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ABSTRACT

Drawing from the theory of David Matza and Gresham Sykes, an attempt was made in this study to examine the relationship between values centering around work and self-reported delinquency. The study was focused upon one major proposition:

There is no difference between those ranking low in self-reported delinquency and those ranking high in self-reported delinquency (all classes) in adherence to the set of values centering around disdain for work and getting ahead, nor in their attitudes toward those participating in juvenile delinquent activities.

A questionnaire designed to measure socio-economic status, occupational values and attitudes, self-reported delinquency, and attitudes toward delinquency was the data gathering instrument. Three groups of white, male respondents completed the questionnaire. Two groups were composed of eighth-grade boys at two junior high schools in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, the third group was composed of adjudicated delinquent boys on probation at Family Court.

1. Glasgow Junior High School was identified as an upper socio-economic status group, Glen Oaks Junior High School and the adjudicated delinquents as lower status groups. A delinquency scale indicated that self-reported delinquency ranging from low to high degree of involvement was found in each of the three groups.

Self-reported delinquency involvement in the two status areas, represented by the two schools, differed significantly; a greater amount of self-reported delinquency was found in the upper status area. When
the adjudicated delinquents were added to the respondents from the lower status area there was no significant difference in self-reported delinquency by status area. Further, when social classes were examined across both social status areas, there was no significant difference in self-reported delinquency by class.

2. Of four occupational value orientations examined — "people-oriented," "extrinsic-reward-oriented," "self-expression-oriented," "easy-way-out-oriented" — a significant difference along the self-reported delinquency dimension was found in only one. Low self-reported delinquents were more likely than high self-reported delinquents to be "people-oriented."

3. There was a high degree of correlation between the respondent's "faith in people" and his degree of self-reported delinquency. Low faith was associated with high delinquency and high faith with low delinquency. There was also a relationship between a respondent's faith in people and his occupational values, i.e., those with high faith stressed, "people-oriented" values, while those with low faith chose "extrinsic-reward" values.

4. On the basis of a measure designed to determine the attitudes of the respondents to peers who committed a series of offenses, it was found that there was a significant difference between the attitudes of the high and the low self-reported delinquent. The most highly delinquent respondents also had the most favorable attitudes toward delinquency.

5. Both high and low self-reported delinquents were interested in material success and expressed a concern for the future.
6. On the basis of these findings it was concluded that the first part of the general proposition is correct. There is an important exception; the high delinquent seems to be motivated less than the low delinquent by interpersonal values in occupational choice. This is reflected in a general view of humanity which is expressed in a greater lack of faith in people than is expressed by the low delinquent.

The second part of the proposition was found to be invalid. The high self-reported delinquent expresses more permissive attitudes toward those participating in delinquent behavior than does the individual low in self-reported delinquency.

In attempting to learn something of the delinquent's similarity to society we have been given some clues to his dissimilarity; a major problem seems to center around interpersonal relations.
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The mushrooming problem of juvenile delinquency has been described as "society's time bomb." At present juvenile delinquency and crime as social problems in the United States are receiving a sustained interest at national and state levels that probably has been unmatched in the history of this country. This is in particular contrast to the observation made by Walter Reckless only a few years ago:

Practically all societies look upon crime as a critical phenomenon, no matter how infrequently it occurs. However, crime and delinquency usually have a very low priority, if you are rating the major social problems of modern societies. In the United States, crime and delinquency have high sensational value. The public gets stirred up. But very soon follows the letdown of unconcern. A sustained interest is not there.

The failure or inability of children and youth to live up to standards set by adults is age-old. Ancient Egypt recorded the message in hieroglyphics, "The times are out of joint, children do not obey their elders." Early in the Old Testament there is the record

---


3Quoted in Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute, Institute on Juvenile Delinquency, p. 5.
that "Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him." (Genesis 4:8). The oldest known code of laws, the Code of Hammurabi, dating from 2270 B.C., takes account of many types of misconduct, some specifically of youth. For example, Item 195 in the Code states "If a son strikes his father, one shall cut off his hands." Societies have always had the disturbing problem of socializing their children and the rehabilitating or punishing offending ones. But a continuous concern with these problems has not always characterized each society. In the United States, sustained public interest in juvenile delinquency as a major social problem -- "a condition affecting a significant number of people in ways considered undesirable, about which it is felt something can be done through collective social action" -- is a recent phenomenon.


6The question of why this is so is an interesting one, but one which falls outside the major purpose of this paper. Perhaps explanation could begin with a statement concerning the sheer increase in the amount of official delinquency and then work outward to more general social trends. Juvenile delinquency has increased each year since 1949 with the exception of 1961. Approximately two per cent of all children aged ten through seventeen are referred to the juvenile courts. When traffic cases are included the percentage rises to 3.3 per cent. During the eight-year period, "the juvenile delinquency years," in which the juvenile court holds power over the
On the other hand, interest in both delinquency and crime has long claimed the theoretical and empirical attention of sociologists in this country.

Late in the nineteenth century, criminology was accepted as a field of study by the growing university departments of sociology, and in the United States since that time systematic studies of crime and criminals have been made primarily by sociologists. A survey made in 1901 indicated that criminology and penology were among the first courses offered under the general title 'sociology' in United States colleges and universities, and the American Journal of Sociology included articles and book reviews on criminology when it was first published in 1895.7

A quick glance at professional sociological journals, lists of research studies in progress, social problems text-books, the increasing number of criminology and juvenile delinquency text-books, and even general theoretical works in sociology, indicate that there is a lively and vital contemporary interest in this problem. It is to

conduct of youth, the probability that a boy or girl will appear in court is considerably increased over the number who appear in any one year. "Allowing for repeaters, who are involved in about one-third of the delinquency cases, it is roughly estimated that eleven per cent (or about one in nine of all children) will be referred to juvenile courts for an act of delinquency (excluding traffic) prior to their eighteenth birthday. Considering boys alone, the probability is much greater -- about one in every six; for girls alone, much less -- one in twenty-three." The number of delinquent children may be expected to increase. By 1970, it is estimated that youth, age ten to nineteen, will number forty million, and by 1980 about forty-seven million. In addition to the children referred to the courts, approximately three times as many come to the attention of the police. See: Juvenile Court Statistics, 1965 (U. S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau, Wash., D.C.) p. 1.

the nature and direction of this contemporary sociological concern with juvenile delinquency that we first turn our attention in this dissertation. Specifically, attention will be directed to the theorization of David Matza and Gresham Sykes. Much of the theoretical literature of the last thirty years has had as a chief concern the "subculture of delinquency." The Matza-Sykes theorization is, in part, a response to that literature, and thus is discussed only after a review of the earlier theoretical formulations has been presented.

Then, in the second place, the socio-psychological investigation conducted by the author in an attempt to test empirically some hypotheses drawn from the theory of Matza and Sykes is presented and discussed. The major research hypothesis drawn from the Matza-Sykes formulation and the means used to evaluate it, are given on page 56 of this paper.

II. RELEVANT SOCIOLOGICAL LITERATURE

The Cultural Transmission Tradition

"Much of the most exciting and potentially fruitful sociological thinking concerning delinquency in recent years has dealt with the empirical problem that has long been discussed in American social science -- the problem of delinquency in

---

populations characterized by low socio-economic status. Although the interest in the subject pre-dates the thirty year period suggested as the limits for a review of literature, Bordua points out that "the problem of group delinquency has been a subject of theoretical interest for American sociologists . . . for well over a half century."

In the course of that period, the group nature of delinquency has come to be a central starting point for many theories of delinquency, and delinquency causation has been seen by some sociologists as pre-eminently a process whereby the individual becomes associated with a group which devotes some or all of its time to planning, committing, or celebrating delinquencies and which has elaborated a set of lifeways -- a subculture -- which encourages and justifies behavior defined as delinquent by the larger society.

Evidence indicates that in its more well-developed and extreme forms, delinquency as a group phenomenon has been heavily concentrated in the low status areas of large cities. It is these two empirical phenomena -- delinquency in its extreme forms concentrated in the male population of the lower-class sections of urban areas and the group nature of delinquency -- which have served as themes for much sociological theorization and research in the last three or four decades. Research and theorization springing from these data have centered primarily


around the study of gangs and later around the concept of "subculture." In fact, "if there is one area of gang research that has been most 'popular' of late, it is research into the results of membership in a delinquency subculture." 11

The existence of segments of the population with high delinquency and crime rates is an old and widely known phenomenon. 12 There have always been reports of regions, rural communities, towns, and groups of people that are troublesome and predatory. The range of these phenomena is wide: the criminal tribes of India, the nomadic gypsy camps, the frontier communities in the United States, and some deteriorated areas are frequently cited examples.

The outstanding case of delinquency concentration causing special concern in this country is the deteriorated area of the modern city, which with other social problems, is characterized by excessive crime and delinquency rates. This type of criminal development has also been known for a long time, but the application of modern social surveys and social-science methods has given such areas national and world-wide attention. Although interest in modern city slums was on


the increase, the systematic and influential studies of the "Chicago School" of American sociology ushered in a new era of research and action. These students of crime and delinquency -- particularly Clifford R. Shaw, Henry McKay and Frederick Thrasher -- all associated with the University of Chicago, were trained in the sociological tradition of W. I. Thomas, Florien Znaniecki, George Herbert Mead, Robert L. Park and Ernest W. Burgess. In a series of important monographs, based primarily on research in the city of Chicago, Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay attempted to account for the distribution of delinquency in American cities. By applying the ecological survey techniques developed in the 1920's under the leadership of Robert E. Park and E. W. Burgess, they identified the areas and characteristics of delinquency concentration which led to the formulation of the concept of the delinquency subculture.

Shaw and McKay noted that the high delinquency rate areas in Chicago in 1900-1906 were also the high rate areas in 1917-1923.

although the ethnic group composition of these areas had in the meantime been largely transformed; as ethnic groups moved in and out of these areas the delinquency rates of those ethnic groups correspondingly rose and fell. They also observed that most delinquent offenses occurred in small groups, usually of two or three, and they obtained detailed life-history materials illuminating the process of involvement in delinquent groups.

Daniel Glaser recently summarized the extensive literature on social disorganization and delinquency. Concerning the principal research findings of pre-World War II sociological studies of delinquency in the United States, he concludes that

These investigations yielded a set of interrelated and major conclusions on juvenile delinquency and social disorganization which can be summarized as follows:

A. **Spatial Arrangement**

Delinquency, as identified by juvenile court cases or by police arrest records, was shown to be concentrated in the most physically dilapidated areas of the city—the slums. These are predominantly 'interstitial' segments of the city, for they are the remainders of areas once primarily designed for residential use, but subsequently cut up by commercial districts, factories, warehouses, railroad yards, stockyards, and the main arteries of automotive traffic. Since these new types of construction made the older residential areas no longer desirable for investment in residential construction, the average age of the housing in the slums is high and its physical condition has deteriorated.

B. **Population Movement**

Because these high delinquency slum areas are the least desirable for residence, they are the areas where the newest and least-skilled immigrants to the city, who have the lowest social status, have been able to make their first
settlements with the least resistance. Frequently they over-crowd these areas far beyond normal room-space-per person ratios.

Perhaps the most striking finding of the Shaw and McKay research was that the same slum areas had the highest delinquency rates in the city even after the predominant national or racial identity of their residents changed completely. Furthermore, for each national or racial group taken separately, delinquency rates declined as place of residence became more distant from the central business district of the city.\(^\text{14}\)

Lois De Fleur, commenting upon Gleser's conclusions, states that demographic and ecological variables have assumed a central place in the discussion of influence on juvenile delinquency in the United States cities. However, a general theory of the relationship between population characteristics and delinquency patterns remains to be developed. "Students of delinquency have tended to drop the investigation of these variables and turn to the study of culture variables (gang culture, class values, youth culture, etc.) in their enthusiasm to uncover the etiology of delinquency."\(^\text{15}\) Nevertheless, the discovery by sociologists of the "Chicago School" of the now commonplace knowledge that juvenile delinquency and many other social problems were concentrated with poverty in the central areas of


\(^{15}\text{De Fleur, op. cit., p. 2.}\)
Chicago and other large cities is a landmark in behavioral science.\(^{16}\)

Shaw and McKay concluded that in the high rate areas, crime and delinquency had become "more or less traditional aspects of the social life," and that "these traditions of delinquency are transmitted through personal and group contacts."\(^{17}\) The chief agencies for the transmission of delinquency are the play groups and gangs. Although delinquency satisfies desires for excitement, companionship, security, etc., this does not distinguish delinquency from nondelinquent activity. "While the standards and values" in the high-rate and low-rate areas "may be widely divergent, or even reversed, the human motives and desires underlying the boy's participation in the activities of his groups are perhaps identical in the two neighborhood situations."\(^{18}\) The thing that does distinguish is the "standards and values," i.e., the delinquent and the non-delinquent cultural patterns through which these desires are satisfied.

Of major interest also was the process by which the child living in a high-rate area became involved in delinquency, a process which was identified as a usual learning process. Theories which

---


\(^{17}\) Shaw and McKay, Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency, p. 387.

\(^{18}\) Ibid, p. 391.
take this approach — called "cultural transmission theories" — have been summarized by Cohen in the following manner:

Deviant behavior is determined by a subsystem of knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes that make possible, permit, or prescribe specific forms of deviant behavior in specified situations. This knowledge, these beliefs, and these attitudes must first exist in the cultural surroundings of the actor, and they are 'taken over' and incorporated into the personality in much the same way as any other elements of the surrounding culture.¹⁹

Edwin H. Sutherland's work,²⁰ developed about the same time and, which, like that of Shaw and McKay, "carries the stamp of the 'Chicago School,'" represents the most systematic and ambitious attempt to formulate a general theory of criminal behavior in cultural transmission terms."²¹ His differential association theory states that criminal behavior is learned; it is not inherited, contrived, nor invented by the actor. It is learned in a process of communications with other persons in small, intimate groups. This learning includes the techniques of committing the crime and the "specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and


²⁰Sutherland's theory of differential association was first presented in his influential textbook, Principles of Criminology, and has been extended by his student and collaborator, Donald R. Cressey. See Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, Principles of Criminology, sixth edition (Chicago: J. B. Lipincott, 1960); Albert Cohen, Alfred Lindesmith, and Karl Schuessler (eds), The Sutherland Papers (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956); and Donald R. Cressey, Delinquency, Crime and Differential Association (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964).

²¹Cohen, op. cit., p. 95.
attitudes."22 The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal rules as favorable or unfavorable. That is, those with whom we associate define the legal rules favorably or unfavorably, and we take over these definitions. A person becomes criminal or delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law. This is the principle of differential association. Thus, it is the "content of learning" -- i.e., in Shaw and McKay's terms, the values and standards of the deteriorated urban area --, "not the process itself, (which) is considered as the significant element determining whether one becomes a criminal or a non-criminal."23

A further landmark in the behavioral sciences stems also from the "Chicago School:" the discoveries that most delinquent youngsters committed their delinquencies in company with one or more peers and that adolescent gangs were concentrated in much the same manner as was delinquency. Here it is necessary to turn to another researcher of the school, namely, Frederick M. Thrasher, who made what can be called a classic interpretation of the gang.24 Bordua, in his critique of sociological interpretations of gang delinquency, states that "the best book on gangs, gang delinquency, and -- though he did not use the term -- delinquent subcultures -- is The Gang by Frederick M. Thrasher."25

22Sutherland and Cressey, op. cit., p. 78.
23Ibid., p. 58.
Not that he originated the basic interpretative framework, says Bordua, but his application of the theoretical materials available at the time, plus his sensitivity to the effects of social environment and his willingness to consider processes at all behavioral levels -- from the basic needs of the child to the significance of the saloon, from the nature of city government to the crucial importance of the junk dealer, from the consequences of poverty to the nature of leadership in the gang -- still distinguish his book.

The Thrasher formulation can be analyzed by examining several levels; in this way more recent theories concerning the gang might be clarified.

1. At the level of the local adult community, the social structure is permissive, attractive, facilitative, morally supportive of the gang development process.

2. At the level of the adolescent and preadolescent groups themselves, the environment is essentially coercive of gang formation; the transition from spontaneous group to gang is largely a matter of participating in the struggle for life of the adolescent world under the peculiar conditions of the slum.

3. At the level of the individual, Thrasher assumes a set of basic needs common to all children; he leans heavily on the four wishes of W. I. Thomas, security, response, recognition, and new experiences, especially the last two. Gang boys come to choose different ways of satisfying these needs than do other boys. It is pointed out that the gang engages in many activities of a quite ordinary sort, ranging from baseball and football to rolling drunks and stealing cars.26

This gives the tenor of Thrasher's formulations. There is the distinctive flavor of essentially healthy boys satisfying universal needs in

a weakly controlled and highly seductive environment.

Compared to the deprived and driven boys of more recent formulations with their status problems, blocked opportunities (or psychopathologies, if one takes a more psychiatric view), Thrasher describes an age of innocence indeed.

This is, perhaps, the most important single difference between Thrasher and some — not all — of the recent views. Delinquency and crime were attractive, being a 'good boy' was dull. They were attractive because they were fun and were profitable and because one could be a hero in a fight. Fun, profit, glory, and freedom is a combination hard to beat, particularly for the inadequate conventional institutions that formed the competition.27

The Anomie Tradition

A new emphasis was given to juvenile delinquency theorization, related to its concentration in deteriorated areas of modern cities and related to its group/gang nature, beginning in the mid-1950's, due to new developments in criminological and general sociological theory. In criminological theory, a return to cultural or subcultural interpretations pushed from the foreground preoccupation with psychiatric and psychological interpretations of personality problems leading to deviant behavior. "Perhaps in no other field were there more substantial gains in understanding made possible by the introduction of a sociological point of view to supplement and to correct individualistic and moralistic interpretations."28 In the late 1950's several authors indicated explicitly their return to the interpretational models of the "Chicago School" of the 1930's.29

27Ibid., p. 292.


29See, for example, Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys, The
But in the process of this revival the approach was changed; instead of emphasizing the processes by which new converts are recruited into the criminalistic subculture, the main interest was in exploring the origin and content of the subcultures.

From general sociological theory, the Durkheimian concept of "anomie," modified by Robert Merton, was retransplanted into American sociology. Forty-one years after the publication of the first edition of Durkheim's *Suicide*, Robert Merton published his *Social Structure and Anomie*, a short paper, later revised and extended, which laid the foundations for a general theory of deviant behavior based upon the concept of "anomie," as Durkheim had applied it to the division of labor and suicide. As was Durkheim's approach, so too was Merton's "a

---


30 The meaning of "anomie," like many other sociological concepts, has undergone many changes at the hands of different authors - - ranging in its use from a social structural fact to a personality trait. In fact, David Matza states that he refrains from using the term because of the many conflicting meanings it has acquired since Durkheim. Matza uses instead the term "drift," partly to avoid the many implications of anomie, and also to suggest the episodic rather than the constant character of moral release. See: Matza, *Delinquency and Drift.*

radically sociological approach.\textsuperscript{32} It focused not on the characteristics of individuals, but on the positions that individuals occupy in the social system. It was concerned with variations with respect to strain within and between systems, and it located the sources of strain in the cultural and social structure. His aim more specifically was to examine the manner in which social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in society to engage in non-conformity.

Merton began by making explicit a threefold distinction that was implicit in Durkheim's analysis of suicide.\textsuperscript{33} First, there are the culture goals -- the wants or aspirations that men are taught by their culture as "worth striving for." A second aspect of the culture structure are the norms prescribing the means that men may legitimately employ in the pursuit of the goals. Third, there are the institutionalized means -- the actual distribution of facilities and opportunities for achieving the culture goals in a manner compatible with the norms. Merton shows that any actual sense of frustration and despair or strain depends on the relationship among these. \textit{"It is indeed my central hypothesis that aberrant behavior may be regarded sociologically as a symptom of dissociation between culturally prescribed aspirations and socially structured avenues for realizing these aspirations."}\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{32}Cohen, \textit{Deviance and Control}, p. 77.

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 132-139.

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 134.
In our society, says Merton, there is an exceptionally strong emphasis upon specific goals, without a corresponding emphasis on institutional procedures. When this process of attenuation reaches an extreme form, demoralization or a state of "anomie" develops. Contemporary American culture is an extreme type in which great emphasis upon success goals occurs without equivalent emphasis upon the institutional means of achieving these goals.

In the acceptance of these success goals and the prescribed means to them, Merton considers five possible types of individual adaptation. To the extent that a society is stable, conformity to both cultural goals and institutional means is the most common and widely diffused. However, where there is unusual emphasis upon success goals without equal emphasis on the means for achieving them, as is true in America, the situation tends to change. Many individuals may accept the success goals but not the institutional means; they are the innovators. Under these circumstances, the line between business-like striving and shady practice may grow quite vague. A ritualistic adaptation, by contrast, accepts the institutional means for achieving social goals in the given society, but avoids psychological strains by rejecting the social goals a society may prescribe. Retreatism is a type of adaptation to social life that rejects both social goals and the means for achieving them. Rebellion, while superficially similar to retreatism, is quite different, for it is

---

characterized by a combination of rejection and acceptance both of social goals and the institutional means for achieving them. The revolutionary who would both set up a new society and a new set of institutional means for achieving the goals of the new society epitomizes the rebel in pure form.

Thus, Merton revised Durkheim's formulation by asserting that anomie develops not because of a breakdown in the regulation of goals alone but, rather, because of a breakdown in the relationship between goals and legitimate avenues of access to them. His discussion of the relation between poverty and crime is especially appropriate at this point, and also is essential for a better understanding of certain of the delinquency subcultural theorists. Whatever the differential rates of deviant behavior in the various social strata, and we know from many sources that the official crime statistics uniformly showing higher rates in the lower strata are far from complete or reliable, it appears from Merton's analysis that the greatest pressures toward deviation are exerted upon the lower strata. Where the desire for conventional goals has been fully internalized and where, at the same time, socially structured "life-chances" present the slimmest opportunity of achieving them, there -- most conceivably -- will exist the most powerful pressures toward deviant behavior. The social area most vulnerable to these pressures will be the lower levels of society. Concerning the situation in the United States, Merton says:

36For a discussion of delinquency rates in different social strata, see below, pp. 28-35.
Our egalitarian ideology denies by implication the existence of non-competing individuals and groups in the pursuit of pecuniary success. Instead, the same body of success symbols is held to apply for all. Goals are held to transcend class line, not to be bounded by them, yet the actual social organization is such that there exist class differentials in accessibility of the goals. In this setting, a cardinal American virtue, 'ambition,' promotes a cardinal American vice, 'deviant behavior.'

Poverty as such and consequent limitation of opportunity are not enough to produce a conspicuously high rate of criminal behavior. Even the notorious 'poverty in the midst of plenty' will not necessarily lead to the result. But when poverty and associated disadvantages in competing for the culture values approved for all members of the society are linked with a cultural emphasis on pecuniary success as a dominant goal, high rates of criminal behavior are the normal outcome.37

Subculture Theory

Major Contributors. Cohen's theory of the delinquent subculture38 also directs attention to the discrepancy between culture goals and institutionalized means, the problems of adjustment which this entails, and the utility of delinquency as a mode of adjustment to these problems. The nature of the problem of adjustment, however, is conceived differently. "Cohen directs attention to characteristics of delinquency in American society which appears to be less 'rationally' and economically motivated than crime as it is conceptualized in the Merton scheme."39 Also, although labelled as a study of the culture of the gang, Cohen does not overlook the psychogenic sources of delinquency.40

37Merton, op. cit., pp. 146-147.
38Cohen, Delinquent Boys.
39Short and Strodtbeck, op. cit., p. 4.
40Cohen states, "However, we are especially interested in a
Cohen attempts to account for the emergence of the "delinquent subculture" in terms of status problems which are involved in the discrepancy between culture goals and institutionalized means. Juvenile delinquency, he points out, consists largely of violence and property destruction or appropriation of goods which have little or no intrinsic value to the thief, illicit sexual behavior, and consumption of alcohol. The bases for conceptualizing delinquency as "subcultural" are the ecological and demographic findings that were discussed earlier — it is largely a male, working-class phenomenon, and it takes an organized and collective form.

When we speak of a delinquent subculture, we speak of a way of life that has somehow become traditional among certain groups in American society. These groups are the boys' gangs that flourish most conspicuously in the "delinquency neighborhoods" in our larger American cities. The members of these gangs grow up, some to become law-abiding citizens and others to graduate to more professional and adult forms of criminality, but the delinquent tradition is kept alive by the age-groups that succeed them.

According to this theory, the delinquent subculture is a response to status problems associated primarily with the male working-class role. The granting of status is governed in large third possibility, namely, that in the majority of cases psychogenic and subcultural factors blend in a single causal process, as pollen and a particular bodily constitution work together to produce hay fever. If this is so, then the task of theory is to determine the ways in which the two kinds of factors mesh or interact. Cohen, op. cit., p. 17.

41Ibid., p. 13.

42It is to be noted that not all boys in the working class respond in a delinquent fashion to the status problems of those in that position. The most common response among the boys in the working class, according to Cohen, is the "stable corner-boy response." The stable corner-boy accepts his way of life and tries to make the best of his predicament. He withdraws "as far as possible into a sheltering
part by adult representatives of the middle classes in institutional contexts such as school, church, and business community. Evaluation of young people is based upon middle-class criteria. These criteria include the following: ambition, a pattern of deferred gratification; a sense of personal responsibility for one's failures and achievements; the possession of skills of potential academic, economic, and occupational value; the rational cultivation of manners, courtesy, and personaleness, which involves patience, self-discipline, and the control of emotional expression, physical aggression, and violence.43

By virtue of their socialization in working-class families and communities, many youngsters are ill-equipped to succeed in terms of these criteria. As a result of failure to measure up to the standards of the "middle class measuring rod," these youngsters experience loss of status and of self-respect. The subcultural nature of delinquency arises by virtue of the fact that youngsters who are similarly disadvantaged join together to reject middle-class criteria of status.

community of like-minded working-class children," pretty much avoiding delinquency. Some boys of the working class "desert a corner-boy way of life for the college-boy way of life," which means that they are willing to play the status game according to middle-class rules and values. Such boys do not gravitate toward delinquent subculture. (The corner-boy and college-boy are labels taken from William Foote Whyte's Street Corner Society.)

But there is the "delinquency response" of some working-class boys, who repudiate middle-class standards. "The number of the delinquent subculture plays truant because 'good' middle-class children do not play truant." The corner-boy way of life "temporizes with middle-class morality; the full-fledged delinquent subculture does not." *Ibid.*, pp. 124-133.

43*Ibid.*, see especially Chap. IV.
and establish their own criteria in terms of which they succeed. Their alternative status system, says Cohen, takes the form of a "reaction formation" against the middle-class criteria in terms of which they are found wanting. "Reaction-formation is stressed because it is not only a way of coming to terms with one's delinquent impulses; it helps to account for the nature of the delinquent behavior itself." It is this which accounts for the non-utilitarian, malicious, and negativistic character of the delinquent subculture. Cohen notes that status is, by definition, the granting of respect by others; hence the response of these youngsters "makes sense" only as a group response. He suggests further that by virtue of their repudiation of convention and the consequent loss of respect from others, participants in the delinquent subculture become all the more dependent for status upon one another. The extremity of gang behavior is related to the fact that "group interaction is a sort of catalyst which releases potentialities not otherwise visible."


Cohen and Short, along with other theorists, have also attempted to account for the variety of patterns taken by gang delinquency. Cohen and Short have recognized the existence of "more or less distinct delinquent subcultures," and have classified them as: (a) a subculture with a more rational, utilitarian, "semi-professional" style; (b) a conflict-oriented or "bopping" subculture; (c) a drug-users' subculture; (d) and a "parent" subculture, which is the common or garden variety of delinquent subculture, more versatile and less specialized than the others, and from which the other subcultures develop. These are all primarily male, working-class subcultures. They have also distinguished a female "parent" subculture and drug-users' subculture and a middle-class delinquent subculture.

A more ambitious and systematic theory to account for varieties of delinquent subcultures, however, is found in Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs by Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin. These men add to Merton's basic premise concerning relative accessibility of legitimate means the notion of differential availability of illegitimate means, and they develop more fully the implications of the theory for subcultural delinquency. It is their contention that delinquent subcultures are formed by lower class youngsters who are blocked in their ambitions for improvement in economic position. These


youngsters are not oriented toward changes in life style, however. Cohen's delinquents, they say, seem likely to be drawn from youngsters who are oriented toward membership in the middle class and who may or may not be oriented toward improved economic goals. Nevertheless they, too, are blocked in their efforts.

From this basic typology, Cloward and Ohlin assume, with Merton, that legitimate means to success goals are limited and, hence, that intense pressures are exerted toward deviant behavior. Merton had suggested that "Al Capone represents the triumph of amoral intelligence over morally-prescribed 'failure,' when the channels of vertical mobility are closed or narrowed in a society which places a high premium on economic affluence and social ascent for all its members."49 Cloward and Ohlin point to the fact, documented by Sutherland, that illegitimate means are not equally available to all.50 Their availability is viewed as varying with the extent of integration of adult carriers of conventional and criminal values in urban areas. Kobrin had also discussed variations in delinquency areas along this dimension.51 In integrated areas, relations between legitimate and illegitimate adults are held to be accommodative; there is reciprocal participation of each in the value system of the other. By contrast, in

49Merton, op. cit., p. 146.


51Cloward and Ohlin, op. cit., pp. 150-160.
unintegrated areas the aims of these adults conflict, and neither
group is effectively organized. Opportunities for learning and per­
forming criminal roles are available in integrated areas, unavailable
in unintegrated areas. In integrated areas, social control originates
and, therefore, is effective in both legitimate and illegal structures,
while it is ineffective in unintegrated areas.52

More specifically, Cleoward and Ohlin say that it is not enough
to point out that people have problems of status frustration. How
people will deal with such problems depends on the alternatives avail­
able in their social settings. Areas characterized by organized and
professional crime (i.e., areas where criminal adults are financially
successful and powerful and participate also in conventional institu­
tions) produce one kind of delinquent opportunity structure. In these
areas, adult criminals are available as role models and the criminal
organizations offer a variety of attractive jobs. Young people in these
areas know of these jobs and come to aspire to them early. They know
also that the criminal role, as defined by the adult criminal reference
groups, places value on criminal skills, loyalty, dependability, shrewd­
ness, and other such traits, but has little use for mildness, irrespon­
sibility, and, in general, the kind of behavior that imperil the suc­
cess of a coolly planned businesslike enterprise. In such areas, young
people who are disadvantaged in terms of legitimate opportunities are
responsive to the demands and expectations of the adult criminals.

52Cleoward and Ohlin, op. cit., pp. 150-160.
Delinquent behavior is a kind of rehearsal and playing at forms of adult crime and takes on a relatively restrained and disciplined quality. 53

There is a second kind of area in which neither conventional nor criminal elements are well organized, and in which crime is individual, petty and sporadic, rather than organized, and yields little income or prestige. In these areas opportunities do not exist either to identify with criminal role models or to learn appropriate skills. Here there are no effective controls arising from any part of the adult population. There are no positive attractions toward the more disciplined, professionally oriented kinds of delinquency. In these areas, therefore, youngsters seek status by participating in the more violent and extreme forms of gang activity. Violence comes to be ascendant, in short, under conditions of relative detachment from all institutionalized systems of opportunity and social control.54

Third, there are individuals who, by reason of internalized moral inhibitions, the lack of necessary skills, or the objective unavailability of either criminal or violence opportunity structures, can make use of neither of these patterns. Such individuals, "double failures," so to speak, tend to form their own "retreatist" subcultures, centering around the use of drugs, alcohol, or some other "kick."55

53 Ibid., pp. 161-171.
54 Ibid., p. 178.
55 Ibid., pp. 178-184.
Albert Cohen's *Delinquent Boys* elicited a great many responses; among them was a portrait of the delinquent subculture by Walter Miller. Miller's theory, in contrast to that of Cohen and Short, and Cloward and Ohlin, is simply that what the law calls delinquent behavior and crime represents conformity not to a specialized youth subculture, but to the expectations and values of the more general lower-class subculture -- "a long established, distinctively patterned tradition with an integrity of its own." This culture is characterized by a family structure typified by the female-based household, whose main trait is lack of reliance on the occupational performance of an adult male. Lower-class culture attaches value to such personal qualities and experiences or "focal concerns" as "trouble," "toughness," "smartness," "excitement," "fate" or "luck," and "autonomy." There are, of course, different ways of realizing these values -- none of them is intrinsically and necessarily delinquent, but their pursuit, Miller suggests, is highly conducive to delinquent behavior.

Miller holds that the lower-class delinquent has internalized lower-class culture only. Without experiencing any ambivalence whatever towards the middle-class system of values, he inevitably collides with its power structure. He says, "Following cultural practices which

---


57 Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
comprise essential elements of the total life pattern of lower class culture automatically violates certain legal norms. In addition, even where law-abiding routes are available, he frequently takes the shortcut illegal route to an objective simply because of the more immediate return and the smaller investment of energy.

In short, Miller has very heavily relied upon the cultural "apartness" of the lower class. As several writers have indicated, by failing to distinguish adequately between lower class norms in general and delinquent norms in particular, he is forced into the position of implying that the lower-class way of life is intrinsically law violating. The entire lower class is seen as a delinquent subculture.

Two Themes.

a. The Position of Delinquents in the Social Structure. In each of the theories of deviant behavior and of juvenile delinquency considered thus far, we find at least one theme tying them together - they have each posited social class variation in rates of delinquency, particularly subcultural or gang delinquency, such that the lowest social stratum has the highest delinquency rate. For example,

58Ibid., p. 18.
59Downes, op. cit., p. 70; Matza, op. cit., p. 36.
60Merton, op. cit., pp. 144-145; Cohen, Delinquent Boys, pp. 36-44; Miller, op. cit., pp. 5-19; Cloward and Ohlin, op. cit.; Delinquency is commonly described in the literature as primarily a phenomenon of the lower class. See also: William Kvaraceus, "Juvenile Delinquency and Social Class," Journal of Educational Sociology 18 (June, 1944) pp. 51-54; Cletus Dirksen, Economic Factors in Delinquency (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1948); Ernest W. Burgess, "The Economic
Cohen's conclusion, "by no means novel or startling," is that juvenile delinquency in general "and the delinquency subculture in particular are overwhelmingly concentrated in the male, working class sector of the juvenile delinquent population."\(^6^1\) In fact, Reiss and Rhodes indicate that official delinquency rates for most serious kinds of delinquency vary inversely with socio-economic status.\(^6^2\)

There are some who argue that differential enforcement of the law and handling of law violators from the socio-economic levels of the population account for these observed differences in official rates of delinquency.\(^6^3\) These critics demonstrate that the data of

---


\(^6^1\)Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 37. Cohen has said concerning the disparity between official delinquency rates and delinquent behavior rates in the general population: If many delinquencies of upper-class children fail to find their way into the police and court records, the same is apparently true also of many delinquencies of working-class children, and conceivably more true." *Ibid.*, pp. 37-41. Although Cohen indicates that the best available evidence supports the traditional and popular conception of the distribution of juvenile delinquency in the class structure, he calls for research that will make known the extent of delinquency behavior in the population not judged delinquent. *Ibid.*, pp. 170-171.

\(^6^2\)Reiss and Rhodes, *loc. cit.* Note that the theories of Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin, and Miller have attempted to account for this relationship in terms of subculture.

\(^6^3\)For a general discussion of the problems in the use of criminal and juvenile delinquency statistics, see: Clement S. Mihanovitch, "Who Is the Juvenile Delinquent?" *Social Science*, 22 (1947), pp. 45-50; Sophia M. Robinson, *Can Delinquency Be Measured?* (New York: Columbia University
law enforcement or judicial agencies give biased estimates of a true rate of delinquency in the population. Estimates of the extent of delinquent behavior in the general population indicates that such behavior may be more evenly distributed in the various socio-economic strata than records lead one to believe. Porterfield, for example, found that college students committed many more delinquent acts than is commonly known and that these delinquent acts were as serious as those which brought other young people, less fortunate economically, into court. Research by Murphy, based on the case histories of adolescents, yielded similar results. Wallerstein and Wyle found that in a group of upper-income individuals ninety-nine per cent answered affirmatively to one or more offenses. Short's research on criminal behavior in selected groups likewise bears testimony to the fact that delinquent and criminal behavior are by no means limited to the lower


64Austin L. Porterfield, Youth In Trouble (Ft. Worth: Leo Polishman Foundation, 1946).


economic groups. The apparently higher rates of the low socio-economic status group is due to the fact that agencies of social control are more likely to classify them as delinquents.

The anonymous-questionnaire procedure (self-reported delinquency) has been utilized very effectively to obtain results reflecting the rates and patterns of illegal behavior among juveniles from different social classes, ages, sexes, and ethnic groups in the general population. Some of the most provocative findings have been those that challenge the almost universally accepted conclusion that the lower socio-economic classes have higher rates of illegal behavior than do the middle or upper classes. For example, neither the Nye-Short study nor that of Dentler and Monroe revealed any significant

---


68 Walter Reckless maintains, for example, that delinquency rates designate categoric risks in the population of being reported to a juvenile court. See Walter C. Reckless, The Crime Problem (New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1950), p. 194.


70 The recent publication of the volume Middle Class Delinquency, Edmund W. Vaz (editor), would seem to indicate a growing concern and attention given to the amount and causes of delinquency at levels other than lower-class.

difference in the incidence of certain illegal or "deviant" behaviors among occupational-status levels -- a finding quite at odds with most explanations of delinquent behavior. Therefore, there appears to be a direct conflict between the formulations of Miller, Cohen, Merton, Cloward and Ohlin, and those findings reported by Nye and Short and Dentler and Monroe.

Clark and Wenninger suggest, however, that this apparent discrepancy in the literature can be resolved, "if one hypothesizes that the rates of illegal conduct among the social classes vary with the type of community in which they are found."73 And in fact, their findings do tend to resolve some of the conflicts in the literature that have arisen from previous research concerning the relationship between the nature of illegal behavior and socio-economic class. Their findings are similar to those of Nye-Short and Dentler-Monroe in that they failed to detect any significant differences in illegal behavior rates among the social classes of rural and small urban areas.74 However, in keeping


72Dentler and Monroe, _op. cit._


74Clark and Wenninger, _op. cit._, p. 833. The studies of Nye-Short and Dentler-Monroe were limited to communities ranging from rural to small city in size. As Nye points out, "They are thus urban but not metropolitan." Nye, _et. al._, _op. cit._, p. 383.
with the class-oriented theories, they did find significant differences, both in quantity and quality of illegal acts, among communities or "status areas," each consisting of one predominant socio-economic class. The lower class areas have higher illegal behavior rates, particularly in the more serious types of offenses.

There are several other related matters which must be considered. One of these is the matter of the size of the concentration of a single social class within a status area. Both the Reiss-Rhodes and Clark-Wenninger studies give consideration to this factor. Further,

75 Most studies of "delinquent gangs" and "delinquent subcultures" have been conducted in metropolitan centers where these phenomena are most apparent, and where greater involvement by lower-class youngsters is reported. See James F. Short, Jr. and Fred L. Stroudbeck, op. cit., especially Chapter 7. From large cities, observational data from lower-class areas with high rates of official delinquency also suggest that the incidence of hidden delinquency in these areas is extremely high. See Walter B. Miller, Mildred S. Geertz, and Henry S. G. Cutter, "Aggression in a Boys' Street-Corner Group," Psychiatry, 24 (1961), pp. 283-298; James F. Short, Jr., Kenneth I. Howard, and Ray A. Tennyson, "Behavior Dimensions of Gang Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 28 (June, 1963), pp. 411-428; and Andrew Greeley and James Casey, "An Upper Middle Class Deviant Gang," American Catholic Sociological Review, 24 (Spring, 1963), pp. 33-41.

76 Bordua, reporting on a Children's Bureau Conference in 1960, states that the discussion was focused largely on urban "lower-class" delinquency because:

low-status, urban 'slum' delinquency is likely to be especially serious in terms of the kind of offenses committed, the degree of violence often manifested, the degree of personal involvement on the part of the delinquent, the relationship of delinquency to adult criminal careers, and the cost of law enforcement and judicial handling.


77 Reiss and Rhodes, op. cit.; Clark and Wenninger, op. cit.
there is obviously more than one "kind" of lower class and each does not have rates or types of illegal behavior identical to that of the others. For example, most rural farm areas, in which occupations, incomes, and educational levels are indicative of lower class status, as measured by most social class indexes, consistently have been found to have low rates of misconduct -- in fact lower than most urban middle class communities. S. M. Miller and F. Riessman propose that the picture so often presented by sociologists of a more or less uniform culture pattern shared in by the lower classes in general is artificial.  

They emphasize the division of the working classes into "working" -- "regular numbers of the non-agricultural labor forces in manual occupations" -- and "lower" -- irregular working people. They assert that the "working" class subculture has more in common with that of the "middle" class than with that of the "lower" class; moreover, it can be seen as the fulcrum for variations within the working class as a whole.

Social class occupies such an important position in theories of delinquency that systematic, objective, and relevant data on the matter are of importance. Reiss and Rhodes concluded as a result of a study of class and juvenile court rates by school district that "it is clear, that there is no simple relationship between ascribed social status and delinquency."  

Nevertheless, says Clark and Wenninger, "to suggest the elimination of social class as a significant correlate to the quantity

---


and quality of illegal behavior before it has been thoroughly examined in a variety of community situations, seems somewhat premature."^80

b. The Group Nature of Delinquency. Earlier in this paper it was pointed out that by far the largest amount of delinquency occurs in groups. Since the discovery of this phenomenon a large number of writers have turned to the group nature of delinquency as a subject of interest and investigation. Not all of this interest has been focused upon subcultural theorization and empirical investigation, but this phenomenon lends itself so readily to this approach and so much attention has been focused of late on this aspect of group delinquency rather than analysis of delinquent acts or individual delinquent careers, that it seems necessary to give more detailed consideration to the concept of the "Delinquent Subculture."

1. The Delinquent Subculture. Since 1955, when Albert Cohen first employed the concept of subculture in relation to certain forms of juvenile delinquency, the term "delinquent subculture" has become common in criminological vocabulary. Downes reminds us, however, that there are difficulties in the use of the concept of "subculture" which are sometimes confused with difficulties in the substance of a theory concerned with a particular delinquent subculture.\(^81\) In fact, Barbara Wooten raises the question of what is to be gained by using the sub-
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^80 Clark and Wenninger, op. cit., p. 327.

^81 Downes, op. cit., p. 1.
culture concept. Downes concludes, after a thorough consideration of the difficulties involved, that certain kinds of questions can most usefully be posed within the subcultural frame of reference. "If the resulting answers make sense, can be nullified or verified scientifically, or -- better -- are simply of use, then the weaknesses inherent in the conceptual source are not crucially relevant."

In his "General Theory of Subculture," Cohen's basic premise is that what people do depends upon the problems they contend with. He points out that whatever factors and circumstances combine to produce a problem derives from either the individual's "frame of reference" or the "situation" he confronts. All problems arise and are solved by way of changes in one or both of these classes of determinants. The really difficult problems are those to which no ready-made solution has been provided by a "culture." If the "situation" remains inflexible, any satisfactory solution to these problems entails some change in the frame of reference itself. However, the solutions to the problems must not impair a person's standing with those whose friendship and esteem is valued most, his reference group. So strong is the need for reference group support for our solutions, that if they prove unacceptable to the group's standards, we are very likely to look for a group that will

---

83Downes, op. cit., p. 6.
84Cohen, Delinquent Boys, Chapter 3, pp. 49-72.
85Ibid., pp. 51ff.
assent. A major reason is that reference group approval validates our solutions.

Then Cohen moves to the central theoretical problem of the book: the emergence of new cultural forms. Subcultural innovation does not occur due to the migration of an individual from one group to another. This occurs, says Cohen, only where there exists, "ineffective interaction with one another, a number of actors with similar problems of adjustment," for whom no effective solution as yet exists for a common shared problem. Only on this basis is the joint elaboration of a new solution possible. It emerges on a group basis, by way of a process of mutual conversion to a new point of view in which the moral frame of reference is not so much obliterated as rapidly transformed. This emergence of new "group standards" is synonymous with that of a new subculture.86

Downes, in a very perceptive fashion, shows how one source of confusion in Cohen's general theory of subcultures is found in his failure to classify "subculture" into two main kinds.

(a) Those which precede, or which are formed outside the context of the "dominant culture": for example, the 'culture' of immigrant groups which become 'subcultures' in the context of the host culture; also, regional subcultures which precede, but came to co-exist, merge with or differentially respond to the enveloping 'dominant culture.'

86Ibid., pp. 59ff.

87In an earlier section of this paper it was shown that the major category of problems with which Cohen is dealing are those of "status," a status based upon middle-class criteria.
(b) Those which originate within the context of the dominant culture: these fall into two sub-categories:

1. Those which emerge in positive response to the demands of the social and cultural structures; for example, occupational subcultures, age-group subcultures, and
2. Those emerging in negative response to the social and cultural structures' demands; e.g., delinquent subcultures; religious-messianic-revivalist subcultures; political-extremist subcultures.

In this classification, Cohen's analysis would apply primarily to subcategory (2) of the second kind of subculture.

In a similar way Milton Yinger has distinguished three clearly different meanings for "subculture" in his review of over 100 sources, and he has located the source of confusion in the vague definition of "subculture" as meaning simply "culture within cultures." Subculture, according to Yinger, has been used as an "ad hoc" concept whenever the writer wished to emphasize the normative aspects of any behavior that differed from some general standard.

Three usages of "subculture" are analyzed by Yinger. The first, found in some anthropological works, refers to "certain universal tendencies that seem to occur in all societies. This usage, however, is only rarely found today. Two other definitions are currently used and are ambiguous even when separated. The concept of "subculture" is applied both to the normative systems of sub-societies (e.g., the
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88Downes, op. cit., p. 9.
90Ibid., p. 625.
working-class subculture) and the emergent norms that appear in frustration or conflict situations (e.g., the delinquent subculture). The first usage includes both vague regional enclaves (e.g., the subculture of the South) and transient occupational groups (e.g., "the subculture among the faculty" cited by Riessman, or Cohen's "the subculture of a factory and of a shop within the factory"). The second usage arises when the reference is to norms that arise from a frustrating situation or from conflict between a group and the larger society. To Yinger, the second usage implies a social-psychological as well as a cultural dimension, and stresses one particular kind of linkage between norms and personality: that is, "the creation of a series of inverse or counter values (opposed to those of the surrounding society) in face of serious frustration or conflict." Yinger has suggested that the term "contraculture" be adopted to refer to the emergent norms of a group in a conflict-laden situation, retaining "subculture" to describe traditional subculture norms. The model for such a "contraculture," as Yinger proposes they should be termed, would be Cohen's construct of the delinquent subculture. 91

2. An Alternative View: The Subculture of Delinquency. David Matza takes the position that there is a subculture of delinquency, but it is not a delinquent subculture as defined by Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin, and Miller. 92 In reviewing the theories of those holding the "delin-

91 Ibid., pp. 626-627.
92 David Matza, Delinquency and Drift, Chapter 2, pp. 33-67.
quent subculture" view, Matza finds their interpretation of the relation between delinquent subculture and conventional culture to be the same. Whatever the underlying reason, reaction formation, alienation and availability, or autonomous traditions, the delinquent subculture stands in opposition to the conventions of middle class morality and inexorably leads its adherents to the breaking of laws.\(^9^3\)

Although the values and norms implicit in the subculture of delinquency are obviously related to delinquency and these values and norms obviously depart in some manner from conventional traditions, Matza feels that for two reasons the relation between the subculture of delinquency and the wider culture cannot be summarized in the term opposition. A subculture is not simply oppositional because it exists within a wider cultural milieu which affects it and which it, in turn, affects. More specifically, the subculture of delinquency cannot be oppositional because, in the first place, it is manned by children, and children are influenced by the society of elders (including parents), almost all of whom are united in their denunciation of delinquent deeds. In the second place, conventional culture is not as simple as usually depicted. It is complex and many-sided, including a wide variety of interrelated traditions.

The basic question and point of difference between Matza and the other theorists pertains, then, to the degree and character of differentiation between the conventional culture and the subculture of delin-

\(^9^3\)Ibid., p. 36.
quency. Does the subculture of delinquency merely tolerate behavior, or "require it as a demonstration of eligibility for membership or leadership status?" Cloward and Ohlin had stated that the delinquent must conform to the dictates of his world. "A member who refuses to perform further delinquencies must expect expulsion from the group." Matza indicates, however, that such strong formulations are misleading. He examines a wide variety of extenuating conditions which excuse members from delinquent activity, and then poses the question: can a member remain in the subculture of delinquency, the world of public delinquency, and through proper extenuation refrain from delinquencies? Matza's answer is, "yes," and the existence and the character of these extenuating circumstances indicate the substance of the subculture of delinquency. They indicate in a dramatic and forcible way the intrusion of conventional values, and thus the accommodative rather than the oppositional character of the subculture. This subculture of delinquency is a delicately balanced set of precepts doubly dependent on extenuating circumstances. Both the commission of delinquent acts and abstinence from them are approved only under certain conditions.

In order to determine whether or not the subculture of delinquency is a delinquent subculture, Matza attempts to assess the posture of delinquents in a variety of circumstances. These situations include (a) the situation of apprehension, (b) the situation of imputation.

---
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(c) the situation of selecting victims, (d) the situation of childhood
(e) the interview situation, and (f) the situation of company. Having
examined these, Matza concludes: "If in all situations the delinquent
reveals a basic ambivalence toward his behavior, a new conception of
his subculture may be warranted, for this ambivalence is strong indi­
cation that his values are not completely opposed to conventional
values."96

Matza summarizes his view in the following words:

The subculture of delinquency consists of precepts and customs
that are delicately balanced between convention and crime. The
subculture posits objectives that may be attained through delin­
quency but also by other means. Its customs allow delinquency
and even suggest it, but delinquency is neither demanded nor
necessarily considered a preferred path. The norms and senti­
ments of the subculture are beliefs that function as the extenu­
ating conditions under which delinquency is possible.

The subculture of delinquency is one of many . . . . The special
characteristics of the subculture of delinquency which is of
critical relevance is the fact that it is manned by juveniles
who, because of their station, are encircled by the conventional
order . . . . The subculture of delinquency is dependent on and
integrated with the conventional order more than most others.
Thus, the key to the analysis of the subculture of delinquency
may be found in its considerable integration into the wider
society and not in its slight differentiation.97

96Ibid., p. 59. See further discussion in the next section of
this paper of the techniques used by delinquents to neutralize conven­
tional values and norms, techniques which allow violation of conventional
values and norms without surrendering allegiance to them.

97Ibid., pp. 59-60.
III. THEORETICAL SCHEME

Neutralization of Values

It has been necessary to trace the thinking of a number of theorists in order to arrive at the theory of delinquency as developed by David Matza and Gresham Sykes. In comprehending the views that have been presented we are better able to understand the problems to which these writers give themselves. Their theory is an attempt to fill in certain gaps and also to make certain corrections to some of those views that have been discussed.

For example, Sykes and Matza agree that delinquent behavior, like most social behavior, is learned and that it is learned in the process of social interaction. The classic statement of this position was found in Sutherland's theory of differential association, which asserts that criminal or delinquent behavior involves the learning of (a) techniques of committing crimes and (b) motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes favorable to the violation of law. Unfortunately, Matza and Sykes indicate, the specific content of what is learned—as opposed to the process by which it is learned—has received little attention in either theory or research. They believe that the "techniques of neutralization" that are discussed herein make up a crucial component of Sutherland's "definitions favorable to the violation of law."  

---
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99 Sykes and Matza, op. cit., p. 667.
They recognize also that the single strongest school of thought on the nature of the content of what is learned has centered on the idea of a delinquent subculture, a subculture whose basic characteristic is a system of values that represents an inversion of the values held by respectable, law-abiding society. Admitting that this image of juvenile delinquency as a form of behavior based on countervailing values and norms has some virtue, these writers attempt to correct the many defects they see and to offer an alternative explanation of delinquency.

Sykes and Matza state that the difficulties in viewing delinquent behavior as arising from a set of deviant values and norms — as arising, that is to say, from a situation in which the delinquent defines his delinquency as "right" — are both empirical and theoretical. They argue that if the delinquent subculture in which the delinquent viewed his behavior as "morally correct" in fact existed, he would exhibit no feelings of guilt or shame at detection and confinement. The major reaction would be, rather, that of the conscientious objector, the nuclear disarmer or the outraged religious minority group. Yet a great deal of evidence suggests that delinquents do experience a sense of guilt or shame, and that this is not a front to appease authorities. In the second place, "the juvenile delinquent frequently accords admiration and respect to law-abiding persons," in particular the "really honest" person. Hence, "while supposedly thoroughly committed to the deviant system of the delinquent subculture, he would appear to recognize

---


101 This point is developed more fully by Matza, *op. cit.*, and discussed in this paper in the section, "The Subculture of Delinquency."
the moral validity of the dominant normative system in many instances."
In the third place, "juvenile delinquents often draw a sharp line
between those who can be victimized and those who cannot;" the selec-
tion of target is often limited by variables of kinship, ethnic group,
social class, age, sex, etc. In the fourth place, "it is doubtful if
many juvenile delinquents are totally immune from the demands for con-
formity made by the dominant social order." Sykes and Matza hold that
the greater probability is that the child internalizes these demands
for conformity, but can neutralize these demands when appropriate cir-
cumstances arise, and the ways in which he accomplishes this neutrali-
zation form the major part of the content of the delinquent "learning
process" which is so central to the notion of "differential association."
This does not mean that the delinquent denies the validity of these
demands for conformity, and substitutes a new normative system for them.
Rather, "techniques of neutralization" provide -- in advance of deviant
behavior -- a psychological escape whereby the delinquent evades or
deflects the delinquency issue. The demands for conformity must be met
and answered. They cannot be ignored as part of an alien system of norms
and values.

In short, Sykes and Matza doubt the subcultural process, "that
sees juvenile delinquency as a form of behavior based on the values and
norms of a deviant subculture in precisely the same way as law-abiding
behavior is based on the values and norms of the larger society."102
Yet the fascinating problem remains of why delinquents violate the laws

102 Ibid., p. 666.
to which they should conform and in which they believe outside the
operation of their own delinquency? The enabling process is at least
partially a function of the rarity with which social norms are "cata-
gorical imperatives," appearing instead as "qualified guides for action,"
limited in their applicability in terms of time, place, person and
social circumstances. Marked by "flexibility," the rules are not felt
to be binding under all conditions. In criminal law, this "flexibility,"
appears in the guise of "mitigating circumstances," by which the offen-
der avoids moral condemnation if it can be shown that criminal intent
was absent. Sykes and Matza argue that much delinquency is based on
what is basically an unrecognized extension of defenses to crimes in the
form of justifications for deviance that are seen as valid by the delin-
quent but not by the legal system or society at large. Unlike the mecha-
nisms of rationalization, "techniques of neutralization" precede delin-
quent behavior and make it possible. Violations are thus seen as
"acceptable" rather than "right," and the delinquent, far from repre-
senting radical opposition to law-abiding society, appears rather as an
apologetic failure.\textsuperscript{103}

Five major "techniques of neutralization" are proposed:

1. The denial of responsibility. Here the delinquent sees
himself as more acted upon than acting. He approaches
a "billiard-ball" self-concept, seeing himself as help-
lessly propelled into delinquency by forces beyond his
control. Society is "stumbled against" rather than
"kicked." The delinquent also displays an acute aware-
ness of the motivation ascribed to him by social

\textsuperscript{103}ibid., pp. 666-667.
workers, etc., as stemming from a "poor home," a "slum background," "bad companions," etc. By seeing himself as more "sinned against than sinning," "the delinquent prepares the way for defiance from the dominant normative system without the necessity of a frontal assault upon the norms themselves."

2. The denial of injury. The delinquent makes the distinction — again found in the legal code — between acts wrong in themselves and acts which are illegal but not immoral. For the delinquent, wrongfulness may turn on the question of whether or not anyone has clearly been hurt by his deviance, and this matter is open to a variety of interpretations; vandalism is described as "mischief," auto theft for "joy rides."

3. Denial of the victim. Even if the delinquent both accepts responsibility for, and recognizes the consequences of his act, he may frequently assert that "the injury is not wrong in the light of the circumstances." In a reversal of roles, the delinquent becomes the avenger, the victim the wrong-doer, e.g., assaults on minority groups, vandalism at school. This indulgence in acts defined as male prohibita as distinct from male in se is enhanced when the victim is abstract and preferably at a distance from the delinquent. Diminished awareness of the victim additionally weakens internalized controls.

4. Condemnation of the condemners. By concentrating attention upon the "corrupt," "stupid" or "discriminatory" practices of police, school or society at large, the delinquent shifts the focus of attention from his own delinquent act to the motives and behavior of those who condemn his law-violation.

5. Appeal to higher loyalties. The delinquent sees himself in the dilemma of divided loyalties, and attributes his behavior to a reluctant sacrifice of the demands of the larger society for those of the smaller social groups to which he belongs. Hence "deviation from certain norms may occur not because the norms are rejected but because other norms . . . are accorded precedence."104
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Sykes and Matza see these "techniques" exemplified in the typically delinquent phrases: "I didn't mean it," "I didn't really hurt anybody," "They had it coming to them," "Everybody's picking on me," and "I didn't do it for myself." "These slogans and their variants prepare the juvenile for delinquent acts, but they represent tangential ... blows at the dominant normative system rather than the creation of an opposing ideology," and are extensions of patterns of thought already prevalent rather than radically new departures. 105

**Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values**

"Neutralization of Values" has centered its attention on how an impetus to engage in delinquent behavior is translated into action. Many delinquents, Sykes and Matza have argued, are essentially in agreement with the larger society, at least with regard to the evaluation of delinquent behavior as "wrong." Rather than standing in opposition to conventional ideas of good conduct, the delinquent is likely to adhere to the dominant norms in belief but render them ineffective in practice by holding various attitudes and perceptions which serve to neutralize the norms as checks on behavior. These "techniques of neutralization" free the individual from a large measure of social control.

There still remains unanswered the question: What makes delinquency attractive in the first place? As we have seen, Matza and Sykes view former answers to this question as troubled by the assumption that the delinquent is a deviant; that is, however commonplace the pressures

105Ibid., p. 669.
that drive him to deviance, his ultimate position is one of opposition to the dominant social order, i.e., the world of the middle class. They assert instead that (a) the values behind much juvenile delinquency are far less deviant than is commonly supposed; (b) this faulty picture is due to gross over-simplification of the middle-class value system.  

Matza and Sykes indicate that the vast majority of accounts of juvenile delinquency and its underlying values agree in substance, if not in interpretation, that three themes recur with marked regularity. First, delinquents are deeply immersed in a restless search for excitement, thrills, or "kicks." The approved style of life, for many delinquents, is shot through with adventurous exploits that are valued for the stimulation they provide. Second, delinquents commonly exhibit a disdain for "getting on" in the realm of work. Occupational goals involving a steady job or careful advancement are often lacking, and there is found in their place a sort of aimless drifting or grandiose dreams of quick success. Chicanery, manipulation, "smartness," are used to make the "big score;" he has no liking for the slow accumulation of financial resources. Third, aggression — whether verbal or physical — is equated with virility and toughness.

In courting danger and provoking authority, the delinquent is not simply enduring hazards, he is also creating hazards, in a deliberate attempt to manufacture excitement. Neither does his disdain for work entail a disdain for money. On the contrary, the "big score" is the delinquent's goal, and he sees illegal means as his only way of achieving it. Also, the concept of reaching manhood by way of an ability to "take it" and "hand it out" is a familiar one to delinquents, and does not necessarily involve the extremities of street gang warfare. This cluster of values — excitement, disdain for "getting on" in work, aggression —, far from denoting the delinquent's apartness from the conventional world, connote his adherence to it.

This emphasis on daring; the rejection of the prosaic discipline of work; the emphasis on luxury and conspicuous consumption; the respect paid to manhood demonstrated by force — all find their counterpart in the values of Veblen's leisured elite. Only the mode of expression — delinquency — is unfamiliar. "The values are obscured by their context," e.g., daring, if anti-social, is seen primarily as an act of deviance, not an act of courage. Yet all these values have their counterparts in the dominant social order. The "stag" party, boardroom cynicism, fiercely competitive sports serve as parallels. More specifically, however, "the values of a leisure class seem to lie behind

\[108\text{Matza and Sykes, op. cit., p. 715.}\]

\[109\text{Ibid.; Merton’s comments on in-group virtues and out-group vices seem germane. Paraphrased, they might read: I am daring, You are reckless, He is delinquent. Merton, op. cit.; pp. 426-430.}\]
much delinquent activity." Matza and Sykes see adolescents in general and delinquents in particular as the "last leisure class," and assert that "in our haste to create a standard from which deviance can be measured, we have reduced the value-system of the whole society to that of the middle-class." They prefer to view class value systems on the model of the "distribution of frequencies" rather than as "distinct groupings of specific values unique to the social class in which they are (allegedly) found." "Most values . . . appear in most social classes; the social classes differ, however, in the frequency with which the values appear."

Further, Matza and Sykes state that all classes embrace certain "subterranean" values — values which are in conflict or even contradiction with other deeply held values, but which are still recognized and accepted by many. These contradictory values may co-exist with conformist values within a single individual and give rise to feelings of ambivalence in many areas of life. They are "deviant" values only insofar as they represent private as opposed to public morality. These values are generally held in abeyance until appropriate circumstances — sports, holidays, recreation — are present, but most societies provide room for . . . a sort of periodic anomie, in which thrill-seeking is allowed to emerge. Gambling, night-clubbing, the "kicking over the traces" at the businessman's conventions, all reflect the espousal of subterranean values that often exist side by side with the values of security, routinization, and stability. In expressing these

110 Matza and Sykes, loc. cit.
values, "it is obvious that something more than the delinquent's sense of appropriateness is required, but . . . in many cases the delinquent suffers from bad timing."111

Neither can the dominant society be viewed as unquestioningly committed to the Protestant ethic of "hard work." Riesman's "insider dopester," Whyte's organization man, "Mills' fixer" are all concepts undermining the Weberian sociologists' affirmation of the work values of society. In what Matza and Sykes term the "compromise between the Protestant Ethic and a Leisure ethic," the delinquent appears "much more in step with his times."112 If he pushes such an ethic to its logical conclusion in a way that most of society's members might not willingly do, he has not necessarily moved into a new realm of values. Via books, movies, TV, and magazines and via aggrandisement of the profit-motive, the dominant society exhibits a widespread taste for violence and legitimizes the ruthlessness inherent in fortune-making. Not only do the mass media frequently act as vehicles for the dissemination of criminal techniques, there are also numerous examples of the acceptance of aggression and violence on the part of the dominant social order — in the glorification of armed combat skills, the punitive aspects of much industrial conflict, and the actual treatment of delinquents themselves by the police.

111Ibid., p. 716.
112Ibid., p. 717.
In brief, "the delinquent may not stand as an alien in the body of society, but may represent instead a dangerous reflection or caricature." Far from establishing a set of counter-values, the delinquent shares the subterranean values of society and this very adherence binds him to the dominant social order. This bond with the larger social order, "facilitates the frequently observed 'reformation' of delinquents with the coming of adult status." To the objection that — if this were the case — much juvenile behavior other than simply delinquent behavior would be analyzed as an extension of the adult world rather than as a product of a distinctly adolescent subculture, Matza and Sykes reply that this is precisely their thesis.

They indicate that the attractiveness of delinquency — and the "techniques of neutralization" which make it possible as modes of

\[\text{113}^{\text{Ibid.}}\]

behavior -- applies with equal force to adolescents "at any class level, for they move in a limbo between earlier parental domination and future integration with the social structure through the bonds of work and marriage."

They therefore postulate that "insofar as these (subterranean) values do lie behind delinquency . . . delinquent behavior prevails among all adolescents rather than those confined to the lower class."

In support of this classless orientation, they turn to the data which indicate that delinquency occurs frequently at upper and middle-class levels as well as at lower-class levels. They assert that the degree to which this is true correspondingly undermines theorization based upon the structural location of most delinquency in the adolescent, urban male segment of the working classes. They acknowledge the failure of their propositions to account for the social class distribution of delinquent behavior, and the degrees and types of delinquent behavior which commonly exist as patterned variations. Nevertheless, they suggest that "it seems worthwhile to pursue the idea that some forms of juvenile delinquency -- and possibly the most frequent -- have a common sociological basis regardless of the class level at which they appear.""117

One such basis is offered, we believe, by our argument that the values lying behind much delinquent behavior are the values of a

115Ibid., p. 718.
116Ibid., p. 719.
117Ibid., p. 718.
leisure class. All adolescents at all class levels are to some extent members of a leisure class, for they move in a limbo between earlier parental domination and future integration with the social structure through the bonds of work and marriage. Yet the leisure status of adolescents, modified though it may be by the discipline of school and the lack of wealth, places them in relationship to the social structure in a manner similar to that of an elite which consumes without producing. In this situation, disdain of work, an emphasis on personal qualities rather than technical skills, and a stress on the manner and extent of consumption all can flourish. Insofar, then, as these values do lie behind delinquency, we could expect delinquent behavior to be prevalent among all adolescents rather than confined to the lower class.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem around which this research was planned and directed was suggested by the papers of Matza and Sykes and the book by Matza, 

Delinquency and Drift. These theorists stressed that "we stand to learn more about juvenile delinquency by exploring the delinquent’s similarity to society rather than his dissimilarity." With their total theoretical approach serving as a framework, the major working propo-

sition for the present research was specifically suggested by the paragraph quoted in its entirety in the preceding section of this paper, and particularly the hypothesis which reads: "Insofar, then, as these values do lie behind delinquency, we could expect delinquent behavior to be prevalent among all adolescents rather than confined to the lower class." 119

The general proposition directing the present research reads:

There is no difference between those ranking high in self-reported delinquency and those ranking low in self-reported delinquency (all classes) in adherence to the three values — search for excitement, disdain for work, and aggression — nor in their attitudes toward those participating in juvenile delinquent activities.

Although this study gave some consideration to the entire cluster of values, primary attention was given to one set — disdain for work and getting ahead — in its relation to attitudes toward and participation in juvenile delinquency. Thus, a specific proposition was stated, as follows:

There is no difference between those ranking high in self-reported delinquency and those ranking low in self-reported delinquency (all classes) in adherence to the set of values centering around disdain for work and getting ahead, nor in their attitudes toward those participating in juvenile delinquent activities.

Five sub-hypotheses were drawn from this statement and served as guides for the research:

1. There is no difference in self-reported delinquency by social class.

2. There is no difference between those high in self-reported delinquency and those low in self-reported delinquency in their occupational value orientations.

119 Ibid., p. 120.
3. There is no difference between those high in self-reported
delinquency and those low in self-reported delinquency in
interpersonal attitudes.

4. There is no difference between high self-reported delinquents and low self-reported delinquents in attitudes
toward those who participate in juvenile delinquent
behavior.

5. There is no difference between high self-reported delinquents and low self-reported delinquents in attitudes
toward success and the future.

In order to evaluate these hypotheses, the following steps were
followed:

1. The socio-economic class positions of two eighth-grade
school groups and an officially adjudicated delinquent
group were determined.

2. By means of a delinquency scale, the degree of involve­
ment in delinquent behavior of the three groups was deter­
mined.

3. The occupational value orientations of the three groups
were examined, and then the relation of these value
orientations to delinquency involvement was determined.

4. The relation between specified attitudes, the major value
orientations, and the delinquency involvement of each
group was examined.

The specific techniques employed and a description of the groups studied
are discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

In the first chapter the basic background material which served to establish the general operational theory and design of this study was presented. In this chapter the writer proposes, first, to describe the design of the research, including a description of the data gathering instrument; second, to indicate the research procedures that were used; and then to present selected characteristics of the sample population.

I. RESEARCH DESIGN

Measure of Values

As is evident from the theories presented in the preceding chapter, many social scientists have found the description of value patterns inescapable in their analyses of societal behavior. Nevertheless, "up until the present time the direct empirical investigation of the values of men in different cultures has somehow seemed beyond the proper province of scientific inquiry . . . ." \(^1\)

Among the explanations advanced for this tendency of social scientists to avoid the study of values, Cattell has suggested: "The wish that the human mind should be untouched by science is father to

the thought that it cannot be treated scientifically."\(^2\) Lundberg, on the other hand, feels that we have tried to reach too high. He attributes much of the failure to obtain objectives results in the study of values, and the very assumption that scientific studies of values are impossible, to the fact that the habitual approach to the subject has involved highly abstract terms like truth, beauty, justice, and goodness. For successful scientific value-research he recommends coming down the ladder of abstraction.\(^3\) Another explanation is presented by Dewey and Humber who maintain in their social psychology text that inasmuch as the social sciences are new and their legitimacy as sciences is still contested, social scientists tend to "worship" the physical and biological sciences and strive to outdo them in renouncing values.\(^4\)

Catton suggests, after looking at the various explanations given, that part of the resistance to undertaking the scientific study of values arises from the belief (among both philosophers and social scientists) that qualitatively unlike values are not quantitatively commensurable. However, on the basis of three empirical tests of the hypothesis of incommensurability, and retests of the same study, Catton concludes that human values, including those which are regarded as being


\(^3\)G. A. Lundberg, *op. cit.* p. 9.

of infinite worth,\(^5\) become measurable relative to each other in exactly the same manner as other verbal stimuli.

The measurability of any class of values, 'infinite' or otherwise, may thus be regarded as a function of the ingenuity of the experimenter in devising techniques for obtaining discriminatory responses to those values, of the sort described by the law of comparative judgement. The mere fact that the stimuli in question are labelled 'values' does not make them non-measurable, nor does the fact that responses to such stimuli are called 'value judgements' prevent them from displaying empirical regularities which may enable social scientists to make predictions.\(^6\)

Part of the problem can be discovered in the very differences in the concepts of value. In an attempt to clarify the confusion surrounding the meaning of value, Franz Adler reduced these concepts to four basic types:\(^7\)

1. Values are considered as absolute, existing in the mind of God as eternal ideas, as independent validities, etc.
2. Values are considered as being in the object, material, or non-material.
3. Values are seen as located in man, originating in his biological needs or in his mind. Man by himself or man in the aggregate, variously referred to as group, society, culture, state or class, is seen as 'holding' values.
4. Values are equated with actions.

\(^5\)Among the "infinite" value categories, Catton lists: (a) human life itself, (b) man's creative achievements, (c) human cooperation for a better life, (d) the worshiping of a power higher than the individual, (e) fullest possible developments of moral character, and (f) fullest possible development of human intelligence and abilities. William R. Catton, Jr., "Exploring Techniques for Measuring Human Values," *American Sociological Review*, 19 (February, 1954), 53; and William R. Catton, Jr., "A Retest of the Measurability of Certain Human Values," *American Sociological Review*, 21 (June, 1956), p. 358.


In considering the empirical study of these four types, Adler states that absolutes are inaccessible to science. Values in objects cannot be discovered apart from human behavior relating to the objects, and internal states cannot be observed apart from action. "Thus," he concludes, "what people do is all that can be known about their values."8

Values, then, must be inferred from behavior -- from what people say and/or from what people do. In this respect, "values are constructs in the mind of the researcher which explain, or label, the conceptual criteria people use as judgment standards when choosing from alternatives."9 The patterned regularity of choices is the key notion in a definition that is operationally useful. Since individuals can verbally express their conception of the more favorable alternative from a set of alternatives, it is possible to infer, from the pattern of verbal choices over a series of situations, the underlying value structure influencing the direction of these choices. This idea is expressed in William Catton's adaptation of the more well-known Kluckhohn definition: "A value is a conception of the desirable which is implied by a set of preferential responses to symbolic desiderata."10 Catton's statement is clear and will serve, in this study, as a useful definition of "values." When value orientations are spoken of, we mean

8Ibid., p. 272.

9H. K. Schwarzweller, "Values and Occupational Choice" (an unpublished paper read at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, Atlanta, April 7-9, 1960), p. 3.

the empirically measured tendency to react favorably or unfavorably to certain generalized conceptions, such as social status, security, creativity, helpfulness, and the like.11

It will be recalled from the general theoretical framework and the statement of the problem that a major objective of this research is to determine the values of the respondents as they center around work. By analyzing the preferential responses to the symbolic desiderata, stated as requirements for an occupation, the subjects' values are determined.

Morris Rosenberg in the book, *Occupations and Values*, tells of a study at Cornell University which had as a chief focus the problem of occupational choices and occupational values.12 In that study of college students, items were included which were designed to shed light on the determinants of occupational choices and on the special role which values play in directing the occupational decision. Specifically, the college students in the study were presented with a list of occupational values and were told to "consider to what extent a job or career would have to satisfy each of these requirements before you could consider it..."

11For a more complete discussion of values and attitudes which can serve as a theoretical background for the problem of occupational values, see: Eugene M. Johnson, *Values and Occupational Choice in Four Selected Occupations* (unpublished Master's Thesis, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1960).

IDEAL." They were instructed to rank these values as high, medium, or low in importance, and then to indicate the relative importance of those marked high. On the basis of the results, certain major "value-orientations" or "value-foci" were distinguished, value orientations which gave some indication of their view of work.

Since this writer had earlier utilized the Rosenberg method of determining "value-orientations" with good results, it was determined to make use of that technique in this investigation. Some modifications were necessary to account for the age of the respondents and to better relate the technique to the study of delinquency. Several of the changes are discussed in the section, "Questionnaire Design."

A question arises: Is the junior high school student too young to have given any thought to work or occupation? One writer suggests that "it is the male 'who must go into the market place,' it is the adolescent who undergoes the crucial process of occupational decision-making." Ginzberg and his associates suggest that occupational choice is a process which is developmental in character, ranging through three periods. The first of these periods is one in which the individual makes what can be described as a fantasy choice; the second period is that in which the individual makes a tentative choice; and the final

---

13Ibid.


period is that in which he makes a realistic choice. The first coincides in general with the latency period between six and eleven, although residual elements of fantasy choices frequently carry over into the preadolescent years. The second coincides by and large with early and late adolescence. With few exceptions, realistic choices are made in early adulthood. Our interest lies in the second period, roughly between the ages of eleven and seventeen, and described as one of tentative choice. During this period, says Ginzberg, choices progressively change from those based upon interests to those based upon capacities to those based on value. In this investigation we are not concerned primarily with what is the final choice of specific occupation. Rather we are interested in the underlying values which would lead to the choice of an occupation and to the dismissal of another from possible acceptance.

Measure of Socio-economic Level

In this study interest was focused on the socio-economic status structure of each of the school populations and of the delinquent population which then could be used as a basis for classifying the population in a social class context. The measure of social status utilized is a quantitative index of social position developed by Duncan.16 The unit scored is an occupation; the score assigned to any occupation is a function of both the education attained and the income received by all

---

males so employed in the civilian labor force in 1950. Duncan has provided the decile rank of 425 occupations, indicating the particular tenth of the labor force into which the position falls. A selected list of these is presented in Table I.

Using the 1960 U.S. Census of Population classification system, the occupation of the father, as indicated by each respondent, was placed in one of ten categories. In order to effect a more exact gradation, the original index scores developed by Duncan were employed to compute a median socio-economic index score. These scores were used to rank the three groups in the population decile scale.

17Nye, Short, and Olson summarized the advantages of using occupation as a measure of socio-economic status: (1) Occupation correlates highly with other criteria of class and status position, such as subjective class affiliation, income, educational level, subjective class ratings, and others. (2) Occupation is related not only to income but to values, attitudes, and goals; to a certain extent it determines the social relations among societal members. (3) The use of occupation as a criterion of socio-economic status makes it possible to correlate a child's delinquent behavior with the socio-economic level of his immediate family rather than with the demographic area in which he lives. (4) In addition, data on the occupation of the father are generally obtained more accurately from adolescents than income, years of schooling of the parents, value of the home, rental, and other items with which the adolescent may not be familiar. F. Ivan Nye, James F. Short, Jr., and Virgil J. Olson, "Socio-Economic Status and Delinquent Behavior," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 63 (January 1958), p. 384. For further discussion of occupation as a criterion of social class position, see: Paul K. Hatt, "Occupation and Social Stratification," *American Journal of Sociology*, 55 (May, 1950), 533-543; Albert J. Reiss, Jr., ed., *op. cit.*; LaMar T. Empey, "Social Class and Occupational Aspiration: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," *American Sociological Review*, 21 (December 1956), 703-709; National Opinion Research Center, "The Quarter's Polls — Occupations," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 11 (1947-48), 138-171; Joseph A. Kahl and James A. Davis, "A Comparison of Indexes of Socioeconomic Status," *American Sociological Review*, 20 (June, 1955), 317-325.

18Table IV on page 90 indicates the distribution of occupations for each of the Groups in this study.
TABLE I

SELECTED OCCUPATIONS BY DECILE RANK AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEX*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>DECILE</th>
<th>SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager - banking and finance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical engineer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate agent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales clerk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV repairman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano tuner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus driver</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping clerk</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto mechanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative (manufacturing)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer (metal industry)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm owner or tenant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator operator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi driver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction laborer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These procedures and the results obtained are presented more fully in the next chapter.

**Measure of Delinquency**

Until recently almost all efforts to discover characteristics that differentiate juveniles who violate legal norms from those who do not have compared institutional and non-institutional populations. As Nye and Short point out, "Delinquency has, in fact, generally been treated not as a variable, but as an attribute. Groups and individuals are treated as delinquent or nondelinquent according to official judgement. The socio-economic and other biases inherent in the dichotomy is well known."\(^{19}\) Though many researchers still employ a "delinquent" or "criminal" sample from institutions,\(^{20}\) there is a growing awareness that the process through which boys and girls are selected to populate the "correctional" institutions may cause such comparison studies to distort seriously the true picture of illegal behavior in our society. Therefore, conclusions based upon such studies are subject to considerable criticism of generalized beyond the type of population of the particular institution at the time of the study.\(^{21}\)

A further problem in the institutionalized—non-institutionalized dichotomy for etiological purposes is that it involves the unknown but

---


20 An example of this type of research design is Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1950).

important effect of the institutionalization process itself on the relationship of the adolescent to his parents, siblings, school, and other significant groups. Are these relationships the same after arrest, probation, supervision, and incarceration? Indeed, there is the problem of the effect of the institutionalization process upon the self concept of the youngster himself.22

The pioneer work of Robinson and Schwartz, together with the studies of Porterfield, Wellstein and Wyle, and Murphy, Shirley and Witmer, have pointed up the problems and futility of basing etiological research and theory solely on the institutionalized—non-institutionalized dichotomy. The more recent work of researchers like Nye and Short, Clark and Wenninger, and Dentler and Monroe has added to the findings of these earlier studies and indicates the feasibility of extensive research on reported delinquent behavior in non-institutionalized as well as institutionalized populations.24

In the present study, we are interested in the delinquent behavior of boys who have been adjudicated delinquent by the Court and


23See the preceding chapter, pp. 28-35, for a review of these works.

are on probation, and also junior high school students who are not adjudicated delinquents. Delinquent behavior is measured by means of an anonymous delinquency check list administered to all the adolescents in the study and by a delinquency scale constructed from it. This delinquency scale is an adaptation of that developed by Nye and Short.

An inventory of 15 items of criminal and anti-social behavior was constructed. Several criteria were employed in their selection: items were desired which would (1) provide a range from trivial to serious crimes (this was modified by two factors: (a) there was an attempt to keep the final scale as much like the scale developed by Nye and Short as possible; so, although the list is designed to include a broad sampling of juvenile misconduct, it does not include several of the more serious types of delinquency, e.g., rape, breaking and entering, and armed robbery, which were also omitted in the Nye-Short Scale; (b) the youth of the respondents in this study suggested offenses of a less serious nature); (2) be committed by an appreciable segment of the population; and (3) be admitted under favorable circumstances.

No questions concerning sex offenses were included in this study, a restriction found necessary in order to gain entrance into the school system. Since sex offenses are typically listed as a major

---

25 Following Nye and Short, this writer accepts Tappan's arguments for legal definition of crimes and delinquencies, but takes exception to his insistence that only those adjudicated as criminals or delinquents are properly the subject of sociological inquiry. See Paul W. Tappan, "Who is the Criminal?" American Sociological Review, 12 (February, 1947), pp. 96-102.
category of offenses for female delinquents, it was felt that the exclusion of questions concerning sex was a reason for eliminating females from the study. A more general reason, however, was the empirical fact -- verified by self-reported delinquency studies -- that officially recognized delinquent behavior is primarily a male phenomenon.

The study of delinquent behavior by reported behavior raises a number of methodological problems, some of which have been investigated by Short and Nye.26 Regarding the question of the bias introduced by reliance upon volunteers, the findings of Short and Nye support suggestions by Wallin27 and Locke28 that such bias is not substantial though certain variations in response have been noted.29 They suggest methods whereby the problems of response reliability and validity can be dealt with by "building in" to the questionnaire items "designed to catch the random respondent, the over-conformist, and the individual who is out to impress the researcher with his devilishness, the truth notwithstanding."30

Following the lead of Short and Nye, several reliability checks

26 Short and Nye, op. cit.; Nye and Short, op. cit.


29 Short and Nye, op. cit., p. 211.

were included in the questionnaire to detect the over-conformer.

These behavior items, such as "pushing to the head of the line instead of waiting your turn," "telling an untruth if it seemed necessary," "pulling pranks on Halloween night," and "smoking," are generally considered by the general public to be undesirable but considered by this writer to be universal with the age group under consideration. A response of "no" to all of these was considered sufficient reason for elimination of the respondent.

It was anticipated that there would be a few individuals who would pretend to have committed "every crime in the book." If a public school respondent indicated, as a few did, that he had committed all 15 delinquencies a maximum number of times, it was considered that he would be found in the state training school, or at least in detention, rather than being at large, and his data were eliminated.

Short and Nye had warned about another type of response problem posed by the extremely poor reader. Because the schools would allow respondents to give only one class period of 50 minutes to this research project, careful attention was given to the matter of the poor reader and the length of the questionnaire.31

For one or more of the above reasons approximately two per cent of the public school student questionnaires were considered invalid and eliminated. There were none eliminated in the case of the delinquents.

---

31 Even with time allowed for introductory remarks by a school official and introduction to the questionnaire by the researcher, every student completed the questionnaire in the time allowed, most in a shorter time than anticipated by the researcher. Many questions considered important to the research had been eliminated by the researcher in order to meet the time requirements. With the adjudicated delinquent
For the respondents retained, two further indications of reliability were available. Scaling of the data (unidimensionality) provides one of these. Similarities in scale patterns in the studies of Nye and Short and those derived by this writer provides another.

Two indications of validity are presented. First, all items are violations of laws or are offenses on the basis of which adolescents are adjudicated. This is an indication of face validity. Second, the scale scores differentiate between groups "known to be different" on the delinquent behavior dimension.

The development of the delinquent scale according to the Guttman technique and the improvement of reproducibility coefficient by use of Israel Gamma Image Analysis is so integral a part of the findings of this paper that these matters are discussed in the next chapter.

Measure of Attitudes

The concept of attitudes is very closely associated with that of values. Following the theoretical approach of such social—psychologists as Ellsworth Faris and George Herbert Mead, attitudes can be


regarded generally as the individual expression of social values (that
is, in those cases where socialization has been successful). The
social attitudes of the person are seen as the subjective aspect of
the objective values, and the internalization of these values is a
function of the process of socialization within the human group. "The
success of socialization is complete when the values of the group
become attitudes in the personality."35

More specifically, attitude is commonly defined as "the predis-
position to act."36 This implies a readiness, or a set to act in a
certain way toward an object. Attitudes are inferred from observed
behavior. Usually, if the behavior is verbal, the verbal response is
termed "opinion." Although opinions "cannot be taken as direct exhi-
bition or description of attitudes,"37 nevertheless attitudes are infer-
red from or best known to us through the expressions of opinions by
informants. Harry K. Schenckweller suggests that the difference
between attitudes studied in this manner and values as they are used

34Ellsworth Faris, "Social Attitudes" and "The Concept of Social
Co., 1937), pp. 127-31, 132-43. George Herbert Mead's lectures were
published in Mind, Self, and Society. (Chicago: University of Chicago
Press, 1934).

35Delbert C. Miller and William H. Form, Industrial Sociology

36Gordon W. Allport, "Attitudes," in C. A. Murchison, editor,
Handbook of Social Psychology (Worcester: Clark University Press, 1935),
pp. 798-844.

37Eugene L. Hartley and Ruth L. Hartley, Fundamentals of Social
In sociology today is one involving the level of abstraction. Values imply the deeper, closer-to-the-core type sentiments; attitude implies more a tendency to act in a certain way in a particular situation. In this sense, values are the more stable and more permanent aspects of personality.  

**Attitudes Related to Occupational Choice and Work.** Three attitudes related to occupational choice and work are examined in this study: attitudes are labeled "faith in people," "attitudes toward success," and "attitudes toward the future." Variations in techniques of investigation are employed with each set of attitudes. Therefore, a description of each technique is presented with the appropriate findings.

**Attitudes Toward Delinquency.** Matza and Sykes have suggested that delinquents frequently express statements indicating a belief in the law while at the same time they break the law. They have outlined certain "techniques of neutralization" by which this becomes possible for the individual delinquent. When asked how they felt about other persons who break the law, some delinquents have replied, "Man, I'm not that bad!"

---


39 See pp. 125-130, 139-141, 144-146 for a discussion of these techniques and findings.

40 See preceding chapter pp. 43-55 for a discussion of this phenomenon.
In an attempt to measure the degree to which the respondents in this study identify with delinquents or delinquent behavior, a Bogardus type measure of social distance was developed. Ten items were taken from the delinquency check list; the respondent was asked his feeling toward someone who behaved in that fashion. These answers were then weighted and the items scaled, using the Guttman technique.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was the basic data gathering instrument used in this investigation. Several problems concerning the content of the questionnaire and the intent of its major sections have been discussed in the preceding portions of this paper. Two other factors governed the final design of the questionnaire: one, the age of the respondents, and two, the amount of time available to the respondent for completing the questions. The fact that the school subjects were eighth grade students meant that the questions needed to be geared to the interests and abilities of 13 and 14-year-olds. The fact that the researcher was allowed one class period of the students' time meant that all questions must be completed by the slowest student in 35-40 minutes.

A copy of the questionnaire, in the final form in which it was administered is reproduced in the Appendix of this dissertation. There

41 This section of the questionnaire is introduced by question 19. For a discussion of Bogardus Social Distance Scales, see Goode and Hatt, op. cit., Chapter 16, pp. 243-260.

42 The next section of this paper, "The Questionnaire Design," gives more specific information concerning the design of this measure of attitudes toward delinquency.
follows a description of it.

The first seventeen questions ask for general information about the individual and his socio-economic background. Also included here are several questions concerning his relations with others and his self concept.

Question 18 introduces a major portion of the questionnaire. It is designed to indicate the importance of selected values in the respondents' choice of an occupation. In the Rosenberg study ten requirements for choosing an occupation were listed. In the present study two other requirements are included - - "Be easy" and "Have short hours" -- because they seem to be appropriate for identifying "delinquent" or "subterranean" values. Twelve requirements are listed, as follows:

"When I go into an occupation I will do so because it will ..

1. Provide a chance to use my special abilities.
2. Provide me with a chance to earn a good deal of money.
3. Permit me to be creative and original.
4. Be easy
5. Give me a chance to work with people rather than things.
6. Have short hours.
7. Cause people to look up to me as someone important.
8. Allow me to look forward to a secure future.

Rosenberg, op. cit., p. 12.
9. Leave me free of supervision by others.
10. Give me a chance to be helpful to others.
11. Give me a chance to be a leader.
12. Provide me with adventure and excitement."

Each person is asked to indicate the importance of each of the requirements in his own choice of occupation by writing:

H (high) next to the requirements considered highly important to his choice.

M (medium) next to the requirements considered of medium importance.

L (low) next to the requirements considered of little or no importance.

Next, each person is asked to go back and consider the requirements he has rated "high." He is asked to rank them in the order of importance to him by writing next to each "H" a "1" for the most important, "2" for the next in importance, and so on, for all the "H's" on the list. The "M's" and "L's" are not ranked.

A second major section of the questionnaire is found in question 19. Here the respondent is asked his feeling about someone whose behavior included the offenses listed in the question. Ten offenses which could be called delinquent by the court are listed, as follows:

1. Ran away from home.
2. Purposely destroyed property that did not belong to him.
3. Defied his parents' authority.
4. Took little things (worth less than $2) that did not belong to him.
5. Skipped school without excuse.
6. Bought and drank liquor as a minor.
7. Took things worth more than $2.
8. Drove without a license.
9. Used narcotics.
10. Took an automobile.

The respondent is asked to indicate his feeling toward someone who committed one of the above offenses by checking:

"I would want him as a close friend or buddy."

"I would not care if he attended my school, but I would not want him for a close friend."

"I would not want him in my school or want to be associated with him in any way."

"I would want him placed in an institution for juvenile delinquents."

Questions 20-23 seek information about the respondents' views concerning the future, getting ahead, and school attendance and participation. Also, the primary attitude of "faith in people" is determined by the subjects' response to five statements planned according to the Guttman method.44

The last major portion of the questionnaire is introduced by question 24. The introduction reads:

Recent research has found that everyone breaks some laws, rules, and regulations during his lifetime. Some break them regularly, others less often. Below are some frequently broken. Check those that you have broken since beginning grade school.

Fifteen offenses are then listed. If the respondents admit commission

44See the next chapter, pp. 125-130 for an explanation of the design of this Guttman scale.
of an offense, they so indicate by disclosing how often they have done so — once or twice, several times, or very often.

At the beginning of the questionnaire there are several brief paragraphs of introduction and instruction. The subjects are asked not to sign their names. Other specific instructions are given in questions 18, 19, 21, and 24. The questions are "closed" in form rather than "open-ended" so that the respondents might answer the questions adequately within forty minutes.

II. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

In designing the questionnaire, questions which would be appropriate for this study were carefully selected from the Nye-Short papers and the Rosenberg report. Then other questions suggested by the theories of Matza and Sykes suitable to the sample populations and to the purpose of the present study were added. This first draft was discussed with professors and fellow graduate students in the sociology department; particularly was it discussed by the members of a graduate course in methodology at Louisiana State University. Administrators in the public school system and probation officers of the Family Court of Baton Rouge offered pertinent suggestions. By utilizing these suggestions and comments, by studying the Nye-Short and Rosenberg reports, and after examining the design of attitude questionnaires, deletions and additions were made to complete the final draft of the questionnaire.

Because two groups of respondents were in two different schools in the same school system and the third group was related to Family Court as adjudicated delinquents on probation, the plan for administration of
the questionnaire in each case was of necessity different. It was necessary first to discuss the nature and purpose of this investigation with administrators of the school system and then to seek their permission to enter the schools for purposes of this research. This permission was granted, and several of these officials gave assistance in identifying the schools that would best serve the purpose of the investigation and also in establishing contact with the principal of each school. It was with the principal and the guidance counselor at each school that plans were made for administering the questionnaire.

At one school -- Glen Oaks Junior High School -- it was possible to make arrangements for all the eighth grade boys present on a particular day to answer the questions during an extended home-room period. All of these boys were asked, without advance notice, to report to the cafeteria, which also serves as a general meeting hall. There the guidance counselor of the school introduced the researcher who then gave a brief explanation of the research purposes of the questionnaire and emphasized the anonymity of each respondent.

At the second school -- Glasgow Junior High School -- it was necessary to administer the questionnaire at four periods throughout the day rather than to all the eighth grade boys simultaneously. This led to a certain amount of rumor and speculation, the effect of which is not entirely known. However, it is felt by the writer that this was not a serious disadvantage. The method of introduction in each case was very similar to that made at the first school.

With the third group -- the adjudicated delinquents on probation -- another procedure was followed; a procedure worked out in consultation
with the chief probation officer and his assistant. Permission was
sought and granted by the Judge of Family Court to question all white
boys who were on probation at that time and whose parents would permit
such interviews. A letter introducing the research project and the
researcher was mailed to each family of a boy on probation by the pro-
bation officer in charge of his case. The parents were asked to
reply affirmatively or negatively to the request that the researcher
be allowed to interview their son. This was accomplished by checking
the appropriate square at the bottom of the letter and returning it to
the probation officer in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided
for that purpose. The parents were also instructed to call the proba-
tion officer if there were questions concerning the letter.

On May 11, 1966, there were 62 white boys on probation at the
Family Court. Letters were sent to the families of 60 of these; two of
the 62 were in psychiatric treatment at that time and so were not includ-
ed. To those who had not returned the letter within two weeks, a post
card was sent reminding them of the request and asking again that per-
mission for an interview be granted. Of the 60 letters mailed, 41 were
returned, with 10 negative responses. Three other families called a
probation officer and gave affirmative replies.

The researcher then attempted to contact by phone the 34 respon-
dents who had replied affirmatively in order to arrange a time at which

45 A copy of this letter is located in the Appendix.
the questionnaire could be administered. It was decided that it would be very difficult to arrange a meeting with the delinquent at any place away from his home. Therefore, the researcher requested permission to interview the boy in his home. This might have affected the delinquent's perception of the questions. However, the disadvantages of this procedure were overcome to a certain degree by the researcher's visit in the home and his observations of the boy in his home environment. Meeting with the boy away from the Family Court Center also emphasized the fact that the researcher was not related to the Court.

At the boy's house the researcher introduced himself and explained something of the purpose of the interview. It was emphasized that other boys from various areas of the city were participating in the study, and it was explained that a number of the boys at that time on probation were participants. The respondents were reminded that the material was completely confidential and were asked not to sign their names. Usually the boy went to another room in order to complete the questionnaire.

There seemed to be no problems of rapport with the group of delinquents. Of course, it was a highly selective group. There is no way to ascertain how those who did not return the letters or who responded negatively to the request for the interview might have behaved.

46 Two of these boys had been present at Glen Oaks on the day the questionnaire was administered, and thus had already given the information requested by the researcher. Since the chief probation officer had indicated that these boys would be with the eighth grade at Glen Oaks, the researcher asked the respondents there, after all had completed the questionnaire, to write "yes" or "no" to the questions, "Are you now on probation at Family Court?" The two boys were identified in this manner and were included, for purposes of data analysis, in the adjudicated delinquent group.
This proves to be a weakness in such a study as this; and yet, the use of an institutionalized delinquent sample presents problems of as serious a nature.

All of the materials gathered from the three groups were coded and then processed at the Louisiana State University IBM Research Center.

III. SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION

As noted in the preceding section, the questionnaires were administered to two groups of white eighth grade boys at two junior high schools, and to a group of white, male adjudicated juvenile delinquents on probation. Both of the schools are in the same school district. The Family Court serves the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area in which the schools are located. According to the 1960 Census of Population report, the population of the SMSA was 230,058; 152,419 were in the central city and 77,039 outside the central city. Both of the schools used in the study are located in the central city and all of the delinquents, except three, were in the central city.

To these three groups a total of 319 questionnaires were distri-

47This included all the eighth grade boys present in each school on the day the questionnaire was administered. At the time of this investigation there were no Negro students in the schools selected for study. Although this was not a criterion in the choice of schools for investigation, the writer had decided to control for the variable of race by excluding Negro respondents. Their inclusion seemed to raise some crucial problems which could hardly be resolved in the limited scope of this research project.
buted. Five of the school questionnaires could not be used because they were improperly completed. When these were discarded there remained 134 from Glen Oaks Junior High School, 146 from Glasgow Junior High School, and 34 from the delinquent group. These 314 cases served as the primary sources of data on which the investigation is based.

Age Composition of the Respondents

The age composition of each group will vary; therefore, the totals for each group are given separately in Table II.

TABLE II
THREE GROUPS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Glen Oaks</th>
<th>Delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 12</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10 (6.8)</td>
<td>4 (3.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>63 (43.2)</td>
<td>56 (42.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>63 (43.2)</td>
<td>51 (38.3)</td>
<td>8 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8 (5.5)</td>
<td>19 (14.3)</td>
<td>9 (26.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
<td>12 (35.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4 (11.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>146 (100.0)</td>
<td>134 (100.0)</td>
<td>34 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48See the section entitled, "Measure of Delinquency," for a discussion of this problem.
The largest number for both of the two schools population are in the age brackets of 13-14. At Glasgow, there are 86.4 per cent and at Glen Oaks there are 81.4 per cent in these two age groups. Glen Oaks has 15.8 per cent above the 13-14 age bracket and 3.87 per cent below. There are 6.9 per cent above and 6.8 per cent below in the Glasgow population.

In the delinquent sample, 23.5 per cent are 14-years-of-age, the remainder, 76.5 per cent, are older. The largest number of delinquents are 16 years of age, with ages 15 and 14 following in that order. This pattern fits the national pattern for ages of persons arrested in the United States as reported by the National Crime Commission.49

CHAPTER III

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS LEVEL AND SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

I. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS LEVEL

In this study, we were interested in the socio-economic status structure of each of the schools and of the delinquents which then could be used as a basis for classifying each of the groups in a social class context. The measure of social status used is a quantitative index of social position developed by Duncan. The unit scored is an occupation; the score assigned to any occupation is a function of both the education attained and the income received by all males so employed in the civilian labor force in 1950. Duncan has provided the decile rank of 425 occupations, indicating the particular tenth of the labor force into which the position falls.

Since a major objective of this study was to observe the class differences in delinquency and the occupational values which might underly this delinquency, a first step was to determine the social class strata to which the respondents in the study belong. The socio-economic index scores developed by Duncan were assigned to the occupa-

---


2Ibid., pp. 263-275.
tion of the father of each respondent and then used to compute a median socio-economic score for each of the three groups studied. The results indicate that the groups receive the following scores:

- Glasgow: 69.6
- Glen Oaks: 30.3
- Delinquents: 30.0

As indicated by Table III, Glasgow will receive a decile scale rank of ten, while both Glen Oaks and the Delinquents receive a scale rank of six. This is not unexpected. In the first place, it had been suggested by leaders in the school system, on the basis of informal observation and school records, that these two schools would probably represent populations at two extreme class levels. It was pointed out, however, that because of the recent opening of new schools, regrouping of students and classes, redistricting, and population shifts in the last few years, the more rigid class distinctions once found in these two schools is not now as evident. This is seen in Table III by the wide distribution of respondents in the socio-economic index from each group. Nevertheless, there is a definite clustering of respondents around certain points in the scale.

---

3 Using the Median Test, the differences between the Glasgow median score and the Glen Oaks score is significant (P < .001). The difference between Glasgow and the Delinquents is also significant (P < .001). The difference between the median scores of Glen Oaks and the Delinquent group is not significant.

4 One of the delinquents who recently had transferred to the upper status school commented on the problems he faced trying to arrange dates with girls in the school. "Most of the girls there are too snooty! You can't make-out with them."
### TABLE III

**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEX AND DECILE SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Socio-Economic Index Scores</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Distribution of Each Group by Decile of Socio-Economic Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE IV
SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEX FOR MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUPS AND DISTRIBUTION OF THREE RESEARCH GROUPS IN EACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Groups (1950)</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Index</th>
<th>Distribution of Research Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62 (42.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-- (----)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17 (11.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16 (11.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-- (----)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Laborers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-- (----)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-- (----)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response (Unclassifiable)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 (7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146 (100.0)</td>
<td>133 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Computed by Duncan as a mean score from the aggregate age, income, and education data for males in the respective major occupation groups.
In the second place, a look at Table IV shows that in a classification of occupations, 55.5 per cent of the fathers in the Glasgow School are located in the professionals and managers categories. Sales workers represent the next highest percentage at Glasgow. Duncan makes the comment that sales workers should probably be placed in a higher prestige position than clerical workers, as indicated by the socio-economic index score, but we are so accustomed to seeing them in this order in the United States Census reports that there is a tendency to think of them in the order printed. At Glasgow, 72.6 per cent are found in the occupations which can be called White Collar (professionals, managers and officials, clerical workers, sales workers).

At Glen Oaks, only 17.3 per cent of the respondents' fathers fall into the professionals and managers categories. For this group, the highest percentages are craftsmen (31.6%) and operatives (21.8%), a total of 53.4 per cent. The third largest group is represented by the managers-officials. At Glen Oaks, 61.7 per cent are found in the occupations which can be called Blue Collar (craftsmen, operatives, service workers, and laborers).
The adjudicated delinquent group parallels closely the Glen Oaks group not only in socio-economic index score, but also in distribution in the occupational categories. The largest number are found in the craftsmen category (26.5%), followed by operatives (17.6%) and managers-officials (14.7%). For the delinquent group, there are 55.9 per cent in the blue collar occupations.

No attempt was made to classify those respondents who omitted the "occupation of the father" question, or whose father was deceased, or where there was divorce and no occupation was listed.

On the basis of the informal observation of school officials, the Duncan socio-economic index median score given to each school, and the occupational classification, two status levels were identified for purposes of this study: an upper or white collar level and a lower or blue collar level. The white collar level is represented by Glasgow School and the blue collar level is represented by Glen Oaks School. The adjudicated delinquent group also falls into the blue collar level. (See Table V)

5The terms white collar and blue collar seem appropriate to this study rather than upper and lower because increasingly there is a distinction made by social class theorists between "laboring class" and "lower class." See for example, the discussion by S. M. Miller and Frank Riessman, "The Working Class Structure: A New View." Social Problems, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Summer 1961), pp. 86-97. For both the lower status groups in this study, the respondents would certainly be listed as "laboring class" rather than "lower class."
TABLE V
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY BLUE COLLAR-WHITE COLLAR STATUS LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS LEVEL</th>
<th>DISTRIBUTION OF THREE GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>(78.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recognized, of course, that there are problems raised by the fact that each population is not completely homogenous. These problems which have been considered by others, but could not be given primary consideration here. On those occasions, however, when it seemed necessary for better understanding to further divide the class groupings, these categories were used: upper status, middle status, lower status. These status groups were also defined in terms of the occupation of the father as it is located on the Duncan Socio-Economic Index.

---

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY THREE SOCIAL STATUS LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Index Score</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Index Decile Score Rank</th>
<th>Distribution by Groups*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>22-49</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>0-21</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This distribution does not include the nonclassifiable occupations.

Table VI indicates the distribution of the respondents in these three classifications.

Again, Glasgow's position as an upper status school is seen, with 72.6 per cent of these respondents in that position and only 4.4 per cent at the lower status position. Glen Oaks and the adjudicated delinquents are very close in status position with 59.1 per cent and 58.6 per cent of their respondents at the middle status level, and almost an equal percentage in each of the other two positions.

II. SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

A second major objective was to determine by means of the self-report approach the degree of delinquency in each sample. Although Dentler and Monroe quite correctly suggest that a distinction should be made between reports of misconduct as deviant acts and as delinquent...
behavior, this researcher chose to retain the term "delinquency" rather than "deviancy" because extensive use was made of the "delinquency scale" as developed by Nye and Short.

By using self-report data concerning delinquency, Nye and Short developed a delinquency scale (following the Guttman scaling technique) for use on high school students. From a pool of 23 items, Nye and Short selected seven which reflected Israel Gamma image reproducibility coefficients ranging from .97 to .99, for samples of boys aged 14 to 16 and over. Girls, however, were treated separately on a quasi scale without image analysis. The seven items ranged from "Driving without a license," to "Defied parents' authority." Whenever Nye and Short com-

---

7Dentler and Monroe refer to Cloward and Ohlin's statement: "Delinquent acts are distinguished from other deviant acts by the very fact that they result, or are likely to result, in the initiation of official proceedings by agents of criminal justice . . . . The anticipated official response to deviant actions is an extremely important element in the definition of delinquency. A deviant act that is frowned upon but otherwise ignored by officials will not mean the same thing either to the community or to the offender as an act that would ordinarily result in delinquency proceedings . . . . Acts that do not ordinarily lead to the initiation of delinquency proceedings may constitute deviance from . . . norms . . . but these acts are not delinquent unless they are likely to be defined as such by agents of criminal justice." (Cloward and Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, [Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960] pp. 4, 6-7, in Robert A. Dentler and Lawrence J. Monroe, "Social Correlates of Early Adolescent Theft, American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (October, 1961), p. 733. Following their lead, Dentler and Monroe chose to consider self-reports of misconduct as deviant acts, not as reports of delinquent behavior. The deviant acts investigated were ones which, on paper, may constitute delinquent acts, but lacking knowledge of how they might be acted upon by agents of criminal justice in particular situations, they believe that the researcher who uses the self-report technique should maintain this distinction.
bined data from public school and training school (officially delinquent) boys, four more delinquency items of a more serious nature were utilized, making an eleven item scale.\(^8\)

As Dentler and Monroe state, most juvenile offenders embark on delinquency careers between the ages of nine and twelve.\(^9\) Since most high school offenders reveal histories of deviance, this researcher wished to examine the results of the self-report approach among junior high school youths. As described in Chapter II of this paper, a fifteen item delinquency check list was prepared. Table XXVI in the appendix summarizes the distribution of responses to these items posed as questions for each of the three groups. From the original 15-item delinquency check list, ten items were selected for scaling on the criteria that (a) the items might measure a single dimension\(^10\) and (b) the items be as much like the Nye-Short scale items as possible within the

\(^8\)The seven item scale developed by Nye and Short included the following items: (1) Driven a car without a driver's license or permit. (2) Taken little things (worth less than $2) that did not belong to you. (3) Bought or drank beer, wine, or liquor. (4) Skipped school without a legitimate excuse. (5) Had sex relations with a person of the opposite sex. (6) Purposely damaged or destroyed public or private property that did not belong to you. (7) Defied your parents' authority (to their face).

The eleven item scale added the following offenses: (1) "Run away" from home. (2) Taken things of medium value ($2 to $50). (3) Took things of large value (worth more than $50). (4) Narcotics violations. (F. Ivan Nye and James F. Short, Jr., "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," *American Sociological Review*, 22 (June 1957), pp. 326-331.


limitations of this study. These ten items were:

1. Bought or drank beer, wine, or liquor? (Include drinking at home) (1) No . . . , (2) Once or twice . . . , (3) Several times . . . , (4) Very often . . . .

2. Taken little things (worth less than $2) that did not belong to you? (1) No . . . , (2) Once or twice . . . , (3) Several times . . . , (4) Very often . . . .

3. Driven a car without a driver's license or permit? (Do not include driver training courses) (1) Very often . . . , (2) Once or twice . . . , (3) Several times . . . , (4) No . . . .

4. Defied your parents' authority (to their face)? (1) No . . . , (2) Once or twice . . . , (3) Several times . . . , (4) Very often . . . .

5. Skipped school without a legitimate excuse? (1) No . . . , (2) Once or twice . . . , (3) Several times . . . , (4) Very often . . . .

6. Purposely damaged or destroyed public or private property that did not belong to you? (1) Very often . . . , (2) Once or twice . . . , (3) Several times . . . , (4) No . . . .

7. "Run away" from home? (1) No . . . , (2) Once . . . , (3) Twice . . . , (4) Three times . . . , (5) Four times . . . , (6) Five or more times . . . .

8. Taken things of medium value (between $2 and $50)? (1) Very often . . . , (2) Several times . . . , (3) Once or twice . . . , (4) No . . . .

9. Taken things of large value (worth more than $50)? (1) No . . . , (2) Several times . . . , (3) Once or twice . . . , (4) Very often . . . .

10. Used narcotics? (1) Very often . . . , (2) Several times . . . , (3) Once or twice . . . , (4) No . . . .

These ten items were then scaled, using the Guttman scaling method. By programming the Guttman scale on the 7040 computer at the

---

11 Since an adjudicated delinquent group was used in the study, it was decided to include in the scale more serious offenses, e.g. items 7, 9, 10, which would better isolate the most serious offenders in all groups.
L.S.U. Research Center, it was possible to develop the scale on the basis of the entire sample of 313 respondents. Trichotomizing these items and employing the Cornell technique, a reproducibility coefficient of .79 was obtained.\(^\text{13}\) This was improved to .96 by employing the Israel Gamma image analysis.\(^\text{14}\) Image analysis, a refinement of scale analysis, is designed to remove "idiosyncratic" elements from the data "to predict what the response would be if the respondent were responding only to the common factor."\(^\text{15}\)

Delinquency scale types isolated for the entire research sample are presented in Table VII. Of the possible 16 scale types, 15 are represented by the entire sample. The number and the cumulative percent for each scale type broken down for each of the three samples are included in the Table.

\(^{12}\)An excellent description of the Guttman technique which brings together information found in many other sources, can be found in Allen L. Edwards, [op. cit.], pp. 172-200.

\(^{13}\)In the scale, all items were trichotomized by combining "several times" with "very often." This did not discriminate well on the more serious offenses, i.e., items 7, 9, 10. These three scale items were dichotomized by combining "once or twice," "several times," and "very often." See Note** accompanying Table VII for further explanation.

\(^{14}\)This procedure, developed by Louis Guttman to minimize "idiosyncratic" elements, is described in M. W. Riley, J. W. Riley, and J. Toby, Sociological Studies in Scale Analysis (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1954), Chapter 18.

\(^{15}\)Ibid., p. 400.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTRIBUTION OF DELINQUENCY SCALE TYPES FOR THREE RESEARCH SAMPLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Number</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Glen Oaks</th>
<th>Delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Number</td>
<td>Cumulative Number</td>
<td>Cumulative Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII cont'd

DISTRIBUTION OF DELINQUENCY SCALE TYPES FOR THREE RESEARCH SAMPLES*

Notes:

*The coefficient of reproducibility of this scale is .96.

†Offense numbers refer to the following delinquent acts: (1) Drinking. (2) Taken less than $2. (3) Driven without a license. (4) Defied parents. (5) Skipped school without excuse. (6) Damaged property. (7) Run away. (8) Taken things of medium value (between $2 and $50). (9) Taken things of large value (worth more than $50). (10) Narcotics.

**In all cases "0" indicates that the offense has not been committed by boys in this scale type. In the case of trichotomized items the score "1" indicates commission of the offense once or twice and a score of "2" indicates commission of the offense more than once or twice. In the case of dichotomized items a score of "1" indicates commission of the offense one or more times. (Dichotomous variables: 7, 9, 10; Trichotomous variables: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8)
In order to provide cutting points for determining high, medium, and low delinquency and also to maximize the differences between the adjudicated delinquents and the two school samples, the cutting points between scale types 4 and 5 and between 9 and 10 in Table VII were selected. On the original tally sheet the clustering of scores seemed to indicate these as the most natural cutting points between categories. Also, by examining the table it can be seen that these cutting points maximize the differences between the adjudicated delinquents and each of the two school samples in involvement in self-reported delinquent behavior. The difference at the first cut off point between Glasgow and the delinquents is 45.0 per cent (the difference between 68.5 per cent of the Glasgow boys at scale type 4 and 23.5 of the delinquent boys); the difference between Glen Oaks and the delinquents is 63.7 per cent (the difference between 87.2 per cent of the Glen Oak boys at scale type 4 and 23.5 per cent of the delinquent boys at this point on the scale).

The difference at scale type 9 for Glasgow and the adjudicated delinquents is 36.5 and for Glen Oaks and the delinquents is 55.0. Thus, for this research project, low delinquency includes scale types 1-4, medium delinquency includes scale types 5-9, high delinquency includes scale types 10-15. On some occasions, for purposes of clarification and where small numbers prevent testing significance, two classifications will be utilized: "Most Delinquent" (scale types 5-15) and "Least Delinquent" (scale types 1-4). In this case, the medium and high categories are combined. However, this cut-off point represents the maximum in differences in the entire series of scale types between the school groups and the adjudicated delinquents.
When the respondents' delinquency scores are combined in this manner, a clearer picture of the distribution of self-reported delinquency for each group is available. (See Table VIII). There is a significant difference in the distribution of the three groups in the three delinquency categories.\(^{16}\)

In the first place, Table VIII indicates that self-reported delinquency ranging from low to high involvement is reported for each of the three groups. It was expected that both of the school groups would have a large per cent with low delinquency involvement. However, 23.6 per cent of the adjudicated delinquents are less delinquent than are 31.5 per cent (Mediums and Highs combined) of the Glasgow respondents and 13.4 per cent of the Glen Oaks respondents. In the second place, an interesting difference between the two schools is evident; the high status school (Glasgow) also has the higher percentage of boys falling in the high delinquency group (25.3\%), while the lower status school (Glen Oaks) has only 6.7 per cent falling in the high delinquency group. Both of the schools have small percentages of medium delinquency respondents. If the three groups are ranked according to degree of high delinquency involvement, the adjudicated delinquents are first, Glasgow second, and Glen Oaks, third.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{16}\)Using Chi-Square, differences among the three groups taken as a whole are found to be significant (Chi-Square is 53.74; \(P<.001\)). When differences between pairs, i.e., Glasgow-Glen Oaks; Glasgow-Delinquents, Glen Oaks-Delinquents, are examined, all are found to be significant (\(P<.001\)). The following Chi-Squares were obtained: Glasgow-Glen Oaks, \(X^2=17.73\); Glasgow-Delinquents, \(X^2=15.11\); Glen Oaks-Delinquents, \(X^2=62.29\).

\(^{17}\)The same ranking is obtained when the mean Guttman scale score for each group is computed. Noting that there is a possible range of scores from 1 to 15, we find that the Delinquents have a mean score of 9.05, Glasgow has a mean score of 5.26, and Glen Oaks a mean score of 3.39. This places both Glasgow and the Delinquents in the medium delinquency range, although at extreme positions in the interval.
### TABLE VIII

**DELINQUENCY BY SCHOOLS AND ADJUDICATED DELINQUENTS**  
**SELF-REPORTED BEHAVIOR AS THE CRITERION FOR DELINQUENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF REPORTED DELINQUENCY</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Glen Oaks</th>
<th>Delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (Scale types 1-4)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (Scale types 5-9)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (Scale types 10-15)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This raises the question of differences in delinquency involvement if the social status structure is viewed across both schools rather than taking one school as representative of a status level. For this purpose, a frequency distribution was obtained showing the ascribed status distribution in each school and the distribution of self-reported delinquency in these three status groupings. (See Table IX.) When the significance of this distribution was tested, Chi Square was 2.79 with a probability of less than .70. This suggests an insignificant relationship between self-reported delinquent behavior and socio-economic level. There is little if any difference in delinquent behavior by socio-economic level.
TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4 (66.7)</td>
<td>No. 20 (83.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 (16.6)</td>
<td>No. 1 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 (16.6)</td>
<td>No. 3 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6 (100.0)</td>
<td>No. 24 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IX continued next page
TABLE IX, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Oak Delinquents</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>Total No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>68 (69.4)</td>
<td>20 (87.0)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>89 (69.0)</td>
<td>100 (68.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7 (7.1)</td>
<td>2 (8.7)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>10 (7.8)</td>
<td>9 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23 (23.4)</td>
<td>1 (4.3)</td>
<td>6 (75.0)</td>
<td>30 (23.2)</td>
<td>37 (25.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98 (100.0)</td>
<td>23 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>129 (100.0)</td>
<td>146 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to examine this relationship further, Kendall's Tau was employed as a measure of the degree of association between status and delinquency. For the two school samples combined, a Tau of .06 was obtained. This proved to be insignificant. When Tau was computed for the three samples combined, it was .04, and was considered insignificant. The small degree of relationship between socio-economic level and delinquency probably occurred by chance. This gives further weight to the argument that delinquency is spread across all socio-economic levels, particularly in a city of the size investigated.

The data yield two basic conclusions. In the first place, self-reported delinquency involvement in the two status areas, represented by the two schools, differs significantly. "Social status area" is used here as Reiss and Rhodes define the concept, i.e., although the school is somewhat heterogeneous, one social class is dominant enough to treat it as representative of a rather homogeneous social status area. Second, when social class differences (what Reiss and Rhodes call "ascribed social status") are examined across the social status areas, there is no significant difference in degree of self-reported delinquency in the various social classes. This finding corresponds to the general

Kendall's Tau is a nonparametric measure of the correlation or degree of association between two ranked sets of attributes or objects, particularly useful when the measurement requirement and normality assumption of parametric statistics are not met. One advantage of this measure is that it can be generalized to a partial correlation coefficient. For a discussion of this measure, see Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956), pp. 195-229.

Reiss and Rhodes, op. cit., p. 722.
conclusions of Nye-Short, Dintel-Monroe, and others, and seems to confirm one hypothesis drawn from Matza and Sykes. The implications of these results are discussed in the final chapter of this paper.

---

Nye and Short, Dintel and Monroe, like Clark and Wenninger, were considering illegal behavior rates among the social classes of rural and small urban areas.
CHAPTER IV

OCCUPATIONAL VALUES AND DELINQUENCY

I. OCCUPATIONAL VALUES

Matza has suggested that delinquents, and indeed the adolescent leisure class, are characterized by a particular cluster of values centering around work. In order to explore this hypothesis, the occupational values of the three research groups were examined and then related to self-reported delinquency.

The range of occupational values which boys in the eighth grade hold is quite wide. For example, each of the boys in this study was presented with a list of occupational values and was told to "consider how important each of these requirements is for you in deciding which job you want." The requirements were introduced by the statement: "When I go into an occupation I will do so because it will ..." They were instructed to rank these values as high, medium, or low in importance, and then to indicate the relative importance of those values marked high. As Table X shows, the total group placed greatest emphasis upon security and material rewards, self-fulfillment, and interpersonal relations.

Considering those who selected various values as their "first choices," we find that 33 per cent of the respondents considered "Allow me to look forward to a secure future" most important and 18.5 per cent chose "Provide me with a chance to earn a good deal of money." Thus, over one-half placed the strongest stress upon what might be called
TABLE X
PERCENTAGE OF ALL RESPONDENTS RANKING "REQUIREMENTS FOR CHOICE OF OCCUPATION" ACCORDING TO IMPORTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Most Important (H1)</th>
<th>*Highly Important (H)</th>
<th>Medium Important (M)</th>
<th>Little or No Importance (L)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Consider how important each of these requirements is for you in deciding which job you want.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Provide a chance to use my special abilities.&quot;</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Provide me with a chance to earn a good deal of money.&quot;</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Permits me to be creative and original.&quot;</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Be Easy.&quot;</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Give me a chance to work with people rather than things.&quot;</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Have short hours.&quot;</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cause people to look up to me as someone important.&quot;</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Allow me to look forward to a secure future.&quot;</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Leave me free of supervision by others.&quot;</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Give me a chance to be helpful to others.&quot;</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Give me a chance to be a leader.&quot;</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Provide me with adventure and excitement.&quot;</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (H1) 100.0%

*Students first ranked the values as highly important (H) and then ranked one of the values as most important (H1). Thus, all H1's are also counted as H's. All students checked each value as (H), medium (M), or low (L) in importance. Thus, H, M, and L for each value equals the total sample, or 100 per cent. In addition, H1 for all values equals 100 per cent.
extrinsic rewards. In addition, 16.9 per cent of the boys gave the
greatest emphasis to "provide a chance to use my special abilities,"
indicating that the use of their innate or acquired potentialities in
work is important to some of these students. Interpersonal relations
is also considered of importance to them, for 10 per cent placed the
strongest stress upon "permit me to work with people rather than things," and 5.2 per cent upon "give me a chance to be helpful to others." A
relatively small proportion gave top priority to prestige, excitement
and adventure, leadership, lack of supervision, creativity, short hours,
and easy work. However, since several of them are of particular interest,
and since they each were ranked "high" (though not High-1) by a substan-
tial number of respondents, they were retained in the list for further
consideration.

The picture presented above is for all respondents regardless of
school or delinquency involvement. Our primary interest, however, was in
the comparison of the three groups, and then in determining the correlation
between these values and delinquency. After obtaining a weighted average
for each "occupational value," the "values" were ranked from most impor-
tant to least important as seen by each group. Agreement in the ranking
among the groups of respondents was relatively high. Kendall's coeffi-
cient of concordance shows a $W$ of .96. This may be interpreted as

---

1 The weighted average was arrived at in the following way: A
weight of 4 was assigned to people selecting a particular value alter-
native as first choice, 3 for second choice, 2 for all other high choices,
1 for medium choice, and 0 for low choice. The weights for each person
in the sample were totaled and then the average score for each require-
ment was obtained.

2 Using Chi-square, it was found that the coefficient of concord-
ance (.96) is significant. ($P < .001$)
meaning that these groups saw, to a large extent, the same values as being important in choosing an occupation.

Since persons tend to consider more than one value as important to them in making an occupational choice, the question arose whether the values were entirely separate and distinct, or whether they might be related to one another in a fairly orderly chain of values. One way to examine this problem was to determine whether people who considered one value highly important to them also tended to consider another specific value important. In order to examine this question, a coefficient of association, Q, was computed between every pair of values. From these results, it became possible to order these values along a sort of value spectrum.

Similar methods have been successfully developed and used in communications research. This same approach has been applied here to

---

3 See Appendix, Table XXVII for matrix of coefficients of association.

4 By way of example, Paul Lazarsfeld and Helen Schneider found that radio daytime programs could be classified into the following five groups: serial dramas, music, audience participation programs, women commentators and news broadcasts. An effort was made to find out to what extent women who like one type of program would show preferences for certain other types. For instance: Do women who listen to serial dramas show a greater preference for music than for news? Or do they prefer other programs? These authors found that there was a very strong affinity between certain types of programs. Listeners to serial dramas were most likely to listen to women commentators and less likely to listen, in this order, to audience participation programs, news broadcasts, and music. No matter the point of departure, the analysis of the data showed that the order "serial dramas -- woman commentators -- audience participation -- news broadcasts -- music" remained. 

the affinity and distance among values. On the basis of the values matrix shown in the Appendix, Table XXVII, the values are ordered so that each occupational value will be most likely to be related to the values adjacent to it and decreasingly likely to be related to values increasing in distance from it. Upon examination of Table XI it seems possible to establish the following value sequence:

1. Permit me to be helpful to others.
2. Permit me to work with people rather than things.
3. Use my special abilities.
4. Permit me to be creative and original.
5. Secure future.
6. Status and prestige (Be looked up to).
7. Chance to earn a good deal of money.
8. Short hours.

This indicates that "helpful" is positively related to "people," "people" is positively related to "abilities," "abilities" is positively related to "creative" and so on down the list. It will be observed, however, that "helpful" is very negatively related to "easy," which is most distant from it. The larger the gap between any two numbers, the less is an individual likely to want to satisfy both values.

---

5 At this point, we do not deal with the value alternatives of "freedom," "leadership," and "excitement." This is due to the fact that they are not included in the four major value-orientations as developed in the next section. Since "prestige" logically falls into the "extrinsic-reward-orientation," it is included here. Rosenberg had used "prestige" as one part of the "extrinsic-reward-orientation" rather than "security." However, since the measure of association between money and security was much higher than that between money and prestige, the combination of money-security was made. Note that security is highly associated with several other "requirements."

6 It is pointed out that the measure of the adequacy of the matrix in Table XI is the degree to which the figures in any line or column grow progressively less positive (or more negative) as they proceed away from the diagonal dashes. (Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), p. 150) Theoretically, "the values on the base
### TABLE XI

**DISTANCE BETWEEN VALUES COMPUTED BY COEFFICIENT OF ASSOCIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Abilities</th>
<th>Creative</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Money</th>
<th>Short Hours</th>
<th>Easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.613</td>
<td>+.134</td>
<td>+.124</td>
<td>+.325</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>-.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>+.613</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.086</td>
<td>+.173</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>+.088</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>+.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities</td>
<td>+.134</td>
<td>+.086</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.183</td>
<td>+.329</td>
<td>+.148</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>+.106</td>
<td>-.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>+.124</td>
<td>+.173</td>
<td>+.183</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.443</td>
<td>+.136</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>+.011</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>+.325</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>+.329</td>
<td>+.443</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.238</td>
<td>+.325</td>
<td>-.521</td>
<td>-.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>+.008</td>
<td>+.148</td>
<td>+.136</td>
<td>+.238</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.135</td>
<td>+.365</td>
<td>+.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>+.325</td>
<td>+.135</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.576</td>
<td>+.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Hours</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>+.106</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.365</td>
<td>-.521</td>
<td>+.576</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>+.199</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.669</td>
<td>+.362</td>
<td>+.266</td>
<td>+.798</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sequence enables us to see the degree of probable mutual exclusion and inclusion of various occupational value alternatives. The more distant people are on the scale, the more radically opposed are their occupational values likely to be. The strongest value difference, as indicated by these boys, is between those who emphasize the satisfactions they will get from interpersonal relations and those who center upon the easiest way out of work. Eighth grade boys, then, who would accept "permit me to be helpful to others" as a value would tend to reject strongly "be easy" or "short hours" as a value requirement for entrance into an occupation.

line (the diagonal adjacent to the dashes) would be high, and these values would progressively decrease, proceeding toward the point of the pyramid (extreme upper right- and lower left-hand corner)," at which point the most negative relationship would appear. (Bebette Kass, "Overlapping Magazine Reading," in Communications Research, 1948-1949, P. F. Lazarsfeld and F. Stanton, editors (New York: Harper, 1949), pp. 130-51.

When the matrix in Table XI is examined, it is seen to be an approximation of this model, although it is not perfect. If we assume that a failure to decrease positively, or increase negatively, as one move away from the diagonal dashes, represents an error, then we find that there are 23 errors out of a possible 72, an error of 32 per cent. Kass (Ibid., pp. 140,142) has noted that the pattern can be highlighted "by taking the averages of the diagonals parallel to the dashes. Were the correlation perfect, the diagonal immediately adjacent to the dashes would yield the highest average, the next diagonal the next highest, and so on to the most distant diagonal whose average would be the lowest." Going from the innermost to the outermost diagonals, we obtain the following averages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagonal adjacent to the dashes</th>
<th>+.384</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Diagonal farthest from dashes  | -.235 |

As one proceeds away from the diagonal adjacent to the dashes, the degree of positive relationship decreases (or negative relationship
If only the first seven values are considered (omitting "easy" and "short hours"), the strongest value difference is between those who emphasize the satisfactions they will get from interpersonal relations and those who center upon the rewards they will receive for the work they do. This can be contrasted with Rosenberg's findings which indicated that his college respondents tended to show the greatest difference between self-fulfillment values and the values dealing with rewards received for work, with interpersonal values coming between these.7

Value Orientations

Because persons who considered one value highly important to them also tended to consider other values important, the question arose whether certain major "value-orientations" or "value-foci" could be distinguished from the results, Rosenberg and his associates, noting the coefficient of association (Q) computed between every pair of values, found that the three highest positive relationships were the following:8

1. "Opportunity to work with people rather than things" and "opportunity to be helpful to others" (Q = +.580). This was called the

---

increases) with the exception of the sixth diagonal from the dashes (average = -.326). The reason for this extreme negative average is that it includes the very strong negative relationship existing between a desire to "work with people" and "short hours." The great number of negative relationships seems to be a function of the extreme negative relationships between "easy" and "short hours" and the other values.

8Ibid., pp. 11-13.
"people-oriented" value complex and was described as the values chosen by those who tend to view work largely as an opportunity for obtaining the gratifications to be derived from interpersonal relations.

2. "Chance to earn a good deal of money" and "give me social status and prestige" (Q = +.594). This is referred to as the "extrinsic reward-oriented" value complex. Those selecting these values tend to view work in instrumental terms; they tend to emphasize the rewards to be obtained for work, rather than the gratifications to be derived from work.

3. "Permit me to be creative and original" and "opportunity to use my special abilities or aptitudes," (Q = +.470). This is called the "self-expression-oriented" value complex. Respondents selecting these values are described as persons who tend to view work chiefly as an end in itself, as an opportunity for expressing their talents and creative potentialities.

By utilizing this suggestion by Rosenberg and his associates in the present investigation, there was found a strong tendency for persons who considered one value highly important to them also to consider another specific value important. In two cases, however, Q was lower than in the Rosenberg study. The coefficient of association between the two requirements "opportunity to work with people rather than things" and "chance to be helpful to others" was +.613. The coefficient of association between "permit me to be creative and original" and "chance to use my special abilities or aptitudes" was +.183. Since the coefficient of association between "chance to earn a good deal of money" and "secure future" (Q = +.325) was higher than that between "money" and "prestige", (Q = +.135),
those two values with the greater amount of association were combined. Since there was this tendency to accept or reject these pairs of requirements together, the value-orientations or foci, "extrinsic-reward-oriented," "people-oriented," and "self-expression-oriented," plus one other value foci described below, were used throughout this study.

Facing the problem of making an occupational choice, one person will tend to ask: What rewards will I get for my work? Another person poses the question: Will it be a challenge, creative experience? And a third person will inquire: Will I enjoy working with the people? On the other hand, there are some who ask: What is the easiest way out? or, How is it possible to get the most for the least effort? Recognizing this, and in order to better relate the Rosenberg approach to the study of delinquency, a fourth value orientation was identified. The coefficient of association between "easy" and "short hours" was + .798. This value orientation or foci is called "easy-way-out-orientation."

From the viewpoint of the occupational value orientations developed in the preceding paragraphs, Table XII summarizes the data concerning the three groups by giving the weighted median score for each group. Each of the three groups ranks highest in the "extrinsic-reward" scores. Glen Oaks places second in "people oriented values," while Glasgow and the adjudicated delinquents rank second in "self-expression values." The three groups are in agreement in placing least emphasis upon "easy-way-out" values in occupational choice.

---

9The weighted median was arrived at in the following way: A weight of 4 was assigned to people selecting a particular value alternative as first choice, 3 for second choice, 2 for all other high


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>People Oriented</th>
<th>Extrinsic Reward</th>
<th>Self Expression</th>
<th>Easy-way Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquents</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Possible range of scores: 0-7

Whenever differences within value orientations are noted, we find that Glen Oaks has the highest median score for the "people-oriented" values (3.66), followed by the adjudicated delinquents (3.24), and finally by Glasgow (2.91). The Median Test indicates that the differences among the three samples' scores in this orientation are significant.10

Another statistically significant difference was noted among the choices, 1 for medium choice, and 0 for low choice. Since each value complex consisted of two value alternatives, it was possible for each individual to choose one value alternative as first choice and another as second choice; this produced a weighted median for each value complex ranging from 0 to 7.

10Chi-square was 8.61 (P<.02). Whenever the two schools were considered separately from the adjudicated delinquents, it was found that they differed from each other only in the "people-oriented-value" scores (Chi-square was 7.67; P<.01). They did not differ significantly in "extrinsic-reward," "self-expression," and "easy-way-out" value scores.
three groups in the "extrinsic-reward" scores.\textsuperscript{11} Glasgow has the highest median score (4.40), with the Delinquents (4.38) and Glen Oaks (4.17) ranking second and third respectively.

Differences among the three samples for the "self-expression" and the "easy-way-out" value orientations are not statistically significant.

II. OCCUPATIONAL VALUES AND SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

In the process of examining the occupational values of the three samples, some attention has been given to the relationship of those values to delinquency. Since the adjudicated delinquent sample is small, however, and intended principally as a comparative group to check the findings based upon self-reported delinquency, this section of the paper will be concerned primarily with an analysis of the occupational values of self-reported high delinquency, moderate delinquency and low delinquency in the two schools.

"People Oriented" Values and Self-Reported Delinquency.

On the basis of sub-hypothesis two, it was expected that there would be very little difference in "people-oriented" median scores between those who rank high and those who rank low in self-reported delinquency. By applying the Median Test to the distribution of median scores as found in Table XIII, a significant difference was found to exist. For the two schools combined, a Chi-square of 6.94 resulted

\textsuperscript{11}When the Median Test is employed, a Chi-square of 7.55 is obtained ($P = .05$).
TABLE XIII
DISTRIBUTION OF "PEOPLE-ORIENTED MEDIAN SCORES
BY AMOUNT OF SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Delinquency</th>
<th>People Oriented Median Scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of scores: 0-7

(P<.05). Since a relation was indicated by this test, a measure was taken to determine the intensity and direction of the relationship. Kendall's \( \tau \), computed for the two schools, was found to be -0.10, which was significant at the .008 level. This can be interpreted to mean that there was a definite tendency for those respondents who were high in self-reported delinquency to be low in "people-oriented" values.

"Extrinsic-Reward" Values and Self-Reported Delinquency.

Table XIV indicates that those respondents who rank high in self-reported delinquency have lower "extrinsic-reward" value scores than do those who rank low in delinquency. The Median Test shows significant differences, both for the two schools combined (Chi-Square is

---

\(^{12}\) When the adjudicated delinquent scores were added, Chi-square became 8.61, (P<.02).
TABLE XIV

DISTRIBUTION OF "EXTRINSIC-REWARD" MEDIAN SCORES
BY AMOUNT OF SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Delinquency</th>
<th>Extrinsic Reward Median Scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of scores: 0-7

6.27; P<.05) and for the three samples combined (Chi-Square is 7.55; P<.05). Thus, there is the indication that the "extrinsic-reward" values scores are not independent of the amount of self-reported delinquency. However, Kendall's Tau of -.01 has a probability of less than .41, indicating that this slight negative relationship is not significant, and therefore is not intense in terms of degree. The high median scores for all categories further suggest that high self-reported delinquents as well as low self-reported delinquents value extrinsic reward.

"Self-Expression" Values and Self-Reported Delinquency.

Table XV indicates that for the two schools there is an inverse relationship between degree of self-reported delinquency and "self-expression" value orientation. However, whenever the Median Test is applied to these scores the relationship is found to be non-significant. Computation of Kendall's Tau indicates that there is a negative relationship of -.10 for the two schools which is significant at the .006 level.
TABLE XV

DISTRIBUTION OF "SELF-EXPRESSION" MEDIAN
BY SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Delinquency</th>
<th>Self-Expression Median Scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of scores: 0-7

Here again, however, this low correlation coefficient plus the lack of differences found among the medians along the self-reported delinquency dimension raises serious question about the meaning or importance of the differing emphasis placed upon "self-expression" as an occupation value. When the very high "self-expression" scores of the adjudicated delinquents are examined, there is further reason to believe that there is little significant difference between delinquent and nondelinquent (self-reported) in emphasis given to this value. For example, the "self-expression" score for the highest delinquency rank among the adjudicated delinquents (3.25) is approximately the same as that of the highest "self-expression" score for Glen Oaks (3.26).
TABLE XVI

DISTRIBUTION OF "EASY-WAY-OUT" MEDIAN SCORES
BY SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Delinquency</th>
<th>Easy-Way-Out Median Scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of scores: 0-7

"Easy-Way-Out" Values and Self-Reported Delinquency.

All three groups show low median scores in the "easy-way-out" value orientation. As might be predicted from the Matza theoretical framework and as seen in Table XVI, higher median scores are found with the highest rather than with the lowest self-reported delinquency rank. However, the Median Test applied to each sample, the two schools combined, and to the three groups combined, indicates that the differences around the median are not significant. Therefore, from a statistical viewpoint, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that the "easy-way-out" oriented value scores are independent of the amount of self-reported delinquency. This is further borne out by the computation of Kendall's $\tau$. There is a small amount of correlation between high self-reported delinquency and high evaluation of an "easy-way-out," ($\tau$ is .06), but the probability of even this small amount of correlation is not significant.
As the data of this chapter are reviewed, one major point stands out: There is clear indication that the person ranking high in self-reported delinquency is less interested than the person ranking low in self-reported delinquency in only one of the value orientations which normally motivate persons in the desire to work and in the choice of an occupation; that is, in his orientation to people. The high self-reported delinquent is less likely to want to work with people or to be helpful. This raises a question concerning his "faith in people," a problem considered in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V

VALUES AND ATTITUDES

Two sets of attitudes, both related to the general topic of occupational values and delinquency, are examined in this chapter. The first group of attitudes concern interpersonal relations, the second group center around "success" and "the future."

I. ATTITUDES TOWARD INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

In the preceding chapter it was discovered that the respondent ranking high in self-reported delinquency differs from the respondent ranking low in self-reported delinquency in an essential manner; he places less value upon "working with people" and "being helpful to others" in the choice of an occupation than does the non-delinquent or less-delinquent. As it was stated there, he is less "people-oriented." This finding raises several questions, which are examined in Part I of this chapter: (1) Is this lack of orientation toward people in the case of the delinquent a general attitude, or is it related only to occupational choice? (2) Is there variation between high self-reported delinquents and low self-reported delinquents in the acceptance of those who engage in delinquent behavior? (3) In what ways are inter-personal attitudes associated with occupational values? The last question is considered first.
Faith in People and Occupational Values

Rosenberg, in his study of *Occupations and Values*, points out that occupational activity is more than just a matter of doing one's job; it is a social system as well. Interpersonal relations are tightly woven into the fabric of occupational activity. Relationships of employer and employee, professional and client, teacher and student, manager and technician, all involve interpersonal relationships and skills of various sorts.\(^1\) Assuming that interpersonal relations are an important aspect of one's occupation it seems relevant to consider how interpersonal attitudes may influence the individual's perception of work.

Perhaps the broadest and most basic interpersonal attitude might be one's view of human nature, or "faith in people." This concept is defined as the individual's degree of confidence in the trustworthiness, honesty, goodness, generosity, and brotherliness of the mass of men.\(^2\) The suggestion that "faith in people" be used as an indication of interpersonal attitudes, is incorporated into this study.

In an earlier chapter, it was stated that an attitude implies a tendency to act in a certain way in a particular situation, whereas values imply the deeper, closer-to-the-core type of sentiments — they are the more stable and more permanent aspects of personality. It was suggested, further, that attitudes are inferred from or best known to

---


\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 26.
us through the expressions of opinions by informants. In an attempt to determine the respondents' attitudes, labeled "faith in people," a scale, consisting of five items reflecting the manifest content of the concept, was constructed by Rosenberg, using the Guttman method. The reproducibility was found to be a high .92; in the present investigation the reproducibility was .91. The items used were the following:

(1) Some people say that most people can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful in your dealing with people. How do you feel about it?

___ Most people can be trusted.

___ You can't be too careful.

(2) Would you say that most people are more inclined to help others, or more inclined to look out for themselves?

___ To help others.

___ To look out for themselves.

(3) If you don't watch yourself, people will take advantage of you.

A ? D

(4) No one is going to care much what happens to you, when you get right down to it.

A ? D

(5) Human nature is fundamentally cooperative.

A ? D

---

For the description of the method used by Rosenberg to develop this scale, see Ibid., pp. 151-53.

"A" stands for "agree," "?" for "undecided," and "D" for "disagree."
The five items yielded six groups, making it possible to combine these into three categories of two groups each: low, medium, and high "faith in people." The number and percentage in the three categories are given in Table XVII. By far the largest percentage for the two schools and the adjudicated delinquents are found in the moderate "faith in people" category.

By utilizing this scale, Rosenberg found that there is a correlation between "faith in people" and occupational choice. Obviously there are some occupations in which attitudes toward other human beings would not appear to be a relevant factor in choice. There are specific cases, however, where one's feelings about interpersonal relations are clearly of importance, e.g., social work. Therefore, it would appear that "there is a tendency for those with different degrees of faith in human nature to select occupational areas involving a 'quality' of interpersonal reactions consistent with this attitude." This relationship was also found to exist in a study of four professions conducted earlier by the

---

5. In order to obtain the six groups, the relatively few "undecided" answers were considered agreements. This gave the six groups, as follows:

1. AAAAA
2. AAAAD
3. AAADD
4. ADDDD
5. ADADD
6. DDDDD

Individual scores were obtained by giving two points to those "agreements" which indicated "positive" faith, one point to each "undecided," and zero to each "disagreement."

6. Rosenberg, p. 27.
TABLE XVII
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY "FAITH IN PEOPLE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith in People</th>
<th>Three Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>Delinquents</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No. (26.0)</td>
<td>% (17.3)</td>
<td>No. (17.6)</td>
<td>67 (21.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>83 (56.8)</td>
<td>80 (60.2)</td>
<td>21 (61.8)</td>
<td>184 (58.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25 (17.1)</td>
<td>30 (22.5)</td>
<td>7 (20.6)</td>
<td>62 (19.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146 (100.0)</td>
<td>133 (100.0)</td>
<td>34 (100.0)</td>
<td>313 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

present investigator. In the present investigation, the matter of specific occupational choice or career choice was not explored due to the youth of the respondents. It was felt that while values underlying a final choice might be examined, the actual choice of an occupation would not have been made at this point.

Rosenberg also observed that it is possible to study the relationship between faith in people and the interpersonal factors in work more directly through the study of occupational values. He had suggested that those with high faith in people were most likely to want to satisfy "people-oriented" occupational values; i.e., they want to work

with people rather than things and they want the chance to be helpful to others. Further, he showed that those with low faith tend, relatively, to choose an impersonal value, namely, "the chance to earn a good deal of money." This tendency was clearly seen in the large college sample used by Rosenberg; it was suggested also by the data from the junior high school respondents employed in this investigation.  

It is important to note, in this context, that a statistically significant correlation is found between "faith in people" and the two occupational value orientations, "people-oriented" and "extrinsic-reward." The size of the interpersonal occupational value score increases as one moves from low to high faith in people. The size of the "extrinsic-reward" value score decreases as one moves from low to high faith in people. (See Tables XVIII and XIX.)

---

8 See Tables XXVIII and XXIX in the Appendix. The data there are presented in the form utilized by Rosenberg.

9 The "people-oriented" scores along the "faith in people" dimension are significantly different. The Median Test indicates a Chi-square of 21.19 (P < .001). Kendall's Tau of .50 indicates a high degree of correlation in a positive direction (P < .001).

The "extrinsic-reward" scores along the "faith in people" dimension are not found to be significantly different when the Median Test is employed (Chi-square is 1.54; P < .50). However, Kendall's Tau indicates that there is a negative correlation of -.26, which is significant at the .001 level.
TABLE XVIII
DISTRIBUTION OF "PEOPLE-ORIENTED" MEDIAN SCORES BY "FAITH IN PEOPLE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith in People</th>
<th>People-Oriented Median Scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of scores: 0-7

TABLE XIX
DISTRIBUTION OF "EXTRINSIC-REWARD" MEDIAN SCORES BY "FAITH IN PEOPLE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith in People</th>
<th>Extrinsic-Reward Median Scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of scores: 0-7
Rosenberg had concluded that "the satisfaction of an occupational value appears to be a specific expression of a more general value complex revolving about one's view of humanity." The data of this investigation seem to confirm this, at least with regard to "people-oriented" and "extrinsic-reward" values.

**Faith in People and Self-Reported Delinquency**

By utilizing the "faith in people" scale scores,\(^{10}\) the median scale score for each group was computed to be, as follows:

- **Glasgow** 3.36
- **Glen Oaks** 3.62
- **Delinquents** 3.54

There are slight differences in these median scores, but the general similarity is striking.\(^{11}\)

When, however, "faith in people" is examined in terms of self-reported delinquency, decided differences are noted. Table XX indicates that in the case of Glasgow and the adjudicated delinquents there

---

\(^{10}\)Scores ranged from 1 - 6.

\(^{11}\)The Median Test indicates that there is no significant difference in the three median scores.
### TABLE XX

"FAITH IN PEOPLE" MEDIAN SCORES BY DEGREE OF SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Delinquency</th>
<th>Faith in People Median Scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of scores: 1-6

is an inverse relationship between "faith in people" scores and degree of delinquency; i.e., low faith in people is associated with high delinquency, and high faith is associated with low delinquency. For Glen Oaks the relationship is curvilinear if the "faith" score for medium delinquency rank is retained, inverse if it is deleted.  

To measure the degree of relationship between faith in people and self-reported delinquency, Kendall's $\tau_u$ was computed for each sample separately and then for the two schools combined. All three samples showed a negative association between high faith in people and high delinquency.  

---

12 Using the Median Test, differences in "faith in people" median scores along the degree of delinquency dimension were determined to be significant for both schools combined (Chi-square is 5.99; probability is .05). Differences in median scores for the Delinquents were not significant (Chi-square is .90; probability is less than .40).

13 $\tau_u$ for the two schools combined as -.14 ($P<.001$). For the Delinquent group $\tau_u$ was -.10 but this correlation was not significant ($P=.20$).
On the basis of this data we may conclude that the value complex revolving around one's view of humanity or one's faith in people is associated also with his delinquency potential. To conclude that a lack of faith in people leads to delinquency or that high faith in people serves as an insulator against delinquency certainly goes beyond the evidence; nevertheless, these possibilities are certainly suggested by the evidence and await further study.

**Attitudes Toward Delinquency**

The examination of interpersonal attitudes was extended further to include attitudes toward those who engage in delinquent behavior. In order to measure this variable, which here is called "attitude toward delinquency," the ten items comprising the delinquency scale were presented to each respondent with the instruction that he should indicate his feeling about someone who took part in each of those offenses. On the basis of these responses toward persons committing offenses, the items were scaled, utilizing the Guttman technique. The reproducibility was found to be .81. It was possible to obtain a higher reproducibility coefficient by employing the Image Analysis process and also by dichotomizing the possible responses. Response statements one and two and statements three and four were combined to

---

14 The ten offenses were: (1) Ran away from home. (2) Purposely destroyed property. (3) Defied their parents' authority. (4) Took little things. (5) Skipped school. (6) Bought and drank liquor. (7) Took things worth more than $2. (8) Drove without a license. (9) Used narcotics. (10) Took an automobile.
become simply "favorable" and "unfavorable" attitudes. The reproducibility then was found to be an extremely high .99. This forced combination of responses, plus a seemingly illogical arrangement of offenses (see footnote 16), necessary in order to achieve the high reproducibility coefficient, raises some question about the validity and usefulness of the "attitude toward delinquency" scale. Therefore, any conclusions reached based upon its use are regarded as only tentative.

---

15 The original response alternatives were:
1. I would want him as a close friend or buddy.
2. I would not care if he attended my school, but I would not want him for a close friend.
3. I would not want him in my school or want to be associated with him in any way.
4. I would want him placed in an institution for juvenile delinquents.

16 Scale types for "Attitude toward Delinquency" are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Offense numbers refer to the following delinquent acts: (1) Damaged property. (2) Took things of medium value. (3) Took an automobile. (4) Narcotics. (5) Drank. (6) Drove without a license. (7) Skipped school. (8) Ran away from home. (9) Took little things. (10) Defied parents.

**U** indicates an unfavorable attitude; **F** indicates a favorable attitude.
TABLE XXI

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
"ATTITUDE TOWARD DELINQUENCY"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Delinquency</th>
<th>Three Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Glen Oak</td>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>(53.7)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(83.4)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Favorable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(17.2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(11.2)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(15.1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7.2)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were a large number of respondents who did not follow directions in this section and whose responses could not be used.

Three categories were derived from the eleven scale types: "unfavorable attitudes" (scale types 1-4), "moderately favorable" (scale types 5-7), and "favorable attitudes" (scale types 8-11). The distribution of respondents in the three categories is given in Table XXI.

An attempt was made to determine the statistical relationship between "attitude toward delinquency" and each of the four occupational values, but in no case was there a significant relationship. In the same way an attempt was made to measure the relationship between "attitude toward delinquency" and "faith in people." Again there was no statistically significant result.
When this same approach was extended to degree of delinquency, however, a highly significant statistical relationship was found.\textsuperscript{17}

Again the question concerns relationships with others; for in determining the attitude toward delinquency, the respondent, in effect, is asked for information concerning the nature of the association he might be willing to have with a delinquent. In each of the three groups — Glasgow, Glen Oaks and adjudicated delinquents — the most highly delinquent respondents also have the most favorable or positive attitude toward delinquency. (See Table XXII) The respondent who ranks low in delinquency is not likely to identify with or want to associate with those who engage in delinquency.

\textbf{TABLE XXII}

"ATTITUDE TOWARD DELINQUENCY" MEDIAN SCORES
BY SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Delinquency</th>
<th>&quot;Attitude Toward Delinquency&quot; Median Scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of scores: 1 - 11

In the first portion of this chapter consideration has been given to those attitudes and values centered around interpersonal relations.

\textsuperscript{17}The Median Test for the data presented in Table XXII indicates that for the two schools combined or for the three groups combined the scores are significantly different. For the three groups combined Chi-square is 51.56 ($P<.001$). Kendall's $\tau_u$ indicates a positive relationship of .75 ($P<.001$).
It was found that the satisfaction of an occupational value appears to be specific complex revolving around one's view of humanity. Those with high faith are more likely to want to satisfy people-oriented values than those with low faith. Those with low faith are more likely to hold extrinsic-reward values than are those with high faith.

Faith in people, or one's view toward humanity is also related to his delinquency involvement. Those with low delinquency rank have more faith in people than those who rank high in delinquency.

To further examine the problem of interpersonal relations, attention was focused on "attitude toward delinquency." Those who were highly delinquent reacted favorably toward delinquents while those low in delinquency reacted unfavorably.

II. ATTITUDES TOWARD SUCCESS AND THE FUTURE

Success

A second major group of attitudes explored are those concerning success and the future. When asked questions concerning their desire to succeed, by far the largest percentage from each group indicated that this was important. For example, to the question, "How important is it for you to get ahead?" approximately 90 per cent of each group indicated that this was fairly important or very important. When asked, "What do you want most to be — Independent, Successful, or Well-liked?", the largest percentage in each group chose "Successful." (See Table XXV in the Appendix)

When the problem of self-reported delinquency and success is explored, it is found that success is most often the choice of both
TABLE XXIII
SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY BY DESIRE TO BE "SUCCESSFUL" IN TWO SCHOOL SAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Reported Delinquency</th>
<th>&quot;Which would you most like to be?&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Well-Liked</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29 (13.4)</td>
<td>111 (52.4)</td>
<td>76 (35.2)</td>
<td>216 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
<td>6 (35.3)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8 (17.8)</td>
<td>22 (48.9)</td>
<td>15 (33.3)</td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41 (14.8)</td>
<td>139 (50.0)</td>
<td>98 (35.2)</td>
<td>278 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

delinquent and nondelinquent alike. Table XXIII indicates that 52.4 percent of those rated low in self-reported delinquency chose "success while 48.9 percent of those rated high in self-reported delinquency also chose "success." This interest in "getting ahead" or "success" found in both the highly delinquent and the less delinquent individual leads to the question of what is meant by success. Most analysts of American values tend to assume that the desire for success is chiefly expressed in the desire to acquire a great deal of money. It is clear, however, that the desire to get ahead and the desire to earn a large amount of money are not necessarily identical. People may wish to get ahead because of the prestige elements involved, because of the opportunities for self-

18Chi-square indicates that differences in concern for success,
fulfillment which a position offers, etc., without being motivated by the desire for wealth.

In light of these considerations, it is interesting to discover that the school respondents in this study tended to link success with money. Tables XXX and XXXI in the Appendix indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between "success" and money and "desire to get ahead" and money. Monetary success appears to be interpreted as a common and important type of success, although it is clearly not the only one.

Assuming that an individual is strongly imbued with the desire for success, a question arises concerning the means he might adapt to achieve it. The range of proper and improper ways of getting ahead is very wide. An effort was made to measure attitudes toward a few of these ways by asking the respondents to agree or disagree with the following three statements:

1. "In order to get ahead these days ... you can't afford to be particular about the means you use."

2. "In order to get ahead these days ... you have to make people do what you want."

3. "In order to get ahead these days ... you really have to love your work."

The first of these statements, "... you can't afford to be particular about the means you use," is a rather blunt statement regarding the relationship between success and the necessity for using independence, and being well liked along the self-reported delinquency dimension are not statistically significant.
institutionally dubious means to achieve the desired end. The first fact to be noted is that the largest number disagreed with the statement in high as well as low delinquency groups. (See Table XXIV) However, if the number who were doubtful about the matter are added to those agreeing with the statement, there would seem to be some real question of whether or not the idea expressed in it is socially disapproved, for then there would be approximately the same number agreeing as disagreeing. Perhaps this might be regarded as one of the "subterranean" values which Matza speaks of as lying alongside the generally recognized and accepted social values. This interpretation is further indicated by the fact that almost one-half of those ranking low in self-reported delinquency either agreed or were undecided concerning the statement, while almost one-half of those ranking high in self-reported delinquency disagreed with the statement.19

In the second statement there is a question of just what is understood by "making people do what you want." Is it an interpersonal skill which students understand to be necessary to influence others — an extremely important skill for success in certain occupations — or does it imply manipulation of persons for less socially approved reasons such as self-aggrandizement at the expense of others?

One way to approach this question is to determine whether there

19Chi-square indicates that the differences are significant at the .01 level. However, the large number of respondents who were "undecided" make this difficult to interpret. When the "undecided respondents are combined with those respondents who "agreed" with the statement, the differences are insignificant.
is a relationship between "making people do what you want" and the two interpersonal occupational values, "helpful to others" and "working with people." According to Tables XXXII and XXXIII in the Appendix, there is a striking tendency for those evaluating highly the interpersonal occupational values to disagree with the statement. This would seem to indicate that "making people do what you want" is interpreted in several ways, but primarily in ways connoting socially disapproved manipulation of persons. Assuming that this is the case, it is not surprising to find that 66.5 per cent of those ranking low in self-reported delinquency as compared to 41.9 per cent of those high in self-reported delinquency disagreed with "making people do what you want" in order to get ahead.\footnote{Chi-square indicates that this distribution of frequencies is significant at the .01 level.} It is interesting to note, however, that there are approximately the same number of high delinquents who disagree as agree with "making people do what you want." (See Table XXIV)

To the third statement, "In order to get ahead these days . . . you really have to love your work," the largest proportion agreed in every case. Nevertheless, there is clear evidence of less agreement and more disagreement of the statement among the high delinquents than among the low delinquents. Thirty-seven per cent of those high in self-reported delinquency disagreed with the statement, while only 14 per cent of those low in self-reported delinquency disagreed with it.\footnote{Chi-square indicates that the differences are significant at less than the .01 level.}
TABLE XXIV

SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD THE "MEANS"
FOR GETTING AHEAD IN TWO SCHOOL SAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY</th>
<th>&quot;In order to get ahead these days . . . You can't afford to be particular about the means you use.&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;You have to make people do what you want.&quot;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>54 (25.6)</td>
<td>47 (22.3)</td>
<td>110 (52.1)</td>
<td>211 (100.0)</td>
<td>35 (16.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>6 (35.3)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19 (42.2)</td>
<td>4 (8.9)</td>
<td>22 (48.9)</td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
<td>19 (44.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83 (30.4)</td>
<td>52 (19.0)</td>
<td>138 (50.6)</td>
<td>273 (100.0)</td>
<td>58 (21.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXIV, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY</th>
<th>&quot;In order to get ahead these days . . . You really have to love your work.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Luck or Contacts

It is sometimes alleged that Americans feel that justice in the occupational realm consists in the matching of merit and reward. The men at the top should be the one with the most intelligence or initiative or assiduity, not the one who has gotten where he is by knowing the right people or by luck. The delinquent, on the other hand, is pictured as holding the obverse view. The preceding paragraph gives some support to that idea in that the individual ranking low in delinquency to challenge the view that hard work leads to success. A question arises concerning the delinquent's belief in the use of "contacts" and inside influence on the one hand and fate or luck on the other.

Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statement: "It's also you know more than what you know that counts these days." The differences between high and low delinquency respondents were not statistically significant. In fact, it can be noted in Table XXXIV in the Appendix that approximately the same percentage in high and low delinquency groups disagreed with the statement.

To further determine the tendency for high self-reported delinquency persons to stress the importance of "contacts" or "luck" for getting ahead, respondents were presented a list and asked: "What two qualities on this list do you think really get a young person ahead fastest today? (Check two)" The alternatives were: hard work; having a pleasant personality; brains; knowing the right people; good luck; being a good politician. When the less socially applauded qualities,
emphasizing contacts, being a good politician, or good luck were considered, they were chosen more frequently by respondents ranking high in delinquency than those ranking low. However, the differences were slight and not statistically significant. (See Table XXXV in the Appendix) The most highly delinquent as well as those ranking low in self-reported delinquency seem to recognize the importance of the socially advocated qualities of hard work, intellect, pleasant personality.

The Future

Although there has been some emphasis in the literature upon the role of luck or fate in getting ahead as expressive of delinquency, this does not show up in a very vivid manner in this data. In fact, very few respondents chose it even as one of two possibilities. This might be explained by the fact that this alternative, like the alternative of "being a good politician," is phrased in a manner that is much too obvious and cynical. Wherever an association between delinquency and belief in luck or fate is found, then questions concerning the respondents' attitudes toward the future become pertinent. It would seem that a person who strongly subscribed to a belief in luck would have little concern in planning for the future.

Having noted above that very few in this study subscribed to a belief in luck for getting ahead, there arose a question as to whether there would be a corresponding concern about the future in both delinquent and nondelinquent alike. Respondents were asked: "How important is it for you to have plans for the future known?" By far the largest
proportion in each of the self-reported delinquency categories con-
sidered this important to them. (See Table XXXVI in the Appendix)
Only a small percentage in each category considered this to be unim-
portant. The high delinquency category had a significantly larger
number who were not concerned with the future (Chi-square is 9.74; P
= .05). However, the low degree of relationship between self-reported
delinquency and concern for the future (C is .17), and the very small
number who indicated that the future is important, raises some question
about the consideration to be given to this slight observed difference.

A related statement given to the respondents helps to clarify
the matter. The respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the
statement: "Nowadays a person has to live for today." In this case,
the differences observed among the delinquency categories are not sig-
nificant. (See Table XXXVII in the Appendix) Most respondents high in
delinquency as well as those low in delinquency disagreed with the
statement or were undecided about taking a "live for the day" attitude.

These statements taken as a group seem to indicate that the
highly delinquent individual, in the status groups investigated, is
concerned about the future and that he does not subscribe to a belief
in fate or luck to bring him the success that he and the less delinquent
individual desire.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of this paper were, first, to review that literature of the sociology of delinquency of the last thirty years to which the theorization of David Matza and Gresham Sykes is a response; and second, to present the findings of a socio-psychological investigation conducted by the author to test empirically some hypotheses drawn from the theory of Matza and Sykes.

I. THE PROBLEM

Juvenile delinquency and crime have long claimed both the theoretical and empirical interest of sociologists. Much of the attention in recent years has been focused upon the subcultural aspects of delinquency. In part, this subcultural interest was prompted by two empirical findings of the Chicago School of the 1930's that (1) delinquency in its extreme forms is concentrated in the male population of the lower-class sections of urban areas and (2) most of this delinquency takes a group form.

In the 1950's there was a return to cultural and subcultural analyses in both general sociological theory and criminological theory. This tended to push from the foreground preoccupation with psychiatric and psychological interpretations of personality problems leading to deviant behavior. Several writers indicated rather explicitly their return to the interpretational models of the Chicago School of the
1930's. But in the process of this revival the approach was modified. Instead of emphasizing the processes by which new converts are recruited into the criminalistic subculture, the main interest was in explaining the origin and content of the subculture.

At this point, criminological theory received a new impetus from general sociological theory. Modified by Robert Merton, the Durkheimian concept of "anomie" was retransplanted into American sociology and influenced the thinking of recent delinquency "subcultural" theorists. Merton revised the Durkheimian formulation by asserting that anomie develops not because of a breakdown in the regulation of goals alone, but rather, because of a breakdown in the regulation between goals and legitimate avenues of access to them. His aim was to examine the manner in which social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in society to engage in nonconformist rather than conformist conduct.

In 1955 Albert Cohen first employed the concept of subculture in relation to certain forms of juvenile delinquency. Since that time "delinquent subculture" has become common in criminological vocabulary, utilized by such theorists as Cloward and Ohlin, James Short, Walter Miller, and others. The views of these theorists can be summarized in terms of absolute and relative position in the social order. Merton, Cohen, and Cloward and Ohlin theorize that universal goals of American society are responsible for problems of adjustment of lower class, and thereby disadvantaged youths. Relative position in the social order is a major contributing factor to the delinquent solutions chosen. Walter Miller takes strong issue with this point when he argues that lower class culture exerts the most direct influence on delinquency — that.
is, absolute position in the social order rather than position relative to others in a universal and competitive system of goals and means to their achievement.

Nevertheless, as David Matza points out, whatever the underlying reason, reaction formation, autonomous traditions, or alienation and availability, the relation between delinquent subculture and conventional culture is the same in the theories of all the men listed in the preceding paragraph. It stands in opposition to the conventions of middle-class morality and inevitably leads its adherents to the breaking of laws.

While admitting that the image of juvenile delinquency as a form of behavior based on countervailing values and norms has some virtue, Sykes and Matza attempt to correct the defects as they see them and to offer an alternative explanation of behavior. They argue that the difficulties in viewing delinquent behavior as springing from a set of deviant values and norms which are viewed as being "right" are both empirical and theoretical. In the first place, if the delinquent subculture in which the delinquent viewed his behavior as "morally correct" in fact existed, he would exhibit no feelings of guilt or shame at detection or confinement. Evidence suggests, however, that delinquents do experience a sense of guilt or shame, and that this is not a front to appease authorities. In the second place, the juvenile delinquent frequently accords admiration and respect to law-abiding persons, thus indicating the moral validity of the dominant normative system in many instances. In the third place, juvenile delinquents often draw a sharp line between those who can be victimized and those who cannot. In the
fourth place, Sykes and Matza find it doubtful if many juvenile delinquents are totally immune from the demands for conformity made by the dominant social order. They hold that the greater probability is that the child internalizes these demands for conformity, but can neutralize these demands when appropriate circumstances arise, and the ways in which he accomplishes this neutralization form the major part of the content of the delinquent "learning process," which is so central to Sutherland's notion of "differential association." This does not mean that the delinquent denies the validity of these demands for conformity and substitutes a new normative system for them. "Techniques of neutralization" — the denial of responsibility, the denial of injury, the denial of the victim, condemnation of the condemners, appeal to higher loyalties — provide in advance of deviant behavior a psychological escape whereby the delinquent evades or deflects the delinquency issue. Unlike the mechanisms of rationalization, "techniques of neutralization" precede delinquent behavior and make it possible. Violations are thus seen as "acceptable" rather than "right," and the delinquent, far from representing radical opposition to law-abiding society, appears rather as an "apologetic failure." In short, these writers doubt the subcultural process that sees juvenile delinquency as a form of behavior based on the values and norms of a deviant subculture in precisely the same way as law-abiding behavior is based on the values and norms of the larger society.

Having centered attention on how an impetus to engage in delinquent behavior is translated into action, Matza and Sykes then turn to the question of what makes delinquency attractive in the first place.
They view former answers to this question as troubled by the assumption that the delinquent is a deviant whose ultimate position is one of opposition to the dominant social order, i.e., the world of the middle class. Instead, they assert that (a) the values behind much juvenile delinquency are far less deviant than is commonly supposed, and (b) this faulty picture is due to an over-simplification of the middle-class value system.

Matza and Sykes indicate that the vast majority of accounts of juvenile delinquency and its underlying values agree in substance, if not in interpretation, that three themes recur with marked regularity. First, delinquents are deeply immersed in a restless search for excitement, thrills, or "kicks." Second, delinquents commonly exhibit a disdain for "getting on" in the realm of work. Third, aggression — whether verbal or physical — is equated with virility and toughness. This cluster of values, however, far from denoting the delinquent's apartness from the conventional world, connote his adherence to it; for, this emphasis on daring, the rejection of the prosaic discipline of work, the emphasis on luxury and conspicuous consumption, the respect paid to manhood demonstrated by force — all find their counterpart in the dominant social order. More specifically, these values seem to be the value of Thorstein Veblen's leisured elite. Only the mode of expression — delinquency — is different. Matza and Matza remind us that most values appear in most social classes; the social classes differ, however, in the frequency with which the values appear.

Further, Matza and Sykes state that all classes embrace certain "subterranean" values — values which are in conflict or even contra-
diction with other deeply held values, but which are still recognized and accepted by many. These contradictory values may co-exist with conformist values within a single individual and give rise to profound feelings of ambivalence in many areas of life. They are deviant values only insofar as they represent private as opposed to public morality and they are generally held in abeyance until appropriate circumstances are present. In many cases the delinquent suffers from bad timing.

In this view, the delinquent may not stand as an alien in the body of society, but may represent instead a dangerous reflection or caricature. Far from establishing a set of counter-values, the delinquent shares the subterranean values of society and this very adherence binds him to the dominant social order, and facilitates the frequently observed "reformation" of the delinquents with the coming of adult status.

Matza and Sykes indicate that the attractiveness of delinquency — and the "techniques of neutralization" which make it possible as modes of behavior — applies with equal force to adolescents at any class level, for they move in a limbo between earlier parental domination and future integration with the social structure through the bonds of work and marriage. They therefore postulate that insofar as these subterranean values do lie behind delinquency, delinquent behavior prevails among all adolescents rather than those confined to the lower class. They suggest that it seems worthwhile to pursue the idea that most forms of juvenile delinquency have a common sociological basis regardless of
the class level at which they appear. One such basis is offered by
the argument that the values lying behind much delinquent behavior are
the values of a leisure class, a temporary leisure by sufferance rather
than by virtue of a permanent aristocratic right. Yet the leisure
status of adolescents, modified though it may be by the discipline of
school and the lack of wealth, places them in relationship to the
social structure in a manner similar to that of an elite which consumes
without producing. In this situation, disdain of work, an emphasis
upon personal qualities rather than skills, and a stress on the manner
and extent of consumption all can flourish. Insofar, then, as these
values do lie behind delinquency, Matza and Sykes expect delinquent
behavior to be prevalent among all adolescents rather than confined to
the lower class.

These conclusions of Matza and Sykes served as the framework for
the propositions guiding the empirical research of this writer. Primary
attention was given to that cluster of values centering around work and
the relation of these values to juvenile delinquency. A major proposi-
tion was stated, as follows:

There is no difference between those ranking high in self-
reported delinquency and those ranking low in self-reported
delinquency (all classes) in adherence to the set of values
centering around disdain for work and getting ahead, nor
in the attitudes toward those participating in juvenile delin-
quent activities.

Five sub-hypotheses were drawn from this statement and served as guides
for the research:

1. There is no difference in self-reported delinquency by
   social class.
2. There is no difference between those high in self-reported delinquency and those low in self-reported delinquency in their occupational value orientations.

3. There is no difference between those high in self-reported delinquency and those low in self-reported delinquency in interpersonal attitudes.

4. There is no difference between high self-reported delinquents and low self-reported delinquents in attitudes toward those who participate in juvenile delinquent behavior.

5. There is no difference between high self-reported delinquents and low self-reported delinquents in attitudes toward success and the future.
II. METHODOLOGY

In order to evaluate these four hypotheses, a questionnaire first was designed to measure the respondent's occupational values, his socio-economic status level, his self-reported delinquency involvement, and specific attitudes toward work, the future and getting ahead. His occupational values, his socio-economic status level and his attitudes were then related to his delinquency involvement.

The measure of occupational values used in this research was developed by Morris Rosenberg, et. al., at Cornell University and was designed to describe three value orientations, "people-oriented," "extrinsic-reward-oriented," and "self-expression-oriented." Because it seemed congruent to the theoretical framework of this paper, a fourth value orientation was added — "easy-way-out."

The measure of socio-economic level was an adaptation of the Otis Duncan socio-economic index. The unit scored was the occupation of the father of the respondents. In this manner, the three samples could be classified according to socio-economic status.

In an attempt to measure self-reported delinquency, an anonymous check list was administered to all respondents in the study and a delinquency scale constructed from it. From the inventory of 15 items of criminal and anti-social behavior ten were chosen for scaling according to the Guttman technique. The final scale was very similar to that utilized by Nye and Short.

Finally, items indicating a respondent's attitudes in several related areas were included in the questionnaire. First, since it
was assumed that a person's faith in people is related to both his occupational choice and to his delinquency involvement, a Guttman scale composed of five items was designed to measure this attribute. A Guttman scale to measure attitude toward delinquency was also developed. Further pertinent attitudes, such as attitudes toward the future, toward getting ahead in life, toward the means of getting ahead, were included. These were not scaled according to the Guttman technique, but were utilized in an attempt to get a general picture of delinquent and non-delinquent attitudes.

The questionnaire was administered to three groups in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The first included all of the male members of an all-white eighth grade of a junior high school which had been designated by several of the Parish School Board officials as predominantly an upper class school. The second included all of the male members of an all-white eighth grade class of a junior high school which had been designated as predominantly a lower class school. The third group was composed of all the white boys who were adjudicated delinquent by the Family Court, but who were on probation at the time of the study and whose parents would permit them to be interviewed. Although the schedule of questions was presented to the school groups in a classroom situation, the adjudicated delinquents were interviewed singly and on a voluntary basis.¹ The total number who completed questionnaires was 319. Of these, five were discarded because they were improperly completed or

¹There were two exceptions to this. Two of the adjudicated delinquents were at Glen Oaks School on the day the questionnaire was presented there.
otherwise failed to measure up to the standards set for their inclusion. There remained a total of 314 respondents; 146 from Glasgow Junior High School, the upper class school; 134 from Glen Oaks Junior High School, the lower class school; and 34 from the adjudicated delinquents.

III. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the empirical data presented in the preceding chapters of this work, an attempt is made now to evaluate the statements which have served as the working hypotheses of this research. The five sub-hypotheses are examined first, and then an evaluation of the general hypothesis will be made.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in self-reported delinquency by social class.

On the basis of the informal observation of school officials, a Duncan socio-economic index median score given to each group, and an occupational classification, the two schools were identified as upper socio-economic level or white collar (Glasgow) and lower socio-economic level or blue collar (Glen Oaks). This does not mean that each of these schools was completely homogeneous; only that these groups were statistically distinct. Each was treated as a "social status area" as Reiss and Rhodes define the concept, i.e., although the school is somewhat heterogeneous, one social class is dominant enough to treat it as representative of a rather homogeneous social status area. The adjudicated delinquents parallel Glen Oaks very closely, falling into the blue collar or lower status group.
By utilizing a delinquency scale, prepared according to the Guttman technique, self-reported delinquency ranging from low to high degree of involvement was ascertained for each of the three groups. When the three groups were ranked according to "high" self-reported delinquency, the adjudicated delinquents ranked first, Glasgow second, and Glen Oaks third.

The data yield two conclusions pertinent to the hypothesis stated above. In the first place, self-reported delinquency involvement in the two status areas, represented by the two schools, differs significantly. In the second place, when social classes are examined across both social status areas, there is no significant difference in the degree of self-reported delinquency among the high, middle or low class levels.

These two findings taken together seem to suggest that the observations of Reiss and Rhodes and Clark and Wenninger are correct. Clark and Wenninger state: "In keeping with the class-oriented theories, we did find significant differences, both in quantity and quality of illegal acts, among communities or 'status areas,' each consisting of one predominant socio-economic class." These findings seemingly do not agree with Clark and Wenninger at one point. They found that the lower class areas have higher illegal behavior rates, particularly in the more serious types of offenses. In the present study of self-reported delinquency, the highest delinquency rate was found in the upper class group

in the high status area.

All of this suggests some interesting relationships. As Clark and Wenninger point out:

The pattern of illegal behavior within small communities or within 'status areas' of a large metropolitan center is determined by the predominant class of that area. Social class differentiation within these areas is apparently not related to the incidence of illegal behavior. This suggests that there are community-wide norms which are related to illegal behavior and to which juveniles adhere regardless of their social class origins.3

In Matza's terms these norms would include those of an adolescent leisure class.

Two interrelated questions must be asked concerning the relationships noted in the study: (1) Why the high self-reported delinquency rate at the high status school? It will be recalled that at this school there were very few boys with low "ascribed social status."
(2) Why the low self-reported delinquency rate at the low status school? Even those who were lowest in ascribed socio-economic status conformed to the pattern of low delinquency found in the "status area."

The suggestions of Matza seem particularly pertinent in consideration of the first question. The upper class teen-ager certainly would seem to come close to characterizing the leisure class man as Matza describes him, particularly with regard to access to leisure and the means to "implement" this leisure, i.e., access to money, cars, trips, movies, malt, snappy clothes, etc. On the other hand, it has been suggested that the lower class represents the other category of persons

3Ibid.
most likely to have leisure time and attitudes. In this case, however, there would be no access to the means of implementing this leisure. In the words of Cleward and Ohlin, there is "differential access" to these means.

While, as Sykes and Matza have suggested, the leisure goals of thrill seeking, violence and romance are common to adolescent and adult age levels, the adolescent is freer to pursue them to the extent to which he is free from adult responsibilities. Also, if we assume that adolescents at all class levels embrace these values — hence the fostering of "youth culture" and the commercialized creation of the "cult of adolescence" — perhaps the upper and lower class adolescent is freer than his middle class oriented counterpart to pursue them. The swiftness with which upper class adolescents imitate certain modes of behavior of lower class adolescents, especially "expressive" modes of behavior, is indicative of their joint involvement in the pursuit of leisure goals common to both class levels on a uni-generational basis. Yet, as indicated above, the lower class adolescent does not share the apparatus with which to utilize leisure possessed by the upper class adolescent; he lacks the fast car, the savoir-faire, the surplus "spending" money with which to indulge his leisure inclinations. In short, the leisure goals for which the lower class boy is most available are precisely those to which he most lacks access.

David Downes suggests that:

The lower class adolescent experiences a double motivation toward delinquency if he is frustrated both in the sphere of work success goals and in the realm of leisure success goals. The middle class dominated youth agency is seen as a barrier
to the pursuit of leisure-goals in much the same way as the occupational opportunity structure restricts job potential. The channels for the expression of 'subterranean' values are not available for the lower class adolescent as they are for the conventional-world adult. The lower class delinquent is also likely to view 'excitement' over competitive sports, the family car, gadgets and cultural media as distinctly 'tame.' As Sykes and Matza note, he is pressurized into the 'manufacture' of excitement; he overcomes the constrictions of his milieu by challenging those constrictions. Seeking out means to express 'subterranean' values in the pursuit of leisure-goals implies an element of dual frustration to the maintenance of delinquent subcultures, but also applies more generally to 'fringe' delinquency which emerges as a by-product of thrill-seeking adolescent behavior.4

This suggests, in answer to the second question raised by the empirical data, that the lower status group, with its relatively low self-reported delinquency rate, is not truly representative of the lower class, as typically presented, whether judged by the occupations of the fathers, or by the delinquency pattern. The socio-economic status scores have indicated that this is indeed the case. These respondents are more nearly representative of the "working class" as distinguished from the "lower class" by Miller and Riesman. They state:

Our definition of working class is simple: regular members of the non-agricultural labor force in manual occupations. Thus, we exclude the 'lower class,' irregular working people, although the analysis has some relevance to the lower class . . . It is especially important to distinguish the segment which has irregular employment (and 'voluntary' withdrawal from the labor force), unskilled jobs in service occupations (and is largely Negro and Puerto Rican now) from the other groupings, which are larger and have more of a commonness to them.

This latter group of regular workers we call 'working class' despite the reluctance of many social scientists today to use

this historic term; the opprobrious term 'lower class' might be applied to the irregular segment although it would probably be all around if a less invidious term (perhaps 'the unskilled') were employed.5

Perhaps the picture of the working class subculture drawn by Miller and Riessman is a good description of the lower status area represented in the school sample studied in this research. If so, some of the basic themes would aid in explaining the low self-reported delinquency rate in that area. The values certainly do not appear to be those of a leisure class.

There is an alternative explanation that is possible, and indeed probable, of the relationship noted between status-area and self-reported delinquency. If the adjudicated delinquents are added to the status group which they most nearly parallel, and from which most come, then there is very little difference in self-reported delinquency rates for the two status areas under consideration. This suggests that those who would have made for a higher rate of self-reported delinquency have been "removed" from the lower status area by arrest or court action; they have acted on their "subterranean" values in delinquent fashion and have been apprehended for it. This leaves at the school a residue of the more non-delinquent members of the status group. This further suggests that there is a bias on the part of the police court in favor of the

upper status individual, expressed in differential definition or treatment of delinquency by social status.6

If this assumption is correct then we can conclude that there is not only a lack of difference between social classes in self-reported delinquency but also a lack of difference between social status areas.

Hypothesis 2: There is no difference between those ranking high in self-reported delinquency and those ranking low in self-reported delinquency in their occupational value orientations.

By employing a scheme worked out by Rosenberg, four value orientations or value foci were delineated — a "people-oriented" complex, an "extrinsic-reward" complex, a "self-expression" complex, and an "easy-way-out" complex. The first three of these had been suggested by Rosenberg, the last was included as a possible "subterranean" occupational value orientation. The two values which composed this "easy-way-out" orientation, "Short hours" and "Be easy," were highly correlated.

In each of the value orientations, with the exception of one, there was a similar pattern expressed by both those ranking high and those ranking low in self-reported delinquency. Although there were some slight differences noted along the delinquency dimension, there was clear evidence that the person ranking high in self-reported delinquency is less interested than the person ranking low in self-reported delinquency only in his orientation to people. The high self-reported

6To the objection that the two adjudicated delinquents who had been returned to the lower status school would certainly indicate that the less conservative portion of the school was represented, it might be suggested that the knowledge of the arrests and handling of these youngsters might have a deterrent effect.
delinquent is less likely to want to work with people or to be helpful.

The respondents high in delinquency were like those low in delinquency in their ranking of each of the remaining occupational value orientations. Both those low and high in self-reported delinquency rank highest in "extrinsic-reward" value scores, followed by the "self-expression" value scores, and both groups placed least value upon "easy-way-out." The fact that there is little difference in high self-reported delinquency and low self-reported delinquency in the two value orientations which normally motivate persons in the desire to work and in the choice of an occupation — "extrinsic-reward" and "self-expression" — is indirect evidence that the delinquent does not reject the prosaic discipline of work — at least as expressed in what he desires in an occupation. More directly there is evidence of this by his low rating of the subterranean value, "easy-way-out."

Of particular interest, however, is the significant difference along the delinquency dimension noted in the "people-oriented" value orientation. The fact that the high self-reported delinquent places significantly lower value upon working with people and being helpful to others in his work raises questions concerning his general view of humanity or his faith in people.

Hypothesis 3: There is no difference between those ranking high in self-reported delinquency and those ranking low in self-reported delinquency in interpersonal attitudes.

Whenever the measure of the respondents' view of humanity or their "faith in people" was taken there was found to be a strong correlation between that view and the degree of self-reported delinquency. Low
faith in people was associated with high delinquency and high faith was associated with low delinquency. Thus, it seems that the value complex revolving around an individual's view of humanity is linked with his delinquency potential or involvement. The hypothesis cannot be accepted.

This is further indicated in the empirical finding that there is a relationship between a respondent's "faith in people" and his occupational values; that is, those with high faith in people stress interpersonal or "people-oriented" values, while those with low faith tend to choose an impersonal value, namely, "the chance to earn a good deal of money."

These findings taken together lead to questions concerning the nature of the social relationships experienced by the delinquent which would lead to this perception of others and to this relative lack of emphasis upon people-oriented occupational values. These are the factors which distinguish the "high" self-reported delinquent from the "low" self-reported delinquent in this study and perhaps give some clues to the delinquent behavior.

Hypothesis 4: There is no difference between high self-reported delinquents and low self-reported delinquents in attitudes toward those who participate in juvenile delinquent behavior.

Closely related to hypothesis three is the problem of personal relationships with persons who engage in delinquent behavior. On the basis of a measure designed to determine the attitudes of the respondents to peers who committed a series of offenses, it was discovered that there is a highly significant difference in the attitude of the
high self-reported delinquent and the low self-reported delinquent.
The respondents ranking highest in delinquency also have the most favorable or positive attitude toward delinquency. The respondents who rank low in delinquency are not likely to want to identify with or want to associate with those who engage in delinquency.

Metze and Sykes had indicated that delinquents tend to neutralize their behavior by means of five techniques. Richard A. Bell, in an attempt to operationalize the idea of neutralization found some support for the assertion that delinquents will accept neutralization more than non-delinquents. The problem is extended in this study to include the delinquent's perception of others as delinquent. Can he neutralize or rationalize for them? How far or to whom does he extend this rationalization? Albert J. Reiss has shown how among certain groups in American society a boy may engage in sex relations with a person of the same sex without being defined by his group as homosexual or "queer." If a lower class boy engages in fellatio with adult males in exchange for monetary payment, if this is casual and sporadic, if it is incidental to his primary involvement in, and attachment to, the "street-corner" group, if he does not take the "passive" or "feminine" role in the act of fellatio, and if his fellows are persuaded that he does not do it because he derives satisfaction from it but only to obtain some ready cash, then

7Richard A. Bell, Neutralization as a Self Factor in Delinquency Risk (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University).
he is not marked out as a special sort of a person — a queer. If
this is true from the viewpoint of the actor, then it would seem that
the actor would look at the actions of his group members in a reciproc-
cal fashion; that is, he would be able to neutralize their action by
means of the same techniques he utilizes for himself.

This problem is not dealt with directly by the present investi-
gation. In fact, a major weakness in the design of the questionnaire
is found in the failure to determine who the respondent was using as
referent when he was asked to indicate how he would feel about someone
who engaged in certain offenses. We can assume that attitudes toward
reference group members would differ from attitudes toward chance
acquaintances. In fact, rather than serving as models of behavior to
be avoided, some individuals might serve as models of behavior which
are admired and desired.

The individual ranking high in delinquency is presented thus far
as one who does not care to work with people or to be helpful in his
occupation, who has less faith in people than the individual ranking low
in delinquency, and who has a favorable or permissive attitude toward
those who engage in delinquent behavior. The fact that he does not want
to work with people and expresses a lack of faith in people while being
quite willing to associate with delinquents suggests that he is being
selective in the groups he uses for reference in the perception of self
as non-delinquent. Perhaps he wants to associate with those who are
more openly accepting of "subterranean" values, and his lack of faith
suggests that he is very much aware of the conflict between the real and
the ideal culture — an awareness that many hold "subterranean" values
which are covered over by overtly approved values or are expressed "discreetly" leads to a lack of trust.

Hypothesis 5: There is no difference between high self-reported delinquents and low self-reported delinquents in attitudes toward success and the future.

In a further attempt to determine the respondents' work values, a brief examination was made of their attitudes toward success, their definition of success, their understanding of the means to success, and their concern for the future.

By far the largest group in both high self-reported delinquency and low self-reported delinquency categories expressed an interest in getting ahead or in achieving "success." Success was generally interpreted to mean monetary success although this was clearly not the only definition given.

Whenever questioned about the means they might use to achieve success, about one-half of those ranking low in self-reported delinquency indicated that they could not agree with the statement: "You can't be particular about the means you use." However, it is significant that the other half of the low delinquents were either undecided or agreed with the statement. Almost half of the high self-reported delinquents disagreed with the statement. It is very difficult to conceptualize a "subterranean value;" perhaps this statement comes closer to delineating one than any other in the study. If this can be called an attitude expressing a subterranean value, then it becomes more interesting to note that one-half of those low in delinquency were either undecided about or agreed with getting ahead by any means.

Those ranking high in delinquency were more likely than those
ranking low in delinquency to agree with the statement that "you have to make people do what you want in order to get ahead these days."

"Making people do what you want" seems to have been defined as manipulation of persons for less socially admired reasons. That more high delinquents than low delinquents agreed with this approach to success seems to fit the general pattern of interpersonal attitudes noted above.

On the other hand, high self-reported delinquents as well as low self-reported delinquents recognize the importance of the socially advocated qualities of hard work, intellectual ability and pleasant personality, as opposed to contacts and luck in achieving. In like manner, high delinquents and low delinquents were concerned about planning for the future rather than taking a "live for today" attitude.

Major Hypothesis: There is no difference between those ranking high in self-reported delinquency and those ranking low in self-reported delinquency (all classes) in adherence to the set of values centering around disdain for work and getting ahead, nor in the attitudes toward those participating in juvenile delinquent activities.

In order to make some evaluation of this major proposition, five sub-hypotheses have been examined. On the basis of the findings and discussion of these sub-hypotheses, we can conclude that the first part of this hypothesis — the part dealing with occupational values and self-reported delinquency in all classes — has been validated. There is an important exception; the high self-reported delinquent seems to be motivated less than the low self-reported delinquent by interpersonal values in a choice of occupation. This is reflected in a general view of humanity which is expressed in a greater lack of faith in people than is expressed by the low delinquent.
The second part of the proposition was found to be invalid for the status groups investigated. The high self-reported delinquent expresses more positive or permissive attitudes toward those participating in delinquent behavior than does the low self-reported delinquent.

Matza and Sykes have stressed that "we stand to learn more about juvenile delinquency by exploring the delinquent's similarity to society rather than his dissimilarity." This study represents one attempt to approach the problem of delinquency in that manner. In doing so, we have found that the occupational values of those ranking high in delinquency are not completely opposed to those ranking low in delinquency in the status groups studied, and also that some who are low in delinquency share values which might be defined as "subterranean." Further, in attempting to learn something of the delinquent's similarity to society we have been given some clues to his dissimilarity; there is some indication that part of the problem centers around interpersonal relations. This is not to say that the values held by the delinquent are different from the non-delinquent; it is to say that the delinquent, in his social interaction, learns to make use of commonly accepted values in a differing manner and to act upon "subterranean" values at times when others would not. Having found this, there is still the basic problem of understanding the interaction processes which would produce the results: delinquent and non-delinquent, or, as in this study, high self-reported delinquency and low self-reported delinquency.

Several major problems have been encountered in this research project. A primary difficulty lay in the nature of the subject matter
itself and the difficulty in conceptualizing "subterranean values."
This suggests that much more empirical data concerning the values which
make up a portion of American culture and the distinct subcultures with­
in it are needed. It suggests, further, that the theory of Matza and
Sykes needs greater conceptual clarification, particularly in regard to
the subterranean values which are such an integral part of the theory.

From an operational point of view, the researcher encountered
undue difficulty by committing himself to the Rosenberg technique for
examining occupational values. Perhaps another approach, more relevant
to and carefully coordinated with the specific theoretical problem,
would have produced more definitive results.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS


Banay, Ralph S. *Youth in Demea.* New York: Coward-McCann, 1948.


Cattell, Raymond E. **An Introduction to Personality Study**. London: Hutchinson, 1950.


Porterfield, Austin L. *Youth in Trouble.* Fort Worth: Leo Potishman Foundation, 1946.


Barnes, Edward W. "The Free Press, 1926."

Barnes, Edward W. "The Free Press, 1927."


Spranger, Eduard. *Types of Men.* (Translated from the fifth German edition.) Halle (Saale): M. Niemeyer, 1928.


PERIODICALS


---


---


Foote, Nelson N. "Identification as the Basis for a Theory of Motivation," *American Sociological Review*, 16 (February, 1951), 14-22.


_____ "The Conflict of Values in Delinquent Areas," American Sociological Review. 16 (October, 1951), 653-661.


_____ "Certain Primary Sources and Patterns of Aggression in the Social Structure of the Western World," Psychiatry, 10 (May, 1947).


———. "Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls," American Sociological Review. 16 (April, 1951).


_____. "Vocational Choices of College Students," School and Society, 46 (1937), 765-68.

_____. "Vocational Choices of Students from Cities, Towns and Farms," School and Society, 54 (1941), 94-96.


______. "Permanence of Vocational Interests," Journal of Educational Psychology, 25 (1934), 336-44.


Tappan, Paul W. "Who is the Criminal?" *American Sociological Review*, 12 (February, 1947), 96-102.


——. "Values and Occupational Choice." Paper read at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, Atlanta, April 7-9, 1960.

APPENDIX
APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE ON SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY
AND OCCUPATIONAL VALUES

By answering the questions contained within these pages, you are taking part in a study of what young people are feeling and thinking about certain subjects, and also what they do in certain situations. We are seeking your cooperation in helping us understand some of these matters. Would you please answer each question as accurately as you can.

Do not sign your name.

Thank you for your cooperation.

(1) What is your grade in school?
   1. _____Seventh
   2. _____Eighth
   3. _____Ninth
   4. _____Tenth

(2) Your age at last birthday?
   1. _____Under 12
   2. _____12
   3. _____13
   4. _____14
   5. _____15
   6. _____16
   7. _____17
   8. _____18

(3) If my grades in school were compared with the grades of all the other students in the eighth grade, they would probably be:
   1. _____Above average
   2. _____Average
   3. _____Below average

(4) How would you say you feel most of the time — in good spirits or in low spirits?
   1. _____Very good spirits
   2. _____Fairly good spirits
   3. _____Neither good nor bad
   4. _____Fairly low spirits
   5. _____Very low spirits
(5) Would you say that you are the sort of person who finds it easier or harder to make friends than most people?
1. _______ Easier
2. _______ About the same
3. _______ Harder

(6) How important is it to you, for you to be well liked by different kinds of people?
1. _______ Very important
2. _______ Fairly important
3. _______ Fairly unimportant
4. _______ Very unimportant

(7) How much does it bother you to have to give orders to other people?
1. _______ It bothers me very much
2. _______ It bothers me a little
3. _______ It doesn't bother me at all

(8) How much does it bother you to be given orders by someone else?
1. _______ It bothers me very much
2. _______ It bothers me a little
3. _______ It doesn't bother me at all

(9) How important is it for you to have your plans for the future rather clearly known to you in advance?
1. _______ Very important
2. _______ Fairly important
3. _______ Not very important
4. _______ Not at all important

(10) Are you the sort of person who lets things worry you or don't you let things worry you?
1. _______ Let things worry me very much
2. _______ Let things worry me quite a bit
3. _______ Let things worry me somewhat
4. _______ Don't let things worry me

(11) Some people say that most people can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful in your dealings with people. How do you feel about it?
1. _______ Most people can be trusted.
2. _______ You can't be too careful.

(12) Would you say that most people are more inclined to help others, or more inclined to look out for themselves?
1. _______ To help others
2. _______ To look out for themselves
(13) How important to you, personally, is it to get ahead in life?
1._____Very important
2._____Fairly important
3._____Not very important
4._____Very unimportant

(14) If you had your choice, which of the following would you most like to be?
(Choose only one)
1._____Independent
2._____Successful
3._____Well liked

(15) When you are in a group, do you prefer to make the decisions yourself, or do you prefer to have others make the decisions?
1._____Usually prefer to make decisions myself
2._____Usually prefer to have others make decisions
3._____Not sure which I prefer

(16) What does your father do for a living?
Specify occupation:__________________________________________

(17) How many years did your father attend school?
1._____1 to 4 years
2._____5 to 8 years
3._____9 to 12 years (High School)
4._____13- to 16 years (College)
5._____17 years and over (Professional and Graduate work)

(18) When they reported their requirements for an IDEAL job, students said it would have to satisfy certain requirements. Some of these requirements are listed below. As you read the list, consider how important each of these requirements is for you in deciding which job you want.

Indicate your opinion by writing:

H (High) next to the requirements you consider highly important in your choice.

M (Medium) next to the requirements you consider of medium importance.

L (Low) next to the requirements you consider of little or no importance.
WHEN I GO INTO AN OCCUPATION, I WILL DO SO BECAUSE IT WILL . . .

(Indicate H, M, L)

1. _____ "Provide a chance to use my special abilities."
2. _____ "Provide me with a chance to earn a good deal of money."
3. _____ "Permit me to be creative and original."
4. _____ "Be easy."
5. _____ "Give me a chance to work with people rather than things."
6. _____ "Have short hours."
7. _____ "Cause people to look up to me as someone important."
8. _____ "Allow me to look forward to a secure future."
9. _____ "Leave me free of supervision by others."
10. _____ "Give me a chance to be helpful to others."
11. _____ "Give me a chance to be a leader."
12. _____ "Provide me with adventure and excitement."

Now GO BACK and look at the requirements you rated "High." Rank them in the order of importance to you by writing next to each H:

1. for the most important
2. for the next in importance

and so on, for all the H's on your list. Do not rank the M's and L's.
Below are listed some types of behavior that are often called offenses by the courts. If you knew someone who took part in one of these offenses, how would you feel about him? Four ways of feeling are listed beside the offenses. Place a check under the feeling that best expresses your reaction to each of the offenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF I KNEW SOMEONE WHO:</th>
<th>I would want him as a close friend or buddy</th>
<th>I would not care if he attended my school, but I would not want him for a close friend</th>
<th>I would not want him in my school or want to be associated with him in any way</th>
<th>I would want him placed in an institution for juvenile delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ran away from home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Purposely destroyed property that did not belong to them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Defied their parents' authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Took little things (worth less than $2) that did not belong to them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skipped school without excuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bought and drank liquor as a minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Took things worth more than $2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would want him as a close friend or buddy</td>
<td>I would not care if he attended my school, but I would not want him for a close friend</td>
<td>I would not want him in my school or want to be associated with him in any way</td>
<td>I would want him placed in an institution for juvenile delinquents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Drove without a license</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Used narcotics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Took an automobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(20) What two qualities on this list do you think really get a person ahead the fastest today? (Check two)
1.____ Hard work
2.____ Pleasant personality
3.____ Intellectual ability
4.____ Knowing right people
5.____ Good luck
6.____ Being a good politician

(21) In the following group of statements, circle the A if you agree, circle the D if you disagree, and circle the ? if you are undecided.

A ? D 1. If you don't watch yourself, people will take advantage of you.
A ? D 2. No one is going to care much what happens to you, when you get right down to it.
A ? D 3. Most people are cooperative.
A ? D 4. It's who you know more than what you know that counts these days.
A ? D 5. In order to get ahead these days ... (a) You can't afford to be particular about the means you use.
A ? D (b) You have to be able to make people do what you want.
A ? D (c) You really have to love your work.

(22) Do you agree or disagree with these criticisms of the way things are today?
A ? D 1. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
A ? D 2. I think most students would cheat on an examination if they were sure of not getting caught.

(23) Do you agree or disagree with these statements about school?
A ? D 1. A person who worries about making higher than passing grades in school is wasting his time.
A ? D 2. School seems to be a good way to prepare for the future.
A ? D 3. If school were not compulsory, and if it were completely left up to me, I would leave school before graduating.

A ? D 4. It's not what you learn but the grades that you make that really count.

(24) Recent research has found that everyone breaks some laws, rules, and regulations during his lifetime. Some break them regularly, others less often. Below are some frequently broken. Check those that you have broken since beginning grade school.

HAVE YOU EVER . . .

1. Driven a car without a driver’s license or permit?
   (Do not include driver training courses)
   1._____Very often
   2._____Several times
   3._____Once or twice
   4._____No

2. Told an untruth if it seemed necessary?
   1._____No
   2._____Once or twice
   3._____Several times
   4._____Very often

3. Taken little things (worth less than $2) that did not belong to you?
   1._____No
   2._____Once or twice
   3._____Several times
   4._____Very often

4. Purposely damaged or destroyed public or private property that did not belong to you?
   1._____Very often
   2._____Once or twice
   3._____Several times
   4._____No

5. Skipped school without a legitimate excuse?
   1._____No
   2._____Once or twice
   3._____Several times
   4._____Very often
6. Bought or drank beer, wine, or liquor? (Include drinking at home)
   1. _____ No
   2. _____ Once or twice
   3. _____ Several times
   4. _____ Very often

7. Defied your parents' authority (to their face)?
   1. _____ No
   2. _____ Once or twice
   3. _____ Several times
   4. _____ Very often

8. Smoked?
   1. _____ Very often
   2. _____ Several times
   3. _____ Once or twice
   4. _____ No

9. Taken someone's car without the owner's permission?
   1. _____ No
   2. _____ Once or twice
   3. _____ Several times
   4. _____ Very often

10. Pushed to the head of a line instead of waiting your turn?
    1. _____ Very often
    2. _____ Several times
    3. _____ Once or twice
    4. _____ No

11. Taken things of medium value (between $2 and $50)?
    1. _____ Very often
    2. _____ Several times
    3. _____ Once or twice
    4. _____ No

12. "Run away" from home?
    1. _____ No
    2. _____ Once
    3. _____ Twice
    4. _____ Three times
    5. _____ Four times
    6. _____ Five or more times

13. Taken things of large value (worth more than $50)?
    1. _____ No
    2. _____ Several times
    3. _____ Once or twice
    4. _____ Very often
14. Used narcotics?
   1. _____ Very often
   2. _____ Several times
   3. _____ Once or twice
   4. _____ No

15. Pulled some pranks on others on Halloween night?
   1. _____ No
   2. _____ Once or twice
   3. _____ Several times
   4. _____ Very often
### TABLE XXV

**SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY BY DESIRE TO BE "SUCCESSFUL" IN TWO SCHOOL SAMPLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Self-Reported Delinquency</th>
<th>&quot;Which would you most like to be?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8 (17.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41 (14.8)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXVI

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO DELINQUENCY CHECK LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven</td>
<td>112 (35.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untruth</td>
<td>24 ( 7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken less than $2</td>
<td>126 (40.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged Property</td>
<td>193 (61.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped School</td>
<td>227 (72.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>127 (40.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defied Parents</td>
<td>186 (59.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked</td>
<td>114 (36.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken Car</td>
<td>277 (88.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Line</td>
<td>56 (17.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken $2-$50</td>
<td>246 (78.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran Away</td>
<td>248 (79.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken more than $50</td>
<td>289 (92.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>298 (95.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranks</td>
<td>97 (31.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents: 313
### TABLE XXVII

**COEFFICIENTS OF ASSOCIATION AMONG OCCUPATIONAL VALUE ALTERNATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abilities</th>
<th>Money</th>
<th>Creative</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Short Hours</th>
<th>Prestige</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>No Supervision</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Excitement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilities</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>+.185</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>+.086</td>
<td>+.106</td>
<td>+.148</td>
<td>+.329</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>+.134</td>
<td>+.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>+.266</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>+.576</td>
<td>+.135</td>
<td>+.325</td>
<td>+.151</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>+.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>+.183</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>+.173</td>
<td>+.011</td>
<td>+.136</td>
<td>+.443</td>
<td>+.090</td>
<td>+.124</td>
<td>-.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>+.266</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.199</td>
<td>+.798</td>
<td>+.362</td>
<td>-.669</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>+.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>+.086</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>+.173</td>
<td>+.199</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.437</td>
<td>+.008</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>+.613</td>
<td>+.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Hours</td>
<td>+.106</td>
<td>+.576</td>
<td>+.011</td>
<td>+.798</td>
<td>-.437</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.365</td>
<td>-.521</td>
<td>+.323</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>+.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>+.148</td>
<td>+.135</td>
<td>+.136</td>
<td>+.362</td>
<td>+.008</td>
<td>+.365</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.238</td>
<td>+.243</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>+.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>+.329</td>
<td>+.325</td>
<td>+.443</td>
<td>-.669</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.521</td>
<td>+.238</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.191</td>
<td>-.325</td>
<td>+.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free of Supervision</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>+.151</td>
<td>+.090</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>+.323</td>
<td>+.243</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>+.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>+.134</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>+.124</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>+.613</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>+.325</td>
<td>+.179</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>+.140</td>
<td>+.460</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>+.571</td>
<td>+.055</td>
<td>+.384</td>
<td>+.554</td>
<td>+.255</td>
<td>+.173</td>
<td>+.058</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>+.111</td>
<td>+.371</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>+.418</td>
<td>+.104</td>
<td>+.230</td>
<td>+.108</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>+.206</td>
<td>+.084</td>
<td>+.329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q - Coefficient of Association
### Table XXVIII

**Faith in People and "People-Oriented" Occupational Values in Two School Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;People-Oriented&quot; Occupational Values</th>
<th>Faith in People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Choice - &quot;Helpful to others&quot;</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Choice - &quot;Work with people rather than things&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest value - &quot;Helpful to others&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest value - &quot;Work with people rather than things&quot;</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Value</td>
<td>Low Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;... chance to earn a good deal of money&quot;</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Choice</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Choice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXX

**DESIRE TO GET AHEAD AND "MONEY" AS OCCUPATIONAL VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Important to Get Ahead&quot;</th>
<th>Money As Value</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Choice</td>
<td>High Choice</td>
<td>Medium Choice</td>
<td>Low Choice</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Important or Very Unimportant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 34.11\]

\[C = .49\]

### TABLE XXXI

**DESIRE TO BE SUCCESSFUL AND "MONEY" AS OCCUPATIONAL VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Which would you most like to be?&quot;</th>
<th>Money As Value</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Choice</td>
<td>High Choice</td>
<td>Medium Choice</td>
<td>Low Choice</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent or Well-Liked</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 9.65\]

\[C = .18\]
### TABLE XXXII

"HELPFUL" OCCUPATIONAL VALUE AND "MAKING PEOPLE DO WHAT YOU WANT"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Helpful&quot; Occupational Value</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Choice</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
<td>17 (70.8)</td>
<td>24 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Choice</td>
<td>30 (21.3)</td>
<td>20 (14.2)</td>
<td>91 (64.5)</td>
<td>141 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Choice</td>
<td>19 (22.4)</td>
<td>17 (20.0)</td>
<td>49 (57.6)</td>
<td>85 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Choice</td>
<td>9 (37.5)</td>
<td>4 (16.7)</td>
<td>11 (45.8)</td>
<td>24 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 40.654 \quad P = .001 \]

\[ C = .36 \]

### TABLE XXXIII

"WORK WITH PEOPLE" OCCUPATIONAL VALUE AND "MAKING PEOPLE DO WHAT YOU WANT"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Work with People&quot; Occupational Value</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Choice</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
<td>10 (76.9)</td>
<td>13 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Choice</td>
<td>25 (21.0)</td>
<td>16 (13.4)</td>
<td>78 (65.5)</td>
<td>119 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Choice</td>
<td>20 (21.7)</td>
<td>20 (21.7)</td>
<td>52 (56.5)</td>
<td>92 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Choice</td>
<td>13 (26.5)</td>
<td>8 (16.3)</td>
<td>28 (57.2)</td>
<td>49 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 8.802 \quad P = .30 \]

\[ C = .17 \]
TABLE XXXIV

SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY AND BELIEF IN "WHO YOU KNOW"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Self-Reported Delinquency</th>
<th>&quot;It's who you know that counts these days&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>51 (23.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19 (42.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 4.678^* \]

\[ \text{P} = .10 \]

\[ C = .13 \]

*Medium and High Delinquency categories combined.*
TABLE XXXV

SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY AND QUALITIES FOR GETTING AHEAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY</th>
<th>&quot;Qualities that get a person ahead fastest&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>13 (38.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>35 (38.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that each person could choose two of these qualities. The number represents the actual number of times that a quality was chosen.
**TABLE XXXVI**

**SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD THE FUTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Self-Reported Delinquency</th>
<th>Importance of having plans for future known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12 (26.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 9.740 \quad P = .05 \]

\[ C = .17 \]

**TABLE XXXVII**

**SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD "LIVING FOR TODAY"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Self-Reported Delinquency</th>
<th>&quot;Nowadays a person has to live for today.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>72 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>9 (52.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.590 \quad P = .10 \]

\[ C = .14 \]
In an effort to understand the attitudes and behavior of young people a little better, Mr. Eugene M. Johnson, of the Sociology Department of Louisiana State University, is seeking to interview several groups of boys in Baton Rouge. Permission has been granted for Mr. Johnson to use the facilities of the Family Court in order that this study might be as meaningful as possible.

Would you be willing to cooperate in this study of the way young people are thinking about work, the law, and related subjects by allowing your son to be interviewed by Mr. Johnson? The answers to the questions asked will be strictly confidential, and in fact, your son's name will never be used. The information received will not affect his relationship with the Family Court in any way.

Please indicate whether or not you give such permission by checking the correct block and returning this letter to the Family Court in the enclosed envelope. If you have further questions please call me at 356-3241. Please return this form as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Probation Officer

[space for options]

I give permission for my son to participate in the study of attitudes and behavior. I understand that his name will not be used and all information will be kept confidential.

I do not give permission for my son to participate in this study.

Signed:______________________________
VITA
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