIRCLE ONE)
- (373)
- Once a week or more 1 (29)
 - Two or three times a month 2
 - Once a month 3
 - Several times a year 4
 - Only on holidays 5
 - Never 6

90. How much of the time that you go to religious services, do you go because your parents insist on it? (CIRCLE ONE)
- (374)
- All the time 1 (30)
 - Most of the time 2
 - Some of the time 3
 - None of the time 4

91. Regardless of how often you go to services, how religious do you think you are? (CIRCLE ONE)
- (375)
- Very religious 1 (31)
 - Somewhat religious 2
 - Not too religious 3
 - Not religious at all 4

92. What social class would you say your family is? (CIRCLE ONE)
- (376)
- Upper class 1 (32)
 - Middle class 2
 - Lower class 3
 - Working class 4

93. As close as you can guess, how much money does your family earn (before taxes) in a year? (CIRCLE ONE)
- (377)
- \$3,000 a year or less 1 (33)
 - \$3,000 to \$5,000 2
 - \$5,000 to \$7,500 3
 - \$7,500 to \$10,000 4
 - \$10,000 to \$15,000 5
 - \$15,000 to \$20,000 6
 - Over \$20,000 7

94. How honest do you think you've been in filling out this questionnaire? Would you say you've been able to be honest on:
- (378)
- All questions 1 (34)
 - Most questions 2
 - Some questions 3
 - Just a few questions 4
 - None 5

- (379) Which questions were you not honest in filling out? (35)

(Out of School Respondents Only)

Start Deck 7

- (380) 1. A. How long has it been since you left school?
 Less than 6 months 1 (17)
 6 months - 1 year 2
 1 year - 2 years 3
 2 years - 3 years 4
 3 years or more 5

- (381) B. If you had it to do all over again, what decision would you make now about leaving school?
 I would leave school 1 (18)
 I'd have problems making up my mind about whether or not to leave school 2
 I would stay in school 3
 I graduated from high school 4

2. Were any of the following reasons why you left school?
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE A - G)
- | | Yes | No | |
|---|-----|----|------|
| (382) A. I found school dull and boring | 1 | 2 | (19) |
| (383) B. I wanted to earn money | 1 | 2 | (20) |
| (384) C. Many of my friends were no longer in school | 1 | 2 | (21) |
| (385) D. Teachers were giving me a hard time | 1 | 2 | (22) |
| (386) E. Parents encouraged me to leave school | 1 | 2 | (23) |
| (387) F. I had to work because my family needed money | 1 | 2 | (24) |
| (388) G. I graduated | 1 | 2 | (25) |

3. When you were making the decision to leave school, did you talk it over with any of the following people? If you did, how did they feel about it?
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE A - G)
- | | No, didn't talk to | Yes, felt it was a good idea | Yes, felt it was a bad idea | Yes, felt neutral about it | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| (389) A. Mother | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (26) |
| (390) B. Father | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (27) |
| (391) C. Brother or sister | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (28) |
| (392) D. School counsellor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (29) |
| (393) E. Teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (30) |
| (394) F. Friends | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (31) |
| (395) G. Clergyman | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (32) |

4. While you were in school, generally how were your grades:
 (396) Much better than average 1 (33)
 Above average 2
 Average 3
 Below average 4

5. A. What kind of school did you go to:
 (397) Public 1 (34)
 Catholic parochial 2
 Other parochial 3
 Other private 4
 B. Is the school coeducational or is it an all boys or all girls school?
 (398) Coeducational 1 (35)
 All boy/all girl 2

6. Did any of the following things happen to you while you were in school? Did you ever . . .
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE A - G)
- | | Yes | No | |
|--|-----|----|------|
| (399) A. Have a fist fight with another student in school | 1 | 2 | (36) |
| (800) B. Know a teacher well enough to discuss a personal problem | 1 | 2 | (37) |
| (401) C. Get suspended from school | 1 | 2 | (38) |
| (402) D. Receive praise from a teacher in front of class for doing good work | 1 | 2 | (39) |
| (403) E. Have a teacher who had it in for you | 1 | 2 | (40) |
| (404) F. Have someone try to take money away from you | 1 | 2 | (41) |
| (405) G. Give a teacher a hard time in class | 1 | 2 | (42) |

7. A. How many of the kids you spend time with have ever done the following:
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - c)
- | | All of them | More than half of them | Less than half of them | None of them | |
|--|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------|
| (406) a. Cheated on an exam at school or turned in work that was not his/her own | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (43) |
| (407) b. Stayed away from school for at least part of a day, just to take off | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (44) |
| (408) c. Bothered a teacher seriously enough to get thrown out of class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (45) |
- B. When you were in school, how often did you ever do any of the following:
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE a - c)

- | | Never | Once or twice | A few times | after | |
|---|-------|---------------|-------------|-------|--|
| (409) a. Cheated on an exam at school or turned in work that was not your own | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| (410) b. Stayed away from school for at least part of a day, just to take off | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| (411) c. Bothered a teacher seriously enough to get thrown out of class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |

8. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE A TO N)

Agree Disagree

- | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|---|------|
| (412) | A. A lot that I learned in class will be useful to me in later years | 1 | 2 | (49) |
| (413) | B. Being with my friends was the best part of school | 1 | 2 | (50) |
| (414) | C. School rules and regulations were too strict | 1 | 2 | (51) |
| (415) | D. Going away to college will be too expensive for most of the kids who live around here | 1 | 2 | (52) |
| (416) | E. It's better to be popular than to get good grades | 1 | 2 | (53) |
| (417) | F. Students should have more to say about how the school is run | 1 | 2 | (54) |
| (418) | G. Most kids who live around here would have trouble being accepted by a good college | 1 | 2 | (55) |
| (419) | H. Most kids in the school I went to were the same race as I am | 1 | 2 | (56) |
| (420) | I. Boys have to be good athletes if they want to be popular in the school I went to | 1 | 2 | (57) |
| (421) | J. Boys have to have a car to drive if they want to be popular in the school I went to | 1 | 2 | (58) |
| (422) | K. Girls have to have the right clothes if they want to be popular in the school I went to | 1 | 2 | (59) |
| (423) | L. If you haven't given teachers a bad time in class, it will be easy to get into college | 1 | 2 | (60) |
| (424) | M. A college degree will make people respect you | 1 | 2 | (61) |
| (425) | N. A college degree is a sure ticket to a good paying job | 1 | 2 | (62) |

9. A. Do you plan to go back to finish high school?

- | | | | |
|-------|---|---|------|
| (426) | Yes | 1 | (63) |
| | No | 2 | |
| | I have graduated from high school | 3 | |

B. Do you have any plans to get some vocational training?

- | | | | |
|-------|---------------|---|------|
| (427) | Yes | 1 | (64) |
| | No | 2 | |

C. Do you ever plan to go to college?

- | | | | |
|-------|---|---|------|
| (428) | No | 1 | (65) |
| | Yes, a two-year community college | 2 | |
| | Yes, a four-year college | 3 | |

10. How many full time jobs have you had since you left school?

- | | | | |
|-------|------------------------|---|------|
| (429) | None | 1 | (66) |
| | One | 2 | |
| | Two or three | 3 | |
| | Four or more | 4 | |

11. A. What kind of full time job do you have now?

- | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------------|---|---------|
| (430) | No full time job now | 1 | (67-68) |
|-------|--------------------------------|---|---------|

(Enter job title such as sales clerk, paint sprayer, delivery man, grocery checker, farm hand, etc.)

B. How satisfied are you with the job you have now? Do you feel . . .

- | | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------|---|------|
| (431) | Very satisfied | 1 | (69) |
| | Satisfied | 2 | |
| | Dissatisfied | 3 | |
| | Very dissatisfied | 4 | |
| | No full time job | 5 | |

C. Is this the sort of job you think you will continue working at or do you think you will switch to something else?

- | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|---|------|
| (432) | Continue this sort of job | 1 | (70) |
| | Switch to something else | 2 | |

In school? No What was the last grade completed?	I. IF NOT IN SCHOOL: Is he/she employed, unemployed, retired, or not working and not looking for work?				J. IF EMPLOYED, UNEMPLOYED, OR RETIRED: What kind of work does he/she do? (PROBE FOR CLEAR JOB DESCRIPTION)
	Emp.	Unemp.	Ret.	NW	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	

R SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED

	AGE (E)	SEX (D)	SCHOOL (H)	GRADE (H)
3. Youth 1:	14....1 18/ 15....2 (446) 16....3 17....4 18....5	Male.....1 19/ Female...2 (447)	In school...1 20/ Not in school....2 (448)	Under 8....1 21/ 9th.....2 10th.....3 11th.....4 (449) 12th.....5 College....6
Youth 2:	(450) 22/	(451) 23/	(452) 24/	(453) 25/
Youth 3:	(454) 26/	(455) 27/	(456) 28/	(457) 29/
Youth 4:	(458) 30/	(459) 31/	(460) 32/	(461) 33/
Youth 5:	(462) 34/	(463) 35/	(464) 36/	(465) 37/

4. Race: White.....1 38/ (466) Black.....2 Oriental..3 Other....4	6. Number of people in household: 40-41/ (468)	7. Type of household: Both parents & children.....1 42/ Single parent & children.....2 Children & other relatives.....3 (469) Children & non-related parent substitute.....4 Parent(s), children & other relatives.....5 Eligible youth, Head or spouse.6 All adult household.....7
5. SES: A.....1 39/ (467) B.....2 C.....3 D.....4		

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

MODIFIED VERSION OF THE INSTITUTE FOR JUVENILE
RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO
CODE JUVENILE COURT CASES

7. Here are some questions about being a student.
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE FROM A TO D)

	Much Better Than Average	Above Average	Average	Average
(14) A. How well do your parents expect you to do at school? Do they expect you to be	1	2	3	4
(15) B. What about most of your teachers? Where do most of them expect you to be? . .	1	2	3	4
(16) C. How well have you actually been doing at school? In terms of grades where do you rank?	1	2	3	4

8. Have any of the following things happened to you in school? Have you ever . . .

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A TO G)

		Yes	No
(18) A. Had a fist fight with another student in school		1	2
(20) C. Been suspended from school		1	2
(21) D. Been praised by a teacher in front of class for doing good work		1	2
(22) E. Had a teacher who had it in for you . .		1	2
(24) G. Given a teacher a hard time in class . .		1	2

9A. How many of the kids you spend time with have ever done the following:

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE A TO C)

	All of Them	More Than Half of Them	Less Than Half of Them	None of Them
(26) b. Stayed away from school for at least part of a day, just to take off	1	2	3	4
(27) c. Bothered a teacher seriously enough to get thrown out of class	1	2	3	4

9B. How often have you ever done any of the following:

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH LINE A TO C)

	Never	Once or Twice	A few Times	Often
(30) c. Bothered a teacher seriously enough to get thrown out of class	1	2	3	4

10A.

None One Three Two Four or
More

(32) 10B. How many other clubs and organizations have you joined in high school	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

11. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM
 A TO N)

	Agree	Disagree
A. A lot that I learn in class		
(33) will be useful to me in later years	1	2
B. Being with my friends is the		
(34) best part of school	1	2
C. School rules and regulations		
(35) are too strict	1	2
E. It's better to be popular than		
(37) to get good grades	1	2
F. Students should have more to		
(38) say about how the school is run	1	2

14. Can you talk freely to your father and mother about
 your personal feelings?
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH PARENT)

	Yes	No
(53) Father	1	2
(54) Mother	1	2

15. How do you get along with your father and mother?
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH PARENT)

	Very well	Fairly well	Not too well	Not well at all
(55) Father	1	2	3	4
(56) Mother	1	2	3	4

19. How much do these statements apply to you?
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A
 THROUGH L)

	Very true of me	Somewhat true of me	Not true of me
(65) A. I would like to grow up to be the kind of person my mother is	1	2	3
(66) B. My mother understands me as I really am	1	2	3
(67) C. My mother has a sense of humor	1	2	3
(68) D. It is important for me to please my mother	1	2	3
(69) E. I take my mother's advice seriously	1	2	3
(71) G. I would like to grow up to be the kind of person my father is	1	2	3
(72) H. My father understands me as I really am	1	2	3
(73) I. My father has a sense of humor	1	2	3
(74) J. It is important for me to please my father	1	2	3
(75) K. I take my father's advice seriously	1	2	3

24. Families differ in the rules they make for their children. In your home, are there any rules for you about . . .
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ON EACH LINE FROM A THROUGH I)

	Yes	No
(88) A. Regular duties or chores around the house	1	2
(89) B. Week night curfews	1	2
(90) C. Weekend night curfews	1	2
(91) D. Rules about studying or homework for school, certain hours, etc. . . .	1	2
(92) E. Parent having to meet and approve your friends	1	2
(95) H. Use of cars	1	2
(96) I. Your parents knowing where you are .	1	2

38. How many kids do you generally go around with?
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

(110)

None	One or two	Three or four	Five or six	Seven or eight	Over eight
1	2	3	4	5	6

40. How much of your free time do you spend together with the kids you hang around with?
 (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- (112)
- a. Most of my free time 1
 - b. Some of my free time 2
 - c. Very little of my free time 3
-

42. How much of your free time is spent without adult supervision--that is, where you and your friends can do pretty much what you want?
(114) (CIRCL ONE ANSWER)

- a. Most of my free time 1
 - b. Some of my free time 2
 - c. Very little of my free time 3
-

43. Groups of kids can be described differently. Can the following statements be used to describe most of the kids you run around with?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH ITEM)

	Yes	No
(116) B. Ready to fight	1	2
(120) F. Get into trouble with the police . .	1	2
(123) I. Into the drug scene	1	2
(125) K. Like to stir up a little excitement	1	2

45. Of the kids you go around with most often, how many do you consider close friends (kids you can discuss a personal problem with)?
(132)

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

- a. None of them 1
 - b. Only a few of them 2
 - c. About half of them 3
 - d. Almost all of them 4
 - e. All of them 5
-

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

MONOGRAPH ON A BOY FROM THE CONTROL GROUP

The following monograph was written from information contained in the Institute for Juvenile Research, "Illinois Youth Study," questionnaire (see Appendix A). In Chapter II there is an explanation of the process used to convert information from the Juvenile Court archival records onto standardized questionnaires. This monograph demonstrates the feasibility of converting quantitative data from the questionnaire to a format similar to the Juvenile Court social investigation. Some details are excluded to prevent identity of the subject.

Name; John Doe

John Doe is a 14 year old and resides with both parents in a suburban community of metropolitan Chicago,

Offenses

John responded that he often shoplifts and has engaged in the following acts a few times: made anonymous telephone calls, damaged property, engaged in petty theft, had fist fights and possessed stolen goods. He also claims to have broken and entered and has carried a weapon once or twice. He does not admit to having used a weapon or to have committed a felony (theft over \$20.00).

The subject also admits to have participated in other deviant acts. He has used inhalants and marijuana once or twice. John also

consumed alcoholic beverages and stated he became drunk a few times,

John has been stopped by the police once or twice, but has never been taken to the police station. He also states that he has not been before a court for either an informal or formal hearing.

Family

John lives with both parents and has seven siblings. Both the mother and father have four year college degrees. The father is employed in a managerial position and earns a comfortable living. The mother is neither employed nor looking for work.

John responded that he gets along with his father "fairly well." He stated that he sometimes takes his father's advice and that he would like to be somewhat like his father. However, John feels that he is not able to communicate well with his father and does not believe that his father understands him as he really is. He also finds it difficult to please his father at times. John believes that his relationship with his father has not changed since he was younger.

The relationship between John and his mother is very poor. He states that he does not get along with her at all; nor is he able to communicate with her. John does not believe that his mother understands him. He said he would not like to be like her and that he does not take her advice. Finally, John responded that his relationship with his mother has become worse since he was younger.

It is also important to note that, according to John, his mother and father do not get along too well with each other.

John is able to talk freely with his siblings and stated that his parents treat the siblings fairly. He also claims that none of his

siblings have been in trouble with the police.

There is some family interaction. For example, John states that he often goes visiting with his parents and that he sometimes goes to movies and plays games with them. John also said that he attends church services every week, however, he adds that he is forced by his parents to attend.

The parents have rules about dress and hair styles. They also enforce weekday and weekend curfews, and are informed about his whereabouts. According to John, his parents are fair about enforcing the rules some of the time and unfair at other times.

School

John is in the ninth grade and attends a public school. He states that his grades are above average. According to John, his parents expect him to have grades which are much above average and his teachers expect him to have above average grades. He claims to have been praised in class.

He also admits to a few school related problems. John states that he has bothered a teacher and has had a teacher who "has had it in for him." He has been truant once or twice and has cheated on an exam a few times. However, he has never been suspended from school.

John has a positive attitude about the value of school. For example, he believes that grades are more important than popularity and that a college degree is needed for respect. John states that he plans to attend a four year college.

Peers

John associates with three or four other youth and is close to a few of them. His peers are his own age. He states that it is not necessary for his parents to approve of his friends.

According to John, his peers have been involved in deviant behavior. For example, John claims that more than one-half of his peers have engaged in delinquent acts similar to the ones he has committed. He said that his peers like to "stir-up" excitement, but are not ready to fight. He also states that his peers are not in trouble with the police nor are they into the "drug scene."

His peers participate in sports, are involved in school, and receive average grades, but they do not believe that grades are important. He spends most of his free time with his friends and they "hang around" the school.

Self-Concept

John's self-concept falls within the high-average range. He has a few self doubts, but is very confident about his abilities.

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

Information from the Juvenile Court records was coded onto a modified version of the Institute for Juvenile Research questionnaire by two persons. Fourteen questionnaire items were selected for the test of our hypotheses. However, there is not perfect agreement by both coders on all of the scores for twelve of the questionnaire items. Thus, a test of reliability is performed on these twelve items. On the basis of the resulting Z scores, there is no significant difference between the scores reported by the two coders for all twelve items.

Question No. 16: How well have you actually been doing in school?
In terms of grades where do you rank?

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	4	4	
2	4	4	
3	3	3	
4	4	4	
5	3	3	
6	4	4	
7	4	4	
8	2	2	
9	3	3	
10	4	4	
11			
12	4	4	
13	4	4	
14	4	4	
15	4	4	
16	4	2	+2
17	4	3	+1
18	1	1	
19	4	4	
20	4	4	
21			
22	4	4	
23	4	4	
24			
25	4	4	
26	4	4	

$\Sigma =$ 84 81 3

M = 3.65 3.52 0.13

Z = .12 (Not significant at the .05 level)

Question No. 53: Can you talk freely to your father about your personal feelings?

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	2	2	
2	2	2	
3			
4	2	2	
5			
6	2	2	
7	2	2	
8			
9	2	2	
10			
11	2	2	
12	2	2	
13	2	2	
14	2	2	
15	2	2	
16	2	2	
17	2	2	
18	2	2	
19	2	2	
20	2	2	
21	2	2	
22	2	2	
23	2	2	
24	2	2	
25	1	1	
26	2	2	
$\Sigma =$	43	43	0
M =	1.95	1.95	

Question No. 54: Can you talk freely to your mother about your personal feelings?

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	2		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	2	2	
7	2	2	
8			
9	2	2	
10	2	2	
11			
12	2	2	
13	2	2	
14			
15	2	2	
16	2	2	
17	1	1	
18	2	2	
19	2	2	
20	2	2	
21	2	2	
22	2	2	
23	2	2	
24	2	2	
25	2	1	1
26	2	2	
$\Sigma =$	37	36	1
M =	1.947	1.894	.052
Z = 0.14 (Not significant at the .05 level)			

Question No. 55: How do you get along with your father?

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	4	4	0
2	3	4	-1
3	1	1	0
4	3		
5	1	2	-1
6	4	4	0
7	4	4	0
8	3	2	1
9	3	2	1
10	2	2	0
11	4	4	0
12	4	4	0
13	4	4	0
14	4	4	0
15	4	4	0
16	4	4	0
17	3	3	0
18	4	3	1
19	2	2	0
20	4	4	0
21	2	2	0
22	2	1	1
23	3	3	0
24	3	3	0
25	2	2	0
26	3	3	0
$\Sigma =$	77	75	2
M =	3,08	3,00	,08
Z =	0.06 (Not significant at the .05 level)		

Question No. 56: How do you get along with your mother?

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	4	4	0
2	4	4	0
3	1	1	0
4	4		
5	1	2	-1
6	4	4	0
7	4	4	0
8	1	1	0
9	3	2	1
10	4	3	1
11		4	
12	4	4	0
13	4	4	0
14	4	4	0
15	3	3	0
16	4	4	0
17	1	2	-1
18	4	2	2
19	4	3	1
20	3	3	0
21	3	3	0
22	2	1	1
23	3	3	0
24	4	4	0
25	2	1	1
26	3	3	0
$\Sigma =$	74	69	5
M =	3.08	2.88	.21
Z = 0.13 (Not significant at the .05 level)			

Question No. 65: I would like to grow up to be the kind of person my mother is.

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	3	3	0
2	3	3	0
3			
4	3		
5			
6	3		
7	3	3	0
8	1	1	0
9	3	2	1
10	3	3	-
11		3	
12	3	3	0
13	3	3	0
14	3	3	0
15	3	2	1
16	3	3	0
17	1	2	-1
18	3	2	1
19	3	3	0
20	2	2	0
21	1	1	0
22	1	1	0
23	2	2	0
24	3	3	0
25	2	2	0
26	3	3	0
$\Sigma =$	53	51	2
M =	2.52	2.43	.095
z = 0.08 (Not significant at the .05 level)			

Questionnaire No. 66: My mother understands me as I really am.

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	3	3	0
2	3	3	0
3		1	
4	3	3	0
5			
6	3		
7	3	3	0
8	1	1	0
9	3	2	1
10	3	3	0
11		3	
12	3	3	0
13	3	3	0
14	3	3	0
15	3	2	1
16	3	3	0
17	1	2	-1
18	3	2	1
19	3	3	0
20	2	2	0
21	2	2	0
22	1	1	0
23	2	2	0
24	3	3	0
25	1	1	0
26	3	3	0
$\Sigma =$	55	53	2
M =	2.5	2.41	.09

$Z = 0.08$ (Not significant at the .05 level)

Question No. 69: I take my mother's advice seriously.

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1		3	
2	3	3	0
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	3	3	0
8			
9			
10	3	3	0
11			
12	3	3	0
13	3	3	0
14	3	3	0
15	3	2	1
16	3	3	0
17	1	2	-1
18	3	2	1
19	3	3	0
20	2	2	0
21	2	2	0
22	1	1	0
23	2	2	0
24	3	3	0
25	2	2	0
26	3	3	0
$\Sigma =$	46	45	1
M =	2.56	2.5	.055

$Z = 0.07$ (Not significant at the .05 level)

Question No. 71: I would like to grow up to be the type of person my father is.

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	3	3	
2	3	3	
3			
4			
5			
6	3	3	
7	3	3	
8			
9	3	2	1
10	2	2	
11	3	3	
12	3	3	
13	3	3	
14	3	3	
15	3	3	
16	3	3	
17	2	2	
18	3	3	
19	3	3	
20	3	3	
21	2	2	
22	1	1	
23	2	1	1
24	2	2	
25	2	2	
26	3	3	
$\Sigma =$	58	56	2
M =	2.636	2.545	.0909
Z = 0.10 (Not significant at the .05 level)			

Question No. 72:

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	3	3	0
2	3	3	0
3		1	
4	3		
5			
6	3	3	0
7	3	3	0
8	3	2	1
9	3	2	1
10	2	2	0
11	3	3	0
12	3	3	0
13	3	3	0
14	3	3	0
15	3	3	0
16	3	3	0
17	2	2	0
18	3	3	0
19	3	3	0
20	3	3	0
21	2	2	0
22	1	1	0
23	2	1	1
24	3	2	1
25	3	2	1
26	3	3	0

$\Sigma =$ 63 58 5

M = 2.74 2.52 .22

Z = 0.26 (Not significant at the .05 level)

Question No. 75: I take my father's advice seriously.

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	3	3	
2	3	3	
3			
4	3	1	2
5			
6			
7	3	3	
8			
9			
10	2	2	
11	3	3	
12	3	3	
13	3	3	
14	3	3	
15	3	3	
16	3	3	
17	2	2	
18	3	3	
19	3	3	
20	3	3	
21	2	2	
22	1	1	
23	2	2	
24	2	2	
25	2	2	
26	3	3	
$\Sigma =$	55	53	2
M =	2.619	2.523	0.095
Z = 0.11 (Not significant at the .05 level)			

Question No. 120: Do peers get into trouble with the police?

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	1	1	
2	1	1	
3			
4			
5	1	1	
6	1	1	
7			
8	2	2	
9	1	1	
10			
11	1	1	
12			
13	1	1	
14	1	1	
15			
16			
17	2	2	
18	1	1	
19	1	1	
20	1	1	
21	1	1	
22	1	1	
23			
24	1	2	-1
25	1	1	
26			
$\Sigma =$	19	20	-1
M =	1.055	1.111	-.055
Z = 0.11 (Not significant at the .05 level)			

Question No. 123: Are peers into the drug scene?

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	1	1	
2	1	1	
3			
4			
5	1	1	
6			
7			
8	2	2	
9			
10			
11			
12	1	1	
13			
14			
15	1	1	
16	1	1	
17	2	2	
18			
19			
20	1	1	
21	1	1	
22			
23			
24			
25	1	1	
26	1	1	
$\Sigma =$	14	14	0
M =	1.076	1.076	

Self Image

Questionnaire Number	Coder		Error
	Ken	Clare	
1	3	3	
2	3	3	
3			
4	3	3	
5			
6			
7	3	3	
8			
9			
10	2	3	-1
11	3	3	
12	3	3	
13	3	3	
14			
15	3	3	
16	3	3	
17	1	1	
18			
19	3	3	
20	3	3	
21			
22	2	2	
23			
24			
25			
26	3	3	
$\Sigma =$	41	42	-1
M =	2.73	2.80	.07
Z = 0.08 (Not significant at the .05 level)			

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Kenneth B. Ehrensaft has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Richard L. Block, Director
Professor, Sociology, Loyola

Dr. William M. Bates
Professor, Sociology, Loyola

Rev. Thomas M. Gannon, S.J.
Professor, Sociology, Loyola

Dr. Alan S. Berger
Assistant Director
Chicago Department of Human Services

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 22, 1983
Date


Director's Signature