RUTH CAVAN'S HYPOTHETICAL BEHAVIORAL CONTINUUM: AN EMPIRICAL TEST

Thesis for the Degree of M. A. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY DONALD GENE WILLIAMS 1968 THESIS



•

RUTH CAVAN'S HYPOTHETICAL BEHAVIORAL CONTINUUM:

AN EMPIRICAL TEST

Βу

Donald Gene Williams

A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

· · · ·

This author is indebted to many persons who freely contributed their time and energies to the completion of this project and wishes to express his appreciation for their assistance and advice. Special mention is due the writer's faculty advisor, Dr. Orden Smucker, for his guidance and patience.

Donald Gene Williams

TABLES OF CONTENTS

Chapt	er Pag	<u>e</u>
I:	Introduction	1
	An Overview of Approaches to Criminal Behavior	2
	Crime as Deviant Behavior	8
	Cavan's Behavioral Continuum 1	2
	Underconformity and Overconformity 1	5
	Summa ry 2	4
II:	Development of Hypotheses and Methodology 2	5
	Empirical Evidence of a Behavior Continuum2	6
	Hypotheses 3	2
	Methodology 4	1
	Characteristics of Sample 4	1
	Technique of Gathering Data 4	6
	Pretest 5	0
	Definition of Terms5	4
III:	Results 5	8
	Attitudes Toward Underconformity and Overconformity 5	8
	Severity of Attitudes Toward Under- conformity and Overconformity 6	6
	Significant Others Named By Sample 8	l

Chapter	Page
IV: Conclusion and Summary	- 95
Summary	- 95
Limitations of Current Study	- 98
Implication and Suggestions for Needed Research	- 101
APPENDIX	- 108
BIBLIOGRAPHY	- 117

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Pa	ge
I:	Characteristics of stages of continuity in behavior	-	21
II:	Average number of offenses reported by Texas college students among 200 men and 137 women in pre-college days, and the percentage reporting one or more of the offenses	_	27
III:	Percentage of 1020 men and 678 women committing specific offenses in New York City	-	30
IV:	Honesty continuum with characteristics of stages according to the traditional interpretation and to Cavan's interpretation	_	34
V:	Percentage of males and females re- sponding to the following question: Which one of these things would be the hardest for you to take your parents' disapproval, your teacher's disapproval, or breaking with your friends?	_	38
VI:	Whose advice do adolescents take?	- 1	40
VII:	Social characteristics of college class and sample	- 1	կյի
VIII:	Scale of juvenile delinquency as developed by Short and Nye	- 1	l ₄ 9
IX:	Characteristics of overt behavior represented by fictitious persons in stories used in study	-	52

Table

Χ:	Number and percentage of students in college freshman sample re- porting attitudes toward various degrees of conformity 61	•
XI:	Number and percentage of male students in college freshman sample reporting attitudes toward various degrees of conformity 67	,
XII:	Number and percentage of female students in college freshman sample reporting attitudes toward various degrees of conformity 72	2
XIII:	Number and percentage of students in college freshman sample reporting attitudes toward various degrees of conformity76	>
XIV:	Number and percentage of students in freshman sample who named at least one person from the following categories of significant others as being concerned about "How well you obey the rules of honesty?" 83	3
XV:	Number and percentage of college freshmen who named a person from one of the following categories of significant others first in response to "Name those persons you feel are most concerned about how well you obey the rules and regulations of honesty." 64	F
XVI:	Number and percentage of students in freshman sample who named at least one person from the following categories of significant others as being concerned about "How well you obey the rules of honesty" 66	

Table

XVII:	Number and percentage of students in freshman sample who named a person from one of the following categories of significant others first in response to "Name those persons you feel are most con- cerned about how well you obey the rules and regulations of honesty." 88
XVIII:	Number and percentage in pretest sample who named at least one person from each of the following

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure			ige
Ι:	Hypothetical formulation of a behavior continuum as presented by Cavan	-	14
II:	Traditional formulation of behavior continuum	-	16
III:	Discrepancies between lower-class and middle-class evaluation of identical behavior	-	l+2
IV:	Graphic presentation of percentage of students in college freshman sample reporting attitudes toward various degrees of conformity	-	65
V:	Graphic presentation of the median attitudinal responses of the students in the college freshman sample toward various degrees of conformity	-	79

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix]	Page
I:	Research	Instrument-	_	_	-	_	-	_	_	-	_	-	_	_	-	108

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Social scientists have offered many and varied explanations for deviant behavior. All of these explanations have been based on three common assumptions: first, deviant behavior is the result of a pathological condition; second, the deviant is the critical variable in the analysis of deviant behavior; and third, behavior can be described in terms of a continuum extending from disapproved deviant behavior through tolerated conformity to idealized conformity to idealized conformity. Chapter I will explore the plausibility of each of these assumptions.

Primarily this thesis will examine the relative merit of two opposing models of the behavioral continuum. The first model conceives the behavioral continuum as a linear model; that is, approval for behavior increases proportionately to the degree of conformity of that behavior. On the other hand, the second model suggests that a more appropriate scheme is a curvilinear model. That is, approval for behavior increases proportionately to the degree of conformity of that behavior; but only up to a certain point, then disapproval for behavior increases proportionately to the degree of overconformity represented by that behavior. Before an attempt is made to systematically examine these assumptions, a brief review of the various approaches to criminal behavior is in order.

AN OVERVIEW OF APPROACHES TO CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

Throughout the ages, man has sought to explain and understand social deviation. Frior to the lôth century, the explanations offered tended to be demonological in nature; that is, the individual was considered to be possessed by "other world powers." During the lôth century Cesare Beccaria founded the classical school of criminology. The major position of this school was that the individual's behavior was guided by rational judgment and free will; that is, an individual engaged in criminal activities because of the anticipation of the pleasure the activities would bring. The neo-classical school modified this position in part as it allowed exclusions from punishment because of mitigating circumstances, age of the offender (youth), or the psychological condition of the offender (insanity).¹

Since the early 19th century when the positivistic school of criminology replaced the neo-classical school, there has been a long succession of criminological theories, most of which have not stood the test of time.

¹ For a complete discussion of the early history of criminological theory, see George Vold, <u>Theoretical</u> <u>Criminology</u> (New York, 1958).

It is possible to classify these theories into three groups depending upon their theoretical orientations: biological and constitutional theories, in which deviancy is explained through the inherited physical and mental makeup of man; psychogenic theories, in which deviancy is explained through the formation of an antisocial character; and sociological theories, in which deviancy is explained through the pressures and pulls of the social milieu. While these classifications are arbitrary and tend to obscure the interdependency of significant variables, they do have utility for analytical purposes.²

The biogenic orientation, the dominant theory in Europe today, points to the inheritance of physiological weaknesses or the inheritance of pronenesses toward crime and delinquency. The specific formulation of this hypothesis varies considerably: the attempt to prove inheritance of proneness through the method of studying criminal twins (Lange, Rosanoff, and Kraz); the attempt to identify body-mind types (Kretschmer, Sheldon, and Hooton); the attempt to identify and explain habitual (serious) offenders as contrasted with occasional offenders or offenders of opportunity (Frey, Vervsech, and Exner); the attempt to trace the

-3-

² For an excellent summary of the three orientations to Criminological theory, see Walter Reckless, The Crime Problem (New York, 1961), Chapters 12-18, pp. 233-360.

inheritance of bad strains through the descendants of notorious degenerate families (Dugdale, Goddard, Davenport, and Estabrook); and the specification of the mesomorphic somatotype (muscular) as the type of constitution which is most usually related to delinquency (Sheldon, and Gluecks).³

The psychogenic school views character and personality as a function of early childhood development. August Aichhorn, one of the fountainheads of this orientation, maintains that faulty development in the first few years of life makes it impossible for the child to control his impulses. The child lingers on as sort of an aggrandizing infant, living in the pleasure principle and failing to develop the reality principle in life. Friedlander refers to this process as an antisocial character structure, and Redl calls it a faulty superego. Others in this tradition have attempted to show the relationship between deviant behavior and feeblemindedness (Goddard, Kuhlman, and Zeleny). Still others view deviant behavior as an expression of neurotic

³ For a complete discussion of the biogenic orientation, see <u>Ibid</u>., Chapter 14, pp. 270-290; and Herbert Bloch and Frank Flynn, <u>Delinquency</u> (New York, 1956), Chapters 5 and 6, pp. 96-149.

mechanisms (Gluecks, Hathaway, and Monachesi).4

Sociologists, ever since Ferri, have been calling attention to bad environmental conditions as causal factors of deviant behavior. This hypothesis was echoed by Bonger, who placed the blame for a disproportional amount of crime and delinquency among the proletariat on the pressures of the capitalistic system.⁵ Using the sociological framework, American criminological theory has taken divergent forms: Vold argues that criminal behavior is the outcome of groups with opposing interests which are in conflict to maintain their respective statuses and/or to gain new status:⁶ Taft argues that criminal behavior is the result of the general cultural structure of American society which provides opportunities for crime (A community has as much crime as it deserves!): Shaw. Mc Kay. and Thrasher explain deviancy in terms of community or social disorganization;⁸ Sutherland argues that criminal

- ⁶ Vold, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., pp. 203-261.
- ⁷ Donald Taft, <u>Criminology</u> (New York, 1956), p. 321.

-5-

⁴ For a complete discussion of the psychogenic orientation, see Reckless, <u>op. cit.</u>, Chapter 15, pp. 291-300; Bloch and Flynn, <u>op. cit.</u>, Chapter 7, pp. 151-175; and Marshall Clinard, <u>Sociology</u> of <u>Deviant</u> <u>Behavior</u> (New York, 1963), Chapter 5, pp. 116-141.

⁵ Ruth Shone Cavan, <u>Readings in Juvenile Delin-</u> <u>quency</u> (New York, 1964), p. 160.

⁸ Clifford Shaw, and Henry Mc Kay, <u>Juvenile Delin-</u> <u>quency and Urban Areas</u> (Chicago, 1942); and Frederic Thrasher, <u>The Gang</u> (Chicago, 1936).

behavior is the result of differential association (according to this theory, delinquent or criminal behavior is learned - as are most other kinds of behavior - learned in association with others, according to the frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of contacts):⁹ Glaser proposes differential identification as a substitute for differential association (one takes over the models of behavior from those (reference) groups with which one identifies):¹⁰ Cohen. employing Merton's anomie as an acute disjunction between the cultural values and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of certain groups to act in accord with those values and goals, contends that working class boys who turn their backs on middle class virtues and values find a solution for their status problems in the delinquent subculture of the gang (alternative solutions are the stable street corner boy who conforms to the working class style of life, and the college boy who strives for middle class status by adopting middle class styles); and Cloward and Ohlin, combining the anomie tradition and the Chicago tradition. assert that the urban slum boys gravitate to delinquent subcultures when they do

Albert Cohen, Delinquent Boys (New York, 1955).

-6-

⁹ Edwin Sutherland and Donald Cressey, <u>Principles</u> of <u>Criminology</u> (Chicago, 1955), pp. 6-8.

¹⁰ Daniel Glaser, "Criminality Theories and Behavioral Images," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, VXI (May, 1956), 430-450.

not have access to legitimate avenues of success, but they do have access to illegitimate avenues (they contend that if both the legitimate and the illegitimate avenues to status are closed, the boys will gravitate to either a retreatist or a conflict subculture).¹²

Due to the inability of the previously mentioned theories to explain all delinquent acts that occur, some criminologists have turned to multiple factor explanations of deviant behavior. Out of their research of 500 delinquent and 500 nondelinquent boys, the Gluecks¹³ proposed a five point causal law. According to this formulation, delinquents are distinguishable from nondelinguents (1) physically. in being essentially mesomorphic; (2) temperamentally, in being restless. impulsive, aggressive, destructive; (3) emotionally, in being hostile, defiant, resentful, assertive, and nonsubmissive; $(\underline{\mu})$ socioculturally, in being reared by unfit parents; and (5) psychologically, in being direct, concrete learners. Also using the multiple factor approach. Reckless proposes the containment theory to incorporate and merge pull, pressure, and push theories

12 Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, <u>Delinquency</u> and <u>Opportunity</u> (New York, 1960).

13 Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, <u>Unraveling</u> Juvenile <u>Delinquency</u> (New York, 1950), pp. 281-282.

-7-

into one theoretical framework.¹⁴ He argues that behavior is the result of the interaction of the push forces of the internal motivational system, the pull and pressure forces of the external social system, and the internal and external containments upon these forces; that is, delinquency occurs when the forces (push and pressure) toward delinquency are greater than the forces (inner and outer containments) against delinquency.

CRIME AS DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

The assumption that deviant behavior is the result of a malfunctioning in the individual and/or in the social order and the assumption that the deviant is the critical variable in the explanation of deviant behavior have been questioned by the developing perspective of the sociology of deviancy.

Historically, explanations for criminal behavior have been based on these two assumptions. Most of these explanations consider crime to be a vagrant form of human activity which has somehow broken away from the more orderly currents of social life and which needs to be controlled. The primary issue raised by most criminologists has been the explanation of the comission of an offense by an individual. Since it has generally been understood that criminal behavior would occur only if

-8-

¹⁴ Reckless, op. cit., Chapter 18, pp. 335-360.

something was wrong with the individual involved or if something was wrong within the social organization itself, explanations for deviant behavior, as noted in the preceding section, were given in terms of "machinery in poor condition." In other words, deviancy is the result of biological malfunctions, psychological disorders, or social disorders and anomie. Further, most of these explanations focused on the deviant or the circumstances in which the deviant was found as the critical variable.

As seen from the developing perspective of the sociology of deviancy, deviant behavior can be defined as conduct which requires the attention of social control agencies. Deviance is not a property inherent in certain forms of behavior; it is a property conferred upon these forms by the audiences which directly or indirectly witness them. Howard Becker refers to this as the process of labeling:¹⁵

Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender." The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label.

The critical variable, then, is the social audience rather

15 Howard Becker, The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance (New York, 1964), p. 3.

-9-

than the individual actor since it is the audience which eventually determines whether or not any episode of behavior or any class of episodes is labeled deviant.¹⁶

This process of labeling, according to the sociology of deviancy, also involves a process of selection. First, the community isolates only a few scattered episodes of behavior and decides that they reflect what a person is really like. After all, even the worst criminal conforms to societal norms most of the time: he wears the "proper" clothing, eats the "proper" food and in a "conventional" manner, speaks the "proper" language, and in a thousand other ways, respects the ordinary conventions of society. Secondly. society does not label all possible acts of nonconformity as deviant but selects only certain individuals and episodes to so label. This screen is not as selective when dealing with extreme forms of deviance such as serious crimes; but in the day to day type of screening, the process is sensitive to such things as the individual's social class, his race, his sex, his past record as an offender, the amount of remorse, and so forth.

Society usually provides a sharp rite of transition when one enters the distinctly deviant role. These rites provide a "formal conformation" between the deviant and representatives of society (as in a criminal trial); they

-10-

¹⁶ Kai Erikson, "Notes on the Sociology of Deviance," <u>Social Problems</u>, IX (Spring, 1962), 311.

announce some "judgment" about the nature of deviancy (the verdict in a trial, for example); and they perform an act of "social placement" which redefines the individual's position in society (for instance, that of prisoner).¹⁷ Because of this social replacement, members of society can accord the deviant treatment considered to be appropriate for such a deviant. At the same time, the deviant usually accepts this redefinition and readjusts his behavior accordingly;¹⁸

No more self-defeating device could be discovered than the one society has developed in dealing with the criminal. It proclaims his career in such loud and dramatic forms that both he and the community accept the judgment as a fixed description. He becomes conscious of himself as a criminal, and the community expects him to live up to his reputation, and will not credit him if he does not live up to it.

A central thesis in this kind of analysis is that "selffulfilling prophecy mechanisms" help to explain deviance; that is, we define an individual as deviant and treat him accordingly, and because of the definition and the treatment, the individual behaves in a deviant manner. His deviant behavior then justifies our original "prophecy."¹⁹

An important aspect of deviancy analysis in these

17 <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 316.

18 Edwin Schur, <u>Crimes</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Victims</u> (Englewood Cliffs, 1965), p. 3.

19 Erikson, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 311.

terms is that crime promotes solidarity in the social group. According to this theory of deviancy. one of the main organizational components of a social system is that of boundary maintenance. A well-functioning social system should be analyzed in terms of two different and often competing forces: those forces which promote a high over-all degree of conformity among its members, and those forces which encourage some degree of diversity so that actors can be deployed throughout social space to patrol the system's boundaries. In other words, the deviant performs a function for society by representing those forces which lie outside the group's boundaries; that is, the deviant informs us "what evil looks like," or "what shape the devil can assume."20 Each time the group censures some act of deviation, it then sharpens the authority of the violated norm and declares again where the boundaries of the group are located. 21

CAVAN'S BEHAVIORAL CONTINUUM

The assumption that behavior can be described in terms of a continuum extending from disapproved deviant

²⁰ <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 15.

²¹ For a complete discussion, see Becker, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>.; Erikson, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., pp. 307-314; Marshall Clinard, <u>Sociology of Deviant Behavior</u> (New York, 1963); John Kitsuse, "Societal Reactions to Deviant Behavior," <u>Social Problems</u>, IX (Winter, 1962), 247-257; Schur, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>.; and Gresham Sykes, <u>Crime and Society</u> (New York, 1966).

behavior through tolerated behavior to idealized behavior is questioned by Ruth Cavan's proposal for a hypothetical formulation of a behavior continuum.²² According to this hypothetical formulation, behavior falls into a continuum ranging from condemnable behavior (area A) through decreasing degrees of disapproved behavior to the central area (area D) and then through increasing degrees of good behavior to near perfection (area G) which is also condemned.²³

²² This hypothetical formulation of a behavior continuum is outlined in Ruth Cavan, <u>Juvenile Delinquency</u> (New York, 1962); Ruth Cavan, <u>Readings in Juvenile</u> <u>Delinquency</u> (New York, 1964); and Ruth Cavan, "The Concepts of Tolerance and Contraculture as Applied to Delinquency," <u>Sociological Quarterly</u>, II (1961), 243-258.

²³ Cavan contends that the line above the curve represents the volume of behavior which falls into each area. She cites the following sources as evidence to support a bell-shaped curve: Floyd H. Allport, "The J-Curve Hypothesis of Conforming Behavior," Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), 141-83; and R. T. La Piere, and P. R. Farnsworth, Social Psychology (New York, 1936), p. 400.

Figure I: Hypothetical formulation of a behavior continuum as presented by Cavan²⁴



Historically, criminological theorists have tended to think in terms of dichotomies: the sinner and the saint, the criminal and the law-abiding citizen, the juvenile delinquent and the modal child. They tend to think in terms of black and white; on the other hand, Cavan argues that between these two rare extremes are many shades of gray. For instance, Cavan proposes such a series as "pitch black, charcoal gray, slate gray, tattletale gray, dingy white, offwhite, and lily white."²⁵

²⁴ Source: Cavan, 1964, p. 17. ²⁵ <u>Ibid</u>., p. 18. In this series of seven, the area of normal conformity (area D) is not white but tattletale gray. (Cavan borrowed this term from the advertisements of a few years ago in which the sheets flapping on the line were tattletale gray because the housewife had not used the right kind of laundry soap.) Cavan contends that observed behavior falls into similar gradations: "the child may break into a store at night and steal (black); deliberately pick up valuables during store hours; occasionally pick up things as opportunity arises; pilfer small objects (tattletale gray); be meticulous about taking things; remonstrate with others who steal; or report other children to teachers or police for even minor pilfering (lily white)."²⁶

UNDERCONFORMITY AND OVERCONFORMITY

Modern criminology recognizes a continuum of criminal behavior ranging from "criminal" to "law-abiding lawbreaking" to "law-abiding."²⁷ This continuum is based on the tendency to think of social norms not as workable expectations of behavior but as ideal or perfect standards.

²⁶ <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 18.

²⁷ For example, see Austin Porterfield, <u>Youth in</u> <u>Trouble</u> (Fort Worth, 1946); James Wallerstein and Clement Wyle, "Our Law-abiding Law-Breakers," <u>National Probation</u> (April, 1947), pp. 107-112; and James Short and Ivan Nye, "Extent of Unrecorded Juvenile Delinquency, Tentative Conclusions," <u>Journal of Criminal Law</u>, <u>Criminology</u>, and Police Science, IL (1958), 296-302.

According to this information, most people fit their behavior into the middle area of tolerable "law-abiding law-breaking" behavior.





²⁸ Source: Adapted from George A. Lundberg, Clarence C. Schrag, and Otto N. Larsen, <u>Sociology</u> (New York, 1958), p. 349.

To the left of this tolerable area is disapproved behavior (criminal); however, to the right, this formulation shows approved deviations. Approved deviations, according to this continuum, exceed the standards set by the group and include at the extreme some 2 or 3 per cent of the people who more than conform to standards of the group and who are given public recognition for their overconformity. According to modern criminology, the ideal standards for behavior would be at the extreme right, would constitute virtual perfection, and would be attained practically by almost no one. Everyone except the 2 or 3 per cent on the right side would be "deviants", or "criminal."²⁹

Current criminological research is often based on a deviant-ideal continuum. For example, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck in their much discussed book, <u>Unraveling Juvenile</u> <u>Delinquency</u>, use this continuum in their comparison of delinquent children (area A) with near-perfect children (area G).³⁰ To make this comparison, the Gluecks matched 500 correctional school boys with 500 boys of exemplary behavior who had identical ages, intelligence, and social backgrounds. Not only were these control boys without any police, court, or correctional-school record, but 74 per cent were without any known delinquency of even a

30 Glueck, op. cit.

²⁹ For a complete description of this continuum, see <u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 339-375.

minor nature. The Gluecks had difficulty in finding 500 such overly good boys, and eventually had to include a few boys guilty of such misbehavior as smoking in early years, hopping trucks, once or twice swiping much desired articles from department stores, crap shooting, disobeying parents, and sneaking into movies. Most of the deficiences were very trivial and had occurred when the boys were seven or eight years old. The Gluecks, then, were comparing boys from area A, the most seriously underconforming, with boys from area G, the near-perfect overconforming. Their findings report that whereas the delinquents tended to be active, aggressive, impulsive, and rebellious, the control group of "normal boys" tended to be neurotic, fearful of failure or defeat, and submissive to authority.

Actually, it seems very doubtful whether so much admiration is really accorded the overconforming group as most criminologists state or imply. The good behavior and achievements that are rewarded by society seem much more likely to be in area D or E (tolerable limits) than in areas F or G (overconforming deviations). Cavan argues that the distribution of this admiration can be seen by a consideration of the descriptive terms and epithets used to describe the behavior of the boys falling into

each of the areas:³¹

Boys in area A are often referred to as little savages, hoodlums, punks, bums, or gangsters--not very complimentary terms. But boys in area G also are not complimented; they are often referred to as sissies, goody-goods, teacher's pet, drips, brains, fraidy-cats, wet blankets, or squares. Adults and youth alike admire the boys in area D, who are essentially conforming but not rigidly so. The area D youth is "all boy," or the all-American boy; he can take care of himself; he is ambitious; he can hold his own with the best of them; he is a good sport. A little later, in college, me makes a "gentleman's C." He may occasionally borrow small things that he needs and forget to return them, truant off and on but not enough to damage his school record, cheat on tests in subjects that he doesn't like, mark up the walks and walls of a rival high school, do some property damage under the stress of excitement, outwork and outsmart his rivals, lie for his own advantage, and occasionally sass his parents and neglect his home chores. But he stays within the tolerance limits; he is developing, even in misbehavior, traits that will help him fit into the adult competitive D pattern of behavior; he is moving toward the social expectations for his future as an adult.

Cavan contends that overconformity is fully as deviant as underconformity, but in the opposite direction. Youths who fall into areas C and E are regarded as members of the social institutions and groups that control area D. They are considered to be "one of ours," erring a little, but to be brought back into the group, disciplined if need be, and forgiven. Overconformers are urged to get into the swing of things, to enjoy themselves, and not to interfere with other people's fun. Youths who fall into areas B and F are felt to be

31 Cavan, 1964, p. 22

marginal deviants. The underconformers are warned or arrested by the police, but not referred to the juvenile courts. Overconformers are socially ostracized, ignored in invitations to parties, and excluded from membership in many groups because it is felt that they hamper activities. The predominant attitude toward these youths is one of reclamation; that is, those people in area D try to encourage those youths in areas B and F to engage in "normal" activities. Those youths in areas A and G are the "real" deviants. Underconformers may be expelled from schools, or may be committed to a correctional institution. Overconformers are socially ostracized and even, at times, held to be in violation of the law (for example, certain religious zealots have been committed to correctional institutions for refusing to serve in the armed forces.)

Characteristics of stages of continuity in behavior ³²	Area A - Extreme underconformity Area B - Moderate underconformity Area C - Minor underconformity Area D - Normal conformity Area E - Minor overconformity Area F - Moderate everconformity Area G - Extreme everconformity	Area A - Condemnation; "hard core" Area B - Disapproval Area C - Toleration without approval Area D - Toleration with approval Area F - Disration without approval Area F - Disapproval Area G - Condemnation	Area A - Rejection; school expulsion; commitment to correctional school Area B - Police varnings; school suspension; referral to social agency Area C - Maciplinary action by school or parent Area D - Indifference; acceptance; mild reproofs Area E - Ignoring Area F - Ostracising Area G - Rejection
Table I:			
	Areas	Public Attitude:	Public Reaction:

Table I (Continued)	Area A - Rejection of values of D Area B - Wavering between acceptance and rejection of D values Area C - Acceptance of values of D; feelings of guilt Area D - Acceptance of values of D; no guilt feelings Area E - No deviation in personal conduct Area F - Criticism of behavior in others Area G - Rejection of D values	Area A - As delinquent, outlaw Area B - Confused, marginal to C and A Area C - As misbehaving nondelinquent Area D - As a conforming nondelinquent Area E - As a true conformer Area F - Better than others Area G - His way is the only right way	<pre>Area A - Armed robbery; burglary; rape; serious ser deviations; drug addiction drug addiction Area B - Larcency of valuables; promiscuity; minor sex deviation occasional use of drugs Area C - "Borrowing" and keeping; pilfering; extensive normal s relations; smoking of marihuana Area D - Minor pilfering; unauthorised borrowing; minor normal a relations; petting; amoking tobaccoo</pre>
	Ghild's Attitude toward public:	Child's self-concept:	Examples:

-22-

(Continued)
н
Table

Examples: (Cont.)

- Area E = Borrowing only with permission; sex relations only in marriage; no petting; no smoking Area F = Extreme care not to use other's possessions; criticism of others; restrained, even in marriage; no stimulating drinks, even though
 - bitm
 - Area G Report even minor pilfering to teacher or police; celibracy as philosophy; opposition to use of stimulants by others

32 Sources Ibida, p. 20.

SUMMARY

Throughout recorded history, man has sought to explain and understand social deviation. His explanations for this deviation can be grouped under three orientations: biological, psychological, and sociological. All of these orientations are based on three common premises: first, deviancy is the result of a malfunctioning in the individual and/or in the society; second, the deviant is the critical variable for the analysis of deviant behavior; and third, human behavior can be described in terms of a continuum ranging from deviant behavior through tolerated behavior to ideal behavior (most people fall between the two rare extremes).

This chapter has suggested that these basic premises need not be upheld; in fact, the support of these premises might be detrimental to the complete understanding of social deviancy. First, social deviancy need not be the result of a malfunctioning individual or group, but merely the overt expression of a boundary maintenance function in an organized group. Second, social deviancy need not be analyzed via the social deviant, but might be analyzed via the social audience (either rule makers or rule enforcers). Third, human behavior can be described in terms of a continuum ranging from disapproved underconformity through normal behavior to disapproved overconformity.

CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY

In her Presidential Address to the Midwest Sociological Society in 1961.¹ Ruth Shone Cavan introduced her hypothetical formulation of a behavior continuum. At that time, she presented three basic hypotheses which had not yet been submitted to empirical testing. The hypotheses were as follows: 1) behavior may be placed on a continuum running from an underconforming contraculture through various degrees of disapproved behavior to normal conformity and then through stages of overconforming behavior to an overconforming contraculture; 2) the reaction of the normally conforming segment of the population to deviations varies in severity according to the threat posed to the social norms by either under- or overconformity; 3) minor deviants usually are drawn back into conformity, but serious deviants often are treated so severely that they are alienated and withdraw into a contraculture. The purpose of this thesis is to empirically examine Cavan's hypothetical formulations.

¹ Ruth Cavan, "The Concepts of Tolerance and Contraculture as applied to Delinquency," <u>Sociological</u> Quarterly, II (1961) 243-258.
EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE OF A BEHAVIOR CONTINUUM

Cavan's premise that human behavior can be placed on a continuum ranging from strict adherence to the legal code to serious violations of that code can be supported by empirical research. Most of this research has been identified as an effort to examine the extent of unrecorded crimes and juvenile delinguencies.

Porterfield demonstrated the utility of a behavioral continuum in reference to juvenile delinquencies.² Porterfield analyzed 2049 cases brought before the Fort Worth Juvenile Court and compared their records with the admitted delinquencies of a group of 337 college students, composed of 200 men and 137 women. Offenses of the college students were obtained in answer to a questionnaire presented personally and returned anonymously. 100% of both the college men and women admitted precollege offenses.

-26-

² Austin Porterfield, Youth in Trouble (Fort Worth, 1946).

and	þe
	5
8	2
2	
	6 •
Ite	
uder	t T T
te e	Toq
1.02	2 •
100	Itag
	1901
Ē	8.
Б т	th
Ť,	and
Dale	Ê
Con	2
G	60L
6	
	3
	5 5 1 1 1
Ę	
Ä	ភ្នំដ
H	
H	
Tabl	

	Percen	itage Ro-						
anors	portene More o Offene	if the or	Mumb Pers	er of one	F 20	otal enses	Offe Aver	
	Male	<u>Fenalo</u>	Male	Fenale	Male	<u>Fendle</u>	Male	Jenal
Freshmen	100.0	100.0	25	35	61.7	203	19.2	3.6
Sophomore	100.0	100.0	17	ಜ	307	6	16.1	4.4
Juniors	100.0	100.0	28	33	7 67	229	17.7	6•9
Sentors	100.0	100.0	56	26	432	รัก	16.5	4.8
Graduates	100.0		4	ł	5	ł	11.2	
Atheletes	100.0	100.0	54	23	954	121	23.3	5.4
Class Officers	100.0	100.0	78	2	723	121	17.0	5.5
Honor Students	100.0	100.0	4	16	717	418	18.0	4.6
Musicians	100.0	100.0	6	16	151	\$	16.8	4.9
Ministerial								
students	100.0		31	ł	412	1	13.4	ł
Family Income								
Below \$500	100.0	100.0	m	2	45	9	15.0	3•0
\$ 500 - \$ 999	100.0	100.0	5	5	247	8	16.5	3.9
\$1000 - \$1499	100.0	100.0	ส	8	345	ระก	16.4	4.6
\$1500 - \$1999	100.0	100.0	11	21	2 93	æ	17.2	2.9
\$2000 - \$2499	100.0	100.0	ร	25	398	123	19.0	4.7
\$2500 and over	100.0	100.0	19	4	328	80	17.0	7.3

³ Sources Ibide, p. 39.

As Table II shows, these students represented a cross section of all college classes and all economic groups. The offenses themselves were as serious as those committed by the cases referred to the court but, apparently, were not as numerous. Porterfield concluded that some of the college students were as delinquent as the juvenile court cases, but society had not seen fit to bring the former into court.⁴

The Cambridge-Somerville Study in Massachusetts gives additional credence to this point of view.⁵ This study covered material secured through case workers in a delinquency prevention project. The social workers had contacts with sixty-one boys who were never brought to court and forty whose offenses were registered with the court. These boys had committed 6416 offenses, only ninety-five (1.5 percent of total) of which had ever received official court action. Approximately 1400 were infractions of city ordinances none of which resulted in a court complaint; 4400 were minor offenses and only twenty-seven or 0.6 percent were prosecuted. Of 616 serious offenses, sixty-eight (11 percent) were punished. The study concludes that most juvenile offenses, apparently, tend to be hidden and that most

4 Ibid., Chapter 2.

⁵ Fred Murphy, Mary Shirley, and Helen Witmer, "The Incidence of Hidden Delinquency," <u>American Journal of</u> <u>Orthopsychiatry</u>, XVI (October, 1946), 686-696.

-28-

boys commit some juvenile offenses.⁶

Impressed by the above findings, James Wallerstein and Clement Wyle of the Randen Foundation in New York City devised a questionnaire listing forty-nine offenses covered by the categories given below.⁷ The questionnaire was submitted to 1020 men and 678 women representing a cross section of the population and a balanced proportion of social religious groups in the metropolitan area of New York City. These persons were asked to indicate whether or not they had committed any of the offenses in the following categories: malicious mischief; disorderly conduct; assault; auto misdemeanors; health law violations; indecency; gambling; larcency; burglary and possession of burglar's tools; robbery and illegal possession of firearms; bribery; falsification and fraud; election frauds; tax evasion; coercion and extortion; conspiracy and compounding a crime; and criminal libel. (Murder was not included in the categories.)⁸

Answers to the questionnaires indicated that 91 percent of the respondents admitted that they had committed offenses after they were sixteen years old. The average number of offenses committed in adult life was 18 for all

^{6 &}lt;u>Ibid</u>., pp. 695-696.

^{&#}x27;James Wallerstein and Clement Wyle, "Our Law-Abiding Law-Breakers," <u>National Probation</u>, (April, 1947), pp. 107-112.

⁸ <u>Ibid</u>., p. 109.

men respondents with a range of 8.2 for ministers to 20.2 for laborers and 11 for all women respondents with a range of 9.8 for laborers to $1!_{\mu}.!_{\mu}$ for those in military and government work. Wallerstein and Wyle conclude that a sizeable proportion of adults are "law-abiding lawbreakers."⁹

More recently, Short and Nye compared the confessed

Table III: Percentage of 1020 men and 678 women committing specific offenses in New York City.¹⁰

Offense	Percent Men	Percent Women
Malicious mischief	84	81
Disorderly conduct	85	76
Assault	49	5
Auto misdemeanors	61	30
Indecency	77	71
Gambling	71	54
Larcency	89	83
Grand larcency (except auto)	13	n
Auto theft	26	
Burglary	17	Ă
Robbery	11	ī
Concealed weapons	35	3
Perjury	23	17
Falsification and fraud	46	34
Election frauds	7	7
Tax evasion	57	μÖ
Coercion	16	-6
Conspiracy	23	ž
Criminal libel	36	29

^{9 &}lt;u>Ibid</u>., pp. 111-112

¹⁰ Source: <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 110.

misbehavior of 2350 public high school students with that of 320 state training school students.¹¹ Questionnaires, consisting of twenty-one items of legal delinquencies translated into language more understandable to adolescents, were anonymously filled out by the two samples. From the initial twenty-one item delinquency check list, nine items were selected for scaling on the criteria that (1) the items might measure a common dimension and (2) the offenses were committed by an appreciable proportion of the respondents. The nine items included: driven a car without a driver's license or permit: taken little things (worth less than \$2) that did not belong to you; bought or drank beer, wine or liquor (include drinking at home); purposely damaged or destroyed public or private property that did not belong to you; skipped school without a legitimate excuse: had sex relations with a person of the opposite sex; defied parents! authority to their face; run away from home; and taken things of medium value (between \$2 and \$50).¹² Analysis of the completed questionnaires revealed that every offense on the list was checked by

¹¹ James Short and Ivan Nye, "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior," <u>Social Problems</u>, V (Winter, 1957-58), 208-213; "Extent of Unrecorded Juvenile Delinquency: Tentative Conclusions," <u>Journal</u> of <u>Criminal Law</u>, IL (November-December, 1958), 296-302; and "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," <u>American Sociological</u> <u>Review</u>, XXII (June, 1957), 326-341.

¹² Ibid., 1957-58, pp. 208-213.

some high school boys and girls, although often only a few. A much higher percentage of the training school boys and girls checked offenses, and admitted repetition of the offenses. Short and Nye conclude that twenty-two percent of the training school students are less delinquent than ten percent of the public high school students.¹³

In short, the above researches hypothesize and empirically demonstrate that human behavior can be placed on a continuum ranging from strict adherence to criminal codes to serious violations of the codes. Furthermore, most human behavior falls between these two extremes.

HYPOTHESES

One example of the behavior continuum is the "honesty" continuum. This continuum would range from armed robbery, burglary, and auto theft at one extreme through petty theft and cheating on income tax returns through minor cheating and unauthorized borrowing through borrowing only with permission and critism of minor pilfering to the reporting of even minor pilfering to authorities at the other extreme.

There are two interpretations of such a continuum. The first interpretation is the traditional interpretation: the extreme represented by armed robbery is interpreted as disapproved deviation with the resulting public condemnation; the center area is interpreted as the area of tolerable behavior; and the opposite extreme

13 Ibid., June, 1957, p. 330.

-32-

is interpreted as approved deviation or idealized behavior. In short, the traditional viewpoint interprets the honesty continuum as ranging from dishonesty at one extreme through "tolerable dishonesty" to honesty at the other extreme.¹⁴ The second interpretation, stemming, from the work of Cavan,¹⁵ asserts that this continuum would range from deviant underconformity through normal conformity to deviant overconformity. Consequently, the public reaction to behaviors at either extreme would be condemnation or disapproval, and the public reaction to behavior between these two areas would be approval. In short, Cavan's interpretation argues that the honesty continuum ranges from dishonesty through honesty to "overhonesty." Table IV summarizes the traditional interpretation and its comparison with Cavan's interpretation of the honesty continuum.

¹⁴ See Chapter I, pp. 9-17.

¹⁵ See Chapter I, pp. 11-17.

Overt Behavior	Area A - Armed robbery; burglary Area B - Larcency of valuables
	Area C - "Borrowing" and keeping; pilfering Area D - Minor pilfering; unauthorised borrowing Area E - Borrowing only with permission Area F - Extreme care not to use other's possessions; oriticism of Area G - Report even minor pilfering to authorities
Traditional Interpretation:	
Behavioral Continuus	Area A Lamproved deviations; dishonesty Area C Tolerance limits; Area D tolerance limits; Area F Approved deviations; honesty Area G Approved deviations; honesty
Public Attitudes	Area A - Condemnation Area B - Disapproval Area C Area E approval Area F - Approval Area G - Idealised
Cavan's Interpretation:	
Behavioral Continuum	Area A C Area B C Extreme underconformity; dishonesty Area C - Minor underconformity; tolerable dishonesty

Table IV: Honesty continuum with characteristics of stages according to the traditional interpretation and to Cavan's interpretation¹⁶

-34-

Area D - Normal conformity; honesty Area E - Minor overconformity; tolerable "overhonesty" Area F T Extreme overconformity; "overhonesty" Area G L Area E - Tolerance without approval Area F - Disapproval Area C - Tolerance without approval Area D - Tolerance with approval Table IV (Continued) Area A - Condemnation Area B - Disapproval Area G - Condemnation Behavioral Continuum (Cont.) Public Attitudes

¹⁶ Table IV is a modification of Ruth Cavan, Readings in Juvenile Delinquency, (New York, 1964), p. 20; and Lundberg, ep. eit., p. 349.

Utilizing Cavan's formulation of the honesty continuum, it is hypothesized that:

HYPOTHESIS I: The normally conforming segment of the late adolescent population reacts unfavorably both to underconformity (dishonesty) and to overconformity (overhonesty).

Furthermore, Cavan theorizes that because of the greater severity of the potential threat to the existing social norms at the extremes on the behavioral continuum, it would be expected that the severity of the reactions to deviations would increase as one moves from area C on the behavioral continuum through area A.¹⁷ Because over-conformity, as well as underconformity, represents a threat to the existing social norms, it would be expected that the severity of reactions to social deviancy would increase as one moves from area G. Thus it is hypothesized that:

HYPOTHESIS II: The reaction of the normally conforming segments of the late adolescent population to deviations varies in severity according to the degree of either overconformity or underconformity.

The foregoing hypotheses rest on the contention that

¹⁷ Cavan, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., pp. 18-26.

a characteristic of adolescence is the immense importance of the opinions of the peer group for the adolescents.¹⁸ Most research findings suggest that the peer group dominates the adolescent's thinking and his behavior. Most social scientists argue that adolescents are essentially conservative where their own age mates are concerned: that is, adolescents conform both to the opinions and to the appearances of other adolescents regardless of their departure from adult standards of conduct, dress, or acceptance of values. It is argued that the motto of the peer group (adolescent) reads: "One just doesn't do that."¹⁹ For example, if miniskirts, and bleached straight hair are generally worn by adolescent girls, then the girl who wishes to escape the opprobrium of being "different" must wear these styles of fashion; or if long-hair is the latest fad for teenage boys, then this haircut must be adopted by any adolescent boy who wishes to be completely accepted by his peers. If by some chance the adolescent is prevented by the parents from following the ways of the agemates, the

19 Josselyn, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 39.

¹⁸ See John Horrocks, <u>Psychology of Adolescence</u> (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 86-128; L. Joseph Stone, and Joseph Church, <u>Childhood and Adolescence</u> (New York, 1957), pp. 281-294; James Bossard and Eleanor Boll, <u>The Sociology</u> of <u>Child Development</u> (New York, 1966), pp. 365-422; Irene Josselyn, <u>The Adolescent And His World</u> (New York, 1952); James Coleman, <u>The Adolescent Society</u> (New York, 1961); and H. H. Remmers and D. H. Radler, <u>The American Teenager</u> (New York, 1957).

adolescent is faced with a most embarrassing situation against which she or he is sure to struggle more or less overtly. To an adolescent the fact that "the other kids are doing it" is the most cogent and overpowering reason for doing a thing, and parents will alienate their sons and daughters by refusing to agree. In short, these theorists argue that the adolescent peer group has iron control of its members.

An opposing viewpoint is presented by Coleman²⁰ and Remmers and Radler.²¹ Coleman contends that adolescents are not oriented solely to one another; yet the pulls are extremely strong, as the responses in Table V suggest. Remmers and Radler attempted to determine the social

Table V: Percentage of males and females responding to the following question: Which one of these things would be the hardest for you to take -- your parents' disapproval, your teacher's disapproval, or breaking with your friends?²²

	Boys	GIFIS
Parents: Disapproval Teacher:s Disapproval Breaking with Friend	53.8% 3.5% 42.7%	52.9% 2.7% 43.4%
Number of Cases	(3621)	(3894)

orientation of the American Adolescent. Their questions

20 Coleman, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., pp. 1-57.

²¹ Remmers, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., pp. 178-237.

22 Source: Adapted from Coleman, op. cit., p. 5.

set up a number of hypothetical situations and then asked whose opinions or feelings the students considered more important in each situation: people their own age. parents or people of their parents's age, or neither age group. An analysis of the results, summarized in Table VI, suggest that the typical adolescent is responsive to the feelings and opinions of his peers on such questions as what to wear to a party, what club to join, how to act with the gang, and personal grooming. On the other hand, he is sensitive to the feelings and opinions of his parents and other adults about his political feelings, about how to spend his money, and about his personal problems or troub-In other words, adolescents are responsive to the les. pressures of the peer group with regard to some aspects of behavior; but in other areas of behavior, they are more responsive to adult standards.

-39-

Orandana	People their	Parents or people their	Neither One is more im-
4005110115	own are	<u>ago</u>	portent
What to wear to a	party:		
Males	69%	19%	12%
Tenalos	75%	15%	10%
Total	72%	17%	11\$
How you feel about	t people of other	races or nations	lities:
Males	31%	33%	36%
Tenales	28%	32%	39%
Total	30%	32%	38%
Your political fe	elings:		
Males	23%	545	23%
Tenales	19%	55%	26%
Total	21%	54\$	25%
How you spend you	r money:		-
Males	35%	45%	20%
Femalos	26%	53%	21%
Total	31\$	49%	20%
Clubs you join:	4		
Males	65%	20%	15%
Females	63%	25%	12%
Total	64,%	22%	14%
How to act when o	out with the gang:		4
Males	60%	25%	15%
Temales	54%	33%	13%
Total	57%	29%	145
Advice on persons	l problems or trou	bles:	
Males	16%	74,5	10%
Tenales	17%	76%	77.
Total	16%	75%	9%
Personal grooming	(how to comb your	hair, how to dr	ess, etc.):
Males	61%	18%	21%
Females	55%	25%	20%
Total	58%	21%	21%

Table VI: Whose advice do adolescents take?²³

23 Source: Adapted from Remmers, op. cit., pp. 234-235.

In as much as honesty seems to be more closely related to those questions on which the adolescents where more responsive to the pressures of parents, it is hypothesized that:

HYPOTHESIS III: Adolescents will tend to name parents as those most concerned with their observance of rules of honesty.

METHODOLOGY

This section is concerned with the characteristics of the sample, the techniques of gathering the data, and the definitions of terms.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

Cavan theorizes that each social class or other large subcultural group has its own definition of what behavior falls into the area of tolerance, what behavior is mildly disapproved, and what behavior is condemned.²⁴ Even when these groups share a basic culture and verbally accept the social norms, their concepts of approved and disapproved behavior may differ. An example of this discrepancy at the left hand extreme of the continuum is the case of the father whose son was in a correctional school for taking a car for joy riding. The father said, "Of course, he took a few cars, but he did not strip them; he just wanted to use them. He is not a bad boy." But in the eyes of the judge, the boy had stolen the cars.

²¹ Cavan, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 27.

An example of this discrepancy at the right hand extreme of the continuum is the case of attitudes toward petting in the lower-class and in the middle-class adolescents: some middle-class groups regard petting as an acceptable

Figure III: Discrepancies between lower-class and middle-class evaluations of identical behavior²⁵

Lower Class Evaluation:

A B C D E F G

A B C D E F G

Middle Class Evaluation:

substitute for premarital intercourse, but the lowerclass would regard this replacement as prudish overconformity. This attitudinal discrepancy would be reflected in the area of honesty. In as much as this hypothesis was not to be tested in this research, the sample was drawn to reflect a homogeneous grouping; however, the homogeneous sample limits the number of important variables which can be employed in the analysis of the data.

The sample for this research consists of all single freshmen enrolled in a large section of a sociology class at Michigan State University who reported no prior conviction record and who were under twenty years of

25 Source: Adapted from Ibid., p. 28.

age.²⁶ All the students in this class filled out the questionnaire (n = 197), but only 49 females and 21 males who fit the above characteristics were included in the final sample. The following individuals were excluded from the final sample: 104 non-freshmen, 48 sophomores, 21 juniors, and 35 seniors; 18 persons older than nineteen years of age, 10 twenty years old, 6 twenty-one years old, and 2 twenty-two years or older; 4 married persons; and 1 individual who confessed to all possible crimes. Table VII indicates that there are no significant differences between the final sample and the class sample for most major social variable; the only exception were college class, age, and marital status differentials.

The majority of the respondents are 18-19 years old, white single college freshmen whose parents were born in the United States. About 50% of the respondents are Protestant, 20% Catholic, 20% Jewish, and approximately 10% report no religious affiliation; furthermore,

²⁶ Also rejected those questionnaires which confessed to all possible crimes and those filled out in a haphazard manner. See questions 16-29 on questionnaire in particular.

Characteristic	Class <u>Number</u>	Percentage	Sample <u>Number</u>	Utilised <u>Percentare</u>
College Class:				
Freshman	93	47.2	70	100.0
Sophomore	48	24.4		
Junior	21	10.7		
Senior	35	17.8		
Sex:				
Male	64	32.5	21	30.0
Fenale	133	67.5	49	70.0
Religion:				
Protestant	93	47.2	34	48.6
Catholic	39	19.8	14	20.0
Jewish	35	17.8	13	18.6
None	30	15.2	9	12.9
Church Attendance:				
Weekly	73	37.1	26	37.1
Monthly	23	11.7	9	12.9
Less than monthly	55	27.9	18	25.7
Never	46	23.4	17	24.3
Subject-Parent Religion:				
Same	175	55,5	62	88.6
Different	22	11.2	8	11.4
Age:				
17	1	•5	1	1.4
18	41	20.9	40	57.1
19	58	29.4	29	41.5
20	32	16.2		
21	31	15.7		
22 or older	34	17.3		
Marital Status:				
Single	158	80.2	70	100.0
Married	34	17.3		
Divorced	4	2.0		
Widow or widower	1	•5		
Race:				
White	195	99.0	70	100.0
Negro	2	1.0		

Table VII: Social characteristics of college class and sample

Table VII (Continued)

	<u>Characteristic</u>	Class <u>Humber</u>	Percentage	Sample <u>Number</u>	Utilized Percentage
Home	Community:				
	Rural	23	11.7	. 9	12.9
	Small town	30	15.2	11	15.7
	Small city	7	3.6	3	4.3
	Large city	35	17.8	12	17.1
	Very large city	38	19.3	13	18.6
	Suburb	64	32.5	22	31.4
Clas	s Identification:				
	Lower class	2	1.0		
	Working class	13	6.6	5	7.1
	Middle class	175	88.2	62	85.6
	Upper class	7	3.6	3	4.3
Fath	er's Occupation:				
	Professional and				
	large business	55	27.9	19	27.1
	White collar and				
	small business	109	55.3	39	55.7
	Skilled manual labor	29	14.7	10	14.3
	Other	4	2.0	2	2.9
Fath	er's Education:				
	Grade school graduate	5	2.5	3	4.3
	Some high school	22	11.2	9	12.9
	High school graduate	34	17.3	12	17.1
	Some college	71	36.0	22	31.4
	College graduate	41	20.9	15	21.4
	Post-graduate	24	12.2	9	12.9
Poli	ce Contact:				
	None	115	58.4	40	57.1
	Minor	72	36.5	26	37.1
	Serious, informal Serious, formal	10	5.1	4	5.7

about 90% of the sample hold the same religious faith as do their parents. 40% of the sample attend church at least once a month, while 25% of the sampe never attend church. The majority of these students are dependent upon their fathers for support. and the majority of these fathers are white collar. small business, or professional workers. 66% of the fathers has at least attended college, and 96% of the fathers had at least attended high school. About half of the respondents report no "official" contacts with law enforcement agencies, and a majority of those who report contact have had contact only because of minor infractions (traffic violations). Only four respondents had had official contact with police because of major offenses (theft, illegal use of alcohol, and disorderly conduct) but formal charges were never pressed.

TECHNIQUE OF GATHERING DATA

There are several methods of obtaining desired information from populations. Because of the advantages associated with the use of a written questionnaire as compared to interviewing or direct observation, this method was utilized for this research. The primary advantage is the reduction of the bias-viewpoint effect;²⁷ that is, this technique gives the respondent

-46-

²⁷ Matilda Riley, <u>Sociological Research</u> (New York, 1963), pp. 166-194.

a sense of privacy and thus the respondent will often report more freely.

The questionnaire consists of four sections. Section I, questions 1 to 13, was utilized to gather information on the social characteristics of the respondents. This section was modeled after a questionnaire developed by Vener and Smucker and one utilized by Maddox and Mc Call.²⁹ The questionnaire was further refined according to the rules of questionnaire-development outlined in Goode and Hatt. Information secured in this section includes: college class, age, sex, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, race, parents! birth place, residence, education and occupation of father, and prior criminal record. Occupational information was coded according to Center's Occupational Index.³¹

Section II, questions 14 and 15, was intended to identify significant others in relation to the honesty

²⁸ Arthur Vener and Orden Smucker, <u>A Study of Social</u> <u>Rules and Regulations</u>, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

²⁹ George Maddox and Bevode McCall, Drinking Among Teen-Agers (New Brunswich, 1964).

³⁰ William Goode and Paul Hatt, <u>Methods in Social</u> <u>Research</u> (New York, 1952).

³¹ Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Class, (Princeton, 1949), pp. 48-51; and Bernard Barber, Social Stratification (New York, 1957), 173-175.

of the respondents; that is, this part was used to identify those people the respondents feel are most concerned about the respondents: honesty and whose concern is important to the respondent; this section was also used to identify the relationship existing between those named as significant others and the respondents. The following two questions were employed to accomplish this task:

Research has found that everyone is concerned about the way others feel toward him. Some peoples' opinions about you are very important to you, while other peoples' opinions are not as important. Below you are asked to list the names of those people MOST IMPORTANT to you.

1/1) Name those people most important in your life. Name How is this person related to you?

15) Name those persons you feel are most concerned about how well you obey rules and regulations of honesty. Name How is this person related to you?

This technique is a modified form of one utilized by Brookover and others in the study of significant others in the learning situation of high school students.³²

Section III, questions 16 to 29, was adopted from

³² Wilbur Brookover, Ann Paterson, and Shailer Thomas, "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement," U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project #845, (East Lansing, 1962); Wilbur Brookover, Jean LePere, Don Hamachek, Shailer Thomas, Edsel Erickson, "Improving Academic Achievement Through Students' Self-Concept Enhancement," U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project #1636, (East Lansing 1965); and Wilbur Brookover, Don Hamachek, and Edsel Erickson, "Relationship of Self-Concept to Achievement in High School." U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project #2831, (East Lansing, 1966).

of the respondents; that is, this part was used to identify those people the respondents feel are most concerned about the respondents' honesty and whose concern is important to the respondent; this section was also used to identify the relationship existing between those named as significant others and the respondents. The following two questions were employed to accomplish this task:

Research has found that everyone is concerned about the way others feel toward him. Some peoples' opinions about you are very important to you, while other peoples' opinions are not as important. Below you are asked to list the names of those people MOST IMPORTANT to you.

1/1) Name those people most important in your life. Name How is this person related to you?

15) Name those persons you feel are most concerned about how well you obey rules and regulations of honesty. Name How is this person related to you?

This technique is a modified form of one utilized by Brookover and others in the study of significant others in the learning situation of high school students.³²

Section III, questions 16 to 29, was adopted from

³² Wilbur Brookover, Ann Paterson, and Shailer Thomas, "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement," U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project #845, (East Lansing, 1962); Wilbur Brookover, Jean LePere, Don Hamachek, Shailer Thomas, Edsel Erickson, "Improving Academic Achievement Through Students' Self-Concept Enhancement," U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project #1636, (East Lansing 1965); and Wilbur Brookover, Don Hamachek, and Edsel Erickson, "Relationship of Self-Concept to Achievement in High School." U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project #2831, (East Lansing, 1966).

a juvenile delinquency scale formulated by Short and Nye.³³ This scale distributes the respondents on a continuum ranging from low delinquency to high delinquency. Table VIII outlines the scale of delinquency, In addition to the scale of delinquency, three questions

Table VIII: Scale of juvenile delinquency as developed by Short and Nye³4

Scale	Code	<u>Offense</u> *
Scale 00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Code 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
16 17 18 19 20	3 3 3 3	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

*Offense numbers refer to the respective questions on the study questionnaire. On the Short and Nye scale, the offenses are numbered from 1 to 10.

questions were included to ascertain the degree of

33 Short and Nye, op cit. (Winter, 1957-58), p. 208. 34 Source: Ibid. overconformity on the part of the respondents.

In section IV, respondents were asked to indicate their reaction to fictitious persons in various stages of conformity to rules and laws pertaining to honesty as presented in five short stories. Question 30 was concerned with cheating: those who cheat, those who do not cheat, and those who report cheating. Question 31 was concerned with minor trespassing: those who would trespass, those who would not trespass, and those who would report minor trespassing. Questions 32 was concerned with petty theft: those who would steal small items, those who would not steal small items, and those who would report the theft of even small items to the authorities. Question 33 was concerned with burglary: those who break and enter with intent to commit theft, those who would not, and those who would report this activity to the police. Question 34 was concerned with auto theft: those who would steal a car, those who would not steal a car, and those who would report auto theft to the police. Table IX summarizes the characteristics of the actors in these stories.

PRETEST

An initial questionnaire was constructed, and administered as a pretest to high school senior classes in the Lansing area. This original questionnaire was similar to the one utilized in this research except for

-50-

the last section; that is, the original questionnaire utilized a revised version of the Bogardus Ethnic Distance Scale.³⁵ In this social distance scale, the respondent is presented a list of questions which give him an opportunity to declare his desired social distance toward his sterotype of a category of individuals. The types of statements he is to respond to either negatively or positively with respect to each category of individuals are as follows:

- 1. Would exclude from our town, if possible.
- 2. Would allow to live in my town, but would prefer in another section of town.
- 3. Would allow in my school, but prefer in other classes.
- 4. Would accept as classmates in my room at school.
- 5. Would allow in my social club.
- 6. Would accept in my home as a dinner guest.
- 7. Would like as a date, or a "special" personal friend.

It was apparent from the pretest that the social distance question needed to be made less ambiguous.

³⁵ Emory Bogardus, "Race Reactions by Sexes," Sociology and Social Research, XLIII (July-August, 1959), 439-441; and "Social Distance Changes in the United States During the Past Thirty Years," Sociology and Social Research, XLIII (November-December, 1958), 127-135.

Table IX:	Characteristics of overt behavior represented by
	fictitious persons in stories used in study

Actor	Overt Behavior Represented in Story
Story 30:	
Ed	Would not cheat, even though in trouble
Bill	Would initiate cheating to help himself
Glen	Would cheat to help friend
Joe	Would report cheating to teacher
Story 31:	
Dick	Would initiate minor trespassing
George	Would not engage in minor trespassing, and would not report those who would
Sam	Would not engage in minor trespassing, but would report those who would
Story 32:	
Dave	Would initiate "petty theft"
Tom and Jim	Would not engage in petty theft, but
	would utilize the stolen goods
Carl	Would not engage in petty theft, but would report petty theft to authorities
Story 33:	
Pete	Would not engage in burglary, and would report burglary to authorities
Earl	Would initiate burglary
Jack	Would not engage in burglary, and would not report those who did
Bruce	Would assist friend in burglary
Story 34:	
John	Would initiate auto theft
Bob	Would not assist in auto theft, and would report those who did to authorities
Larry	Would not assist in auto theft, and would not report these who did

Consequently, the social distance scale was replaced by the story-reaction technique.

After the questionnaire was revised, it was again administered to another sample of high school seniors at Pewamo-Westpalphia High School. Two versions of the story-reactions were used in this testing: one using open ended responses, and the other using structured responses. The analysis of this pretest indicated that not enough additional information was obtained from the open ended responses to warrant their use.

On the basis of the results of the pretests, a final draft of the questionnaire was developed.

When the scheduled administration of the questionnaire in Muskegon High School was cancelled,³⁶ the decision to utilize a sample of high school seniors was re-evaluated. It was decided that, since college freshmen are in the final stages of gaining their independence from their parents and are most susceptible to the influence of peers, a sample of college freshmen would be less likely than a sample of high school seniors to demonstrate the pervasive influence of their parents. Thus by utilizing a sample of college freshmen, the results would be the least likely to show the validity of Hypothesis III. In as much as the utilization of

-53-

³⁶ Scheduled testing in a high school in the Muskegon area cancelled due to possible effect on millage vote.

a college freshman sample rather than a high school senior sample would not drastically influence the results of Hypotheses I and II, the decision was made to use a sample of college freshmen.

As the samples used in the pre-tests of the questionnaires were high school seniors and the sample to be used in the final administration was college freshmen, the researcher retested the instrument using a small sample of college freshmen. The shortcomings revealed by this informal probing were taken into consideration in the final development of the instrument.

On the basis of the results of the pretests, a final draft of the questionnaire was developed and administered.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Adolescence: Adolescence is that period of life beginning with the pubescent growth spurt and ending with full social maturity. Adolescence is a social-cultural phenomenon (that stage of social life between childhood and adulthood); while pubescence (that physical period of about two years preceding puberty, and the physical changes occuring during that time) and puberty (that physical point of development at which the biological changes of pubescence reach a climax marked by the indicators of sexual maturity) are biological phenomenon; and juvenile (that age-level during which a youngster can be tried as a juvenile offendor: usually between the ages of ten and seventeen in America, but reaching as low as seven and as high as nineteen at times) is a legal concept. For the general purposes of this thesis, we need not concern ourselves with the specific delineation of particular boundaries for each of the above categories.

Juvenile delinquency: Delinquency is both a legal concept and a sociological concept. Delinquency as a legal concept refers to that behavior which the people of a state and their leaders believe to a threat to public safety or a hindrance to the best development of the child. and whose prohibition they have incorporated into law. Delinquency as a sociological concept refers to that behavior which people identify as delinquency and react to asdelinquency. The usual confusion surrounding this concept in criminological research and literature concerns the demarcation of behavioral acts as delinquent. This confusion is often the result of the failure to distinquish delinquency as a legal concept from delinquency as a sociological concept. The positions of this debate can be summarized as follows: some argue that the commission of an illegal act constitutes delinquency, others contend that an illegal act is delinquent only when it is brought to the attention of official agents,

other argue that delinquency occurs only when an offender is brought to the attention of the court, others argue that delinquency occurs only when an individual is adjudicated as a delinquent, and others contend that delinquency occurs only when an individual is labeled as a delinquent by society regardless of the individual's interaction with the legal system. This debate is of little concern for this particular thesis and will not be settled herein. However, this author maintains that the last position is the most fruitful sociologically.

Deviant Behavior: Deviant behavior is that behavior labelled by the social audience as an infraction of societal rules and regulations, and to which resulting sanctions and consequences are applied. In essence, the deviant is one to whom the deviant label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label.

Underconformity: Underconformity is an exaggeration of the tolerance allowed by the modal norms.

<u>Overconformity</u>: Overconformity is an exaggeration of the strict observance of formal social norms.37

-56-

³⁷ Values are ideals or ultimate goals. Social norms are the specific formulations to implement values. Modal norms are the practical, attainable formulations which tolerate some flexibility and minor deviations. For adequate functioning of society, a balance must be maintained between the rigid social norms and the more flexible modal behavior.

<u>Attitude</u>: Attitude refers to relatively enduring system of affective, evaluative reactions based upon and reflecting the evaluative concepts or beliefs which have been learned about the characteristics of a social object or class of social objects.³⁸ That is, an attitude is the positive, neutral, or negative feelings toward an object or class of objects. The attitude should always be distinguished from the overt behavior presumably related to it.

<u>Significant others</u>: Significant other is a person defined as important by an individual to that individual and whose expectations for behavior influence the behavior of that individual. Significant others operationally defined are those listed in answer to the following question: Name those persons you feel are most concerned about how well you obey rules and regulations of honesty.

Honesty: The character or quality of being honest; that is, not cheating, stealing, or lying.

³⁸ Marvin Shaw and Jack Wright, <u>Scales</u> for the <u>Measurement</u> of <u>Attitudes</u> (New York, 1967).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter will focus on the analysis of the findings of the research conducted for this study. Generally, the discussion will examine the reactions of the normally conforming adolescents to various degrees of conformity (underconformity - conformity overconformity). In addition, the discussion will also examine those who influence the adolescent's conformity to the rules and regulations of honesty.

ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERCONFORMITY AND OVERCONFORMITY

Hypothesis I asserts that the normally conforming segment of the late adolescent population reacts negatively both to underconformity (dishonesty) and to overconformity (overhonesty). Underconformity is an exaggeration of the tolerance allowed by modal norms. In terms of honesty, underconformity consists of those behavioral acts labeled as theft, cheating, or trespassing. Overconformity is also an exaggeration of the tolerance allowed by modal norms. In terms of honesty, overconformity consists of those behavioral acts such as strict adherence to the rules of honesty and "tattle-taling" on others. In short, hypothesis

-58-

I suggests that the normally conforming segment of the late adolescent population disapproves both of underconformity (not strict enough adherence to the rules of honesty) and of overconformity (too strict adherence to the rules of honesty).

If hypothesis I is valid, one would expect that the college freshman sample would express disapproval both of those fictitious persons representing dishonesty and of those persons representing overhonesty. The results of this study support this contention.

Table X reports a summary of the data pertaining to this hypothesis; that is, Table X shows the percentage of students in the college freshman sample who report approval or disapproval of behaviors reflecting various degrees of conformity to the modal norms of honesty. The table indicates that a majority of the students in the sample disapprove of those who engage in cheating, petty larcency, burglary, and auto theft. The table also shows that a majority of the students disapprove of those who report minor trespassing (swimming in a private lake), who report minor theft (stealing watermelons), or who report cheating. On the other hand, a majority of the students express approval of those who would report auto theft or burglary, and of those who would not engage in auto

-59-

theft, cheating, or trespassing. In short, the students in the college freshman sample expressed disapproval of underconforming behaviors and of overconforming behaviors; but they expressed approval of the conforming behaviors between these two extremes.

By arbitrarily assigning a numerical value to each attitudinal response (approval: 0: no opinion: 1: and disapproval: 2) and determining the median attitudinal values toward various degrees of conforming behaviors, these behaviors can then be ranked according to the magnitude of their median attitudinal values. The following behaviors received a median value of 2 (disapproval): auto theft, burglary, cheating, petty larcency, reporting minor trespassing, reporting minor theft, and reporting cheating. The following behaviors received a median attitudinal value of 0 (approval): reporting burglary, refusing to commit auto theft, neither committing nor reporting cheating, and neither committing nor reporting minor trespassing. As shown in Table X, one can identify some of the behaviors receiving a median score of 2 as underconformity and others as overconformity. Thus the placement of the underconforming behavior at the bottom of the table and the overconforming behavior at the top of the table results in a behavioral continuum similar to Cavan's hypothesized continuum.

By converting the data from tabular form (Table X)

-60-
				Attitudes	(m 70)		
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of <u>Conformity</u>	Approve Number	<u>l (0)</u> Percent	No Opin Number	ion (1) Percent	Di sappr Number	oval (2) Percent	<u>Median</u>
Reporting minor trespass- ing (Sam)	دی ا	4.3	Ŷ	12.9	58	82.9	N
Report minor theft (Carl)	0 9	11.4	10	14.3	52	74.3	N
Report cheating (Joe)	16	22.9	18	25.7	36	51.4	N
Report auto theft (Bob)	35	50.0	15	21.4	20	28.6	• 51
Report burglary (Pete)	54	77.1	J.	7.1	H	15.7	0
Neither commit nor report theft (Larry)	58	82.9	9	12.9	ŝ	4.3	0
Neither commit nor report cheating (Ed)	63	90.0	6	6 .6	ц	1.4	0

Table I:	
Number toward	
and percentage various degree	
of students in s of conformity	
college	
freshaan	
sample	
reporting	
attitudes	·

Table I (Continued)

				Attitudes (n	70)		
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	Approv	al (0) Percent	<u>No Opin</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>don (1)</u> Percent	<u>Disappi</u> Number	oval (2) Percent	Median
Meither commit nor report trespassing (George)	61	87.1	Q.	8.6	6	4.3	o
Meither commit nor report burglary (Jack)	15	21.4	26	37.1	5 3	41.4	-
Minor trespassing (Dick)	10	14.3	30	42.9	30	42.9	Ч
Utilise stolen property (Tim)	0	12.9	ส	17.1	49	70°0	લ
Aid others in cheating (Glen)	Ч	1.4	17	24.3	22	74.3	R
Petty larcency (Dave)	4	5.7	13	18.6	53	75.7	2
Cheating (Bill)	Я	2.9	10	14.3	58	82.9	N

Table I (Continued)

				Attitudes (n	70)		
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	<u>Approv</u> Number	al (0) <u>Percent</u>	<u>No Opini</u> <u>Number</u>	on (1) Percent	<u>Di sappr</u> Number	oval (2) Percent	Median
Aid in burglary (Bruce)	ŝ	7.1	o	0*0	65	92.9	5
Burglary (Earl)	2	2.9	O	0*0	68	1.79	8
Auto theft (Jehn)	O	0•0	0	0*0	70	100.0	8

into graphic format (Figure IV), the behavioral continuum based on the attitudinal responses toward the behaviors can more easily be identified. If the traditional behavioral continuum is the appropriate model. Figure IV should show a linear relationship. In other words, the social audience should predominately disapprove of those behavioral patterns reflecting underconformity; they should moderately disapprove of those behavioral patterns reflecting conformity; and they should predominately approve of overconformity. On the other hand, if Cavan's hypothetical behavioral continuum is the appropriate model, Figure IV should show a curvilinear relationship. That is, the social audience should express disapproval of underconforming behavior: they should approve of conforming behaviors; and they should express disapproval of overconforming behavior. The data in Figure IV support Cavan's rather than the traditional continuum. Focusing on the solid line graph in Figure IV which shows the extent of approval associated with each behavioral category this graph shows that those behavioral patterns at the top representing overconformity received only slight approval from the college freshman sample. Those behavioral patterns at the bottom representing underconformity also received only slight approval. However, those behavioral patterns in the center representing conformity received high approval. In short,





Approval _____

*Names are used in this graph rather than the complete description of each category. For a complete description of each category, see Tables IX and X. the college sample approved of conforming behaviors but disapproved of underconforming behaviors and overconforming behaviors. The broken line graph in Figure IV presents the reverse pattern. That is, disapproval is high at the extremes, and low in the center. In other words, the college sample expressed little disapproval for conformity, but expressed high disapproval for both underconformity and overconformity.

In summary, Hypothesis I suggests that the normally conforming segment of the late adolescent population reacts negatively both to underconformity and to overconformity. The data of this study supports this hypothesis.

SEVERITY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD

UNDERCONFORMITY AND OVERCONFORMITY

Hypothesis II asserts that the reaction of the normally conforming segment of the late adolescent population to deviations varies in severity according to the degree of either overconformity or underconformity. The data of this study support this hypothesis.

One measure of this relationship is the elaboration of the percentage of students who approve or who disapprove of various degrees of conformity. Thus if hypothesis II is valid, the percentage of students who disapprove of a particular behavior should increase as the degree of overconformity or underconformity of that

ample reporting	
freshman s	
XI: Number and percentage of male students in college 1	attitudes toward various degrees of conformity
rable	

	I				At	t1tudes	(12:a)				
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	Sti Appi	rong (C (App (rovel 1)	6 ×	No 2) &	а Д 4	approvel (3)	St Dise	rong (4)	Median
leporting minor trespassing (Sam)	0	0•0	0	0•0	ы	4.8	6	42.9	ਸ	52.4	4
leport minor theft (Carl)	0	0•0	Ч	4.8	Ч	4.8	6	6°27	0	47.6	m
Weport cheating Joe)	o	0•0	4	19.0	3	14.3	2	33•3	2	33•3	m
leport auto theft (Bob)	Ч	4.8	10	38.1	4	19.0	3	9.5	9	28.6	8
leport burglary (Pete)	Ч	4.8	13	61.9	Ч	4.8	3	14.3	n	14.3	ч
leither commit nor report uto theft (Larry)	100	38.1	100	38.1	ŝ	23.8	0	0°0	0	0•0	ч
ieither commit nor report theating (Id)	6	42.9	60	38.1	m	14.3	н	2 •7	0	0.0	ч

Continued
Ĵ.
Ħ
Table

					¥	titudes	(12=1)				
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity		rong 10Val 0)	d∎ ∎	lavorel (1)	fdo *	Ko 2) S	ar Dia	approvel (3)	Sti Disej	rong pproval (4)	Median
Meither commit nor report trespassing (George)	+	19.0	า	7.4	'n	9.5	0	0•0	• •	0•0	п
Meither commit nor report burglary (Jack)	o	0.0	ŝ	23.8	6	42.9	5	33•3	o	0•0	8
Minor trespassing (Dick)	0	0•0	4	19.0	ង	57.1	4	19•0	ч	4. 8	Ŋ
Utilise stolen property (Tom)	0	0•0	n	14.3	3	9.5	13	6 1 .9	ŝ	14.3	~
Aid others in cheating (Glen)	0	0•0	Ч	4.8	2	33.3	21	57.1	H	4 . 8	"
Petty larcency (Dave)	Ч	8 • 7	n	14.3	100	38.1	10	38,1	Ч	4.8	8
Cheating (Bill)	0	0•0	Ч	\$•†	9	28.6	10	47.6	-4	19.0	~

tinued
-
•
25
$\mathbf{\nabla}$
\sim
Ħ
•
-
· ~ .
- a

					At	itudes ((12 2 1)				
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	Sti Appi ((cong coval)) \$	App ()	Lavoral (I	ر بلوم (۱۹۹۵ ا	lo uton 2) &	Di se	pprovel (3) \$	St Dise	rong pproval (4)	Median
Aid in burglery (Bruce)	0	0•0	o	0°0	o	0•0	6	42.9	ង	57.1	4
Burglary (Earl)	N	9.5	o	0•0	o	0•0	t 0	38.1	ដ	52.4	4
Auto theft (John)	0	0•0	o	0*0	0	0•0	40	38.1	13	61.9	4

behavior increases. That is, as the degree of conformity of behavior increases, the percentage of students expressing approval of that behavior will increase; conversely, as the degree of unconformity of behavior increases, the percentage of students expressing disapproval of that behavior will increase.

Table XI reports the number and percentage of male students in the college freshman sample reporting attitudes toward various degrees of conformity. A majority of these students report strong disapproval of burglary and auto theft; they report disapproval of cheating and petty larcency; and they are somewhat neutral in their reaction to minor trespassing. These behaviors can be identified as underconformity or dishonesty. Thus as the degree of dishonesty increases. the severity of the disapproval to that dishonesty in the male college sample increases. On the other hand, a majority of these students express strong disapproval of those who would report minor trespassing, and disapproval of those who would report minor theft or cheating. These behaviors can be identified as overconformity or "overhonesty." Thus as the degree of "overhonesty" increases, the severity of the disapproval of the male college sample to that "overhonesty" increases. Between these two extremes, there is a range of conforming behaviors which receive approval from the male college sample: those who neither commit nor report cheating or minor

theft, and those who report auto theft or burglary. In short, Table XI suggests that the severity of approval or disapproval among the male college students varies with the degree of overconformity ("overhonesty") or underconformity (dishonesty). However, the data does not suggest that the disapproval of overconformity (overhonesty) is as severe as the disapproval of underconformity (dishonesty).

Table XII reports a similar relationship for the female college sample. A majority of these students expressed strong disapproval of those who would engage in burglary or auto theft. They expressed disapproval of those who would cheat, or commit petty larcency. This group also expressed disapproval of minor trespassing. On the other hand, these students expressed disapproval of those who would report minor trespassing, minor theft, or cheating and of those who would not report burglary. In short, the female college sample expressed disapproval of underconformity (dishonesty), the severity of this disapproval depending upon the degree of underconformity; they expressed disapproval of overconforming behavior ("overhonesty"), the severity of the disapproval depending upon the degree of overconformity; but they expressed approval of the conforming behavior located between these two extremes. However. the female sample did not express the severity of disapproval to overconformity (overhonesty) as to

semp1e	
Number and percentage of female students in college freshman (reporting attitudes toward various degrees of conformity	Attitudes (n=49)
• 111	
Tabl	

	I				¥	titudes	(6 2= 4)				
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	St.	rong roval 0) \$	App.	1)	ţdo 🖌	Ko nion 2) %	E .	lapproval (3) \$	Dia Bi	irong ipproval (4)	Med1an*
Report minor trespassing (Sam)	-	2•0	Ś	4.1	t 0	16.3	5 8	57.1	9	20.4	۰ ۱
Report minor theft (Carl)	0	0•0	2	14.3	0	18.4	&	59.2	4	8,2	n
Report chesting (Joe)	n	6.1	6	18.4	15	30.6	17	34.7	ŝ	10.2	N
Report auto theft (Bob)	2	4.1	24	49.0	ц	22.4	10	20.4	ส	24.5	ч
Report burglary (Pete)	٢	14.3	33	67.3	4	8,2	*	10.2	0	00	-
Meither counit nor report auto theft (Larry)	15	30.6	27	55.1	-4	8•2	8	4.1	н	2•0	ч
Meither commit nor report cheating (Ed)	33	67.3	13	26.5	n	6.1	0	0*0	o	0*0	o
Meither commit nor report trespassing (George)	17	34.7	25	51.0	4	8°2	n	6.1	o	0•0	н

Table XII (Continued)

					¥	titudes	(6 <u>7</u> =4)				
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	Str Appr (C	ong ()	4pp }	roval 1) g	optr (2)	lo Lion X	Di sa	pproval (3)	St. Maa	rong pproval (4) \$	Median *
either commit nor report urglary (Jack)	-	2.0	6	18.4	17	34.7	19	36.5	3	6.1	8
linor t respassing Dick)	Ч	2.0	Ň	10.2	18	36.7	22	6.11	m	6.1	3
tilise stolen property Tem)	0	0.0	\$	12.2	10	20.4	25	51.0	60	16.3	<i>ه</i>
id others in cheating Glen)	0	0•0	0	0*0	10	20.4	25	51.0	7	28.6	e
etty larcency Dave)	0	0•0	0	0•0	ŝ	10.2	33	67.3	ដ	22.4	•
heating Bill)	Ч	2•0	0	0*0	4	8°5	25	51.0	19	38.5	~
id in burglary Bruce)	8	4.1	n	6.1	O	0.0	ส	28.6	ŝ	61 . 2	4

• • • • • • •

· · · · · · · ·

_
-
-
•
-
22
-
-
-
ک ک
T .
-
-
_ Y
23
~
\sim
-
-
2
Z
A
Labl

					Ĭ	tt1tudee	67=U)				
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	App St	rong roval 0)	total	Lavoval X		Mo 2) X	Dia	approval (5) \$	Btroi Diseppi (4)	brail A	Median*
Burglary (Earl)	0	0•0	0	0•0	0	0*0	•0	16.3	14	83.7	4
Auto theft (John)	0	0*0	o	0*0	o	0•0	10	20.4	39	9.62	4

* Chi square results for the median test testing the difference between males and females: 3.00, p.10; 2.45; .84; .27; .89; .01; .38; .07; .002; 1.19; .07; 2.30; 4.61, p.05; 1.74; .012; ; and .103.

underconformity (dishonesty).

Another measure of the relationship between the degree of conformity and the severity of the response to that conformity is a median value calculated for the attitudinal responses. This median attitudinal value was calculated by arbitrarily assigning a numerical value to the various degrees of approval-disapproval: strong approval - 0; approval - 1; no opinion - 2; disapproval - 3; and strong disapproval - μ . Thus the lower the median attitudinal value, the greater the degree of approval toward that behavioral category. Conversely, a high median attitudinal value indicates high disapproval of the behavior.

The median attitudinal values for the male college sample are reported in Table XI; the values for the female students are reported in Table XII; and the values for the total college sample are reported in Table XIII. Statistical analysis of the differences between the median values for the males and females indicates that the differences are not statistically significant.¹ The only two exceptions were the following: the male students were more disapproving of those who would report minor trespassing than were the females,

¹ The median test, involving the use of Chi square, was utilized to test for statistical significance. For a detailed description of this test, see Sidney Siegel, <u>Nonparametric Statistics</u> For The Behavioral Sciences (New York, 1956).

orting	
le rep	
n samp	
freshma	•
8	
Ţ	onfo
4	5
ents	809
stud	degr
ef o	g
tege	Trav
LCOD.	Pa
, per	ŝ
and	deg
Number	attitu
iIII	
Table	

					Att	Ltudes (n=70)				
	St.	rong				No			St.	Juon	l
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	App	rovel ()		roval (1)	6 4 4	nton 2) \$	8 73 4	Ipproval (3)	Disa a	pproval (4)	Median
leport minor trespassing Sam)	-		N I	2.9	. 0	12.9	34	52.9	រ្ភ	30.0	6
leport minor theft (carl)	0	0*0	60	ז•נו	10	14.3	38	54.3	አ	20.0	Ś
leport cheating Joe)	n	4.3	13	18•6	18	25.7	え	34.3	ជ	17.1	ŝ
leport auto theft Bob)	3	4.3	ž	45.7	15	21.4	ส	17.1	40	1.4	1.5
kport burglary Pete)	60	11.4	46	65.7	ŝ	7.1	60	11.4	e	4.3	J
either commit nor report uto theft (Larry)	23	32.9	35	50.0	6	6°21	2	2.9	Ч	1.4	Ч
either commit nor report heating (Ed)	3	60 ° 0	ส	30.0	9	8 . 6	ч	1.4	0	0•0	o
either commit nor report respassing (George)	2	30.0	40	57.1	\$	8.6	m	4.3	o	0*0	н

tinued	
(Cor	
IIIX	
Table	

					Att	itudes (n=70)				
	Str	a do				No			St.	ano	
Behaviors Reflecting Various Degrees of Conformity	Appr (0			I) Level		2) 2	Piece Mae	upproval (3) \$		oproval	Median
Meither commit nor report burglary (Jack)	н	1.4	r 1	20.0	5¢	37.1	56	37.1	~	4.3	R
Minor trespassing (Dick)	Ч	1.4	6	12.9	8	42.9	26	37.1	4	5.7	3
Utilise stolen property (Tom)	0	0•0	6	12.9	ส	1,1	*	54.3	ង	15.7	e 7
Aid others in cheating (Glen)	o	0•0	Ч	1.4	11	24.3	3	52.9	15	21.4	n
Petty larcency (Dave)	Ч	1.4	n	4.3	13	18.6	4	58.6	ង	1,1	e
Cheating (H11)	ч	1.4	Ч	1.4	10	14.3	35	50.0	23	32.9	n
Aid in burglary (Bruce)	Я	2.9	n	4.3	o	0•0	23	32.9	4	60 •0	4
Burglary (Earl)	2	2.9	0	0•0	o	0•0	16	22.9	52	74.3	4
Auto theft (Jehn)	o	0•0	0	0°0	. 0	0•0	18	25.7	52	74.3	4

although both sexes disapproved of this behavior;² and the females were more disapproving of petty larcency (stealing watermelon from a farmer) than were their counterparts, however both the males and the females disapproved of this behavior.³

The median scores reported in Tables XI, XII, and XIII support Hypothesis II. The median attitudinal values increase as the degree of the nonconformity in-Those behaviors identifiable as conformity to creases. the modal norms received relatively low median attitudinal values indicating approval: the median value for those who would neither commit nor report cheating was O (strong approval); the median value for those who would neither commit nor report minor trespassing or auto theft and for those who would report burglary was 1; and the median value for those who would report auto theft was 1.5. As behavior departs from the modal norms, the extent of disapproval increases: minor trespassing and failure to report burglary received median attitudinal scores of 2: the reporting of minor trespassing, minor theft, or cheating, as well as cheating and petty larcency received scores of 3; and burglary and auto theft received scores of L. However, the median attitudinal values for overconformity (overhonesty) did not increase to the same

 $^{^2}$ This difference was statistically significant at the .10 level.

³ This difference was statistically significant at the .05 level.

		Median	Attitudi	nal Values	
Categories of Con- formity*	Strong Approval (0)	Approval (1)	No Opinion (2)	Disapproval (3)	Strong Disepproval (4)
Sam				J	
Carl					
Joe					
Bob					
Pete					
Larry					
Ed	<				
George					
Jack			$\overline{}$		
Dick					
Tom-Jim					
Glen					
Dave					
B111					
Bruce					
Barl					
John					

Figure V: Graphic presentation of the median attitudinal responses of the students in the college freshman sample toward various degrees of conformity

*Names are used in this graph rather than the complete description of each category. For a complete description of each category, see Tables IX, XI, XII, and XIII. proportion as the median attitudinal values for underconformity (dishonest).

Another technique applicable for showing the relationship of degree of conformity-nonconformity and of the response to that conformity-nonconformity is the conversion of the tabular data (Table XIII) into graphic data (Figure V). If Hypothesis II is valid, Figure IV should show a curvilinear relationship. That is, the median attitudinal values for extreme underconformity should be high; the median attitudinal values should decrease as conformity is approached; and then the values should increase as the degree of overconformity increases. The chart in Figure V supports this contention. The behaviors at the top of the chart represent overconformity; the behaviors in the center represent conforming behavior: the behaviors at the bottom of the chart represent underconforming behavior. The median values at the extreme right of the chart represent strong disapproval of the behavior by the college sample; the median values at the extreme left represent strong approval; and those median values between these two extremes represent the various degrees of approval-disapproval between the extremes. Those behaviors at the top of the chart (overconformity or overhonesty) receive relatively high median attitudinal values (disapproval): those in the middle of the chart (various degrees of overconformity) receive progressively smaller values until the minimal median value (strong

-80-

approval) is reached; and those behaviors in the bottom half of the chart (various degrees of underconformity) receive progressively higher values. However, the graph shows that the median attitudinal values for underconformity (dishonesty) are greater than the median attitudinal values for overconformity (overhonesty).

In summary, Hypothesis II suggests that the reaction to deviations by the normally conforming segment of the late adolescent population varies in severity according to the degree of either overconformity or underconformity. The data of this study suggest that the severity of the reactions to deviations do vary with the degree of either overconformity or underconformity; however, the data suggest the reaction to overconformity is not as severe as to underconformity.⁴

SIGNIFICANT OTHERS NAMED BY SAMPLE

In Chapter II, it was hypothesized that, for problems of honesty, adolescents are most responsive to the influence of parents. As college freshmen are in the final stages of gaining their independence from their parents and are most susceptible to the influence of peers, this group would be the least likely to demonstrate the

⁴ One explanation for the lack of complete support for this hypothesis by the data is that those behaviors designated as overconformity were not deviant to the same degree as those behaviors designated as underconformity. That is, the data focused on a limited range of the behavioral continuum, and had a broader range been used, the data might have supported the hypothesis.

pervasive influence of their parents. Thus by utilizing a sample of college freshmen, the results would be the least likely to show the validity of Hypothesis III.

One measure of this influence is a listing of those persons which adolescents feel are most concerned with their observance of the rules of honesty. Table XIV summarizes the number and percentage of the students in the freshman sample who named at least one person from the following categories of significant others as being concerned about how well the students follow the rules of honesty: parents or people their parents' age, people their own age, unclassifiables, or self.⁵ Almost all of the respondents named their parents or people their parents' age (100% of the males, 94% of the females, and 96% of the total sample). In comparison to this, only half of the males (52%), three fourths of the females (74%), and two third of the total sample (67%) named people their own age.

-82-

⁵ Categories utilized in Tables XIV and XV are similar to those employed by Remmers. See Chapter II, pp. 28-30; and H. H. Remmers and D. H. Radler, <u>The</u> <u>American Teenager</u> (New York, 1957).

Table XIV: Number and percentage of students in freshman sample who named at least one person from the following categories of significant others as being concerned about "How well you obey the rules of honest?"

		Males]	Temales		Total
		(n=21)		(n=49)		(n=70)
Significant Others	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Parents or People Their age	21	100.0	46	93.9	67	95 .7
People Their Own Age	11	52.4	36	73.5	47	67.1
Unclassifiable (Society, God, Pet, etc.)	3	14.3	11	22.4	14	20.0
Ego (self)	2	9.5	2	4.1	4	5.7

Table XV is based on the assumption that the order of listing is relevant; that is, those persons listed first are more important to the adolescent than those listed subsequently.⁶ A majority of the students in the college freshman sample (81% of the males, 88% of the females, and 86% of the total sample) named their parents or people their parents' age first in response to the following item: Name those persons you feel are most concerned about how well you obey the rules and regulations of honesty. Only a small percentage named people

⁶ The validity of this assumption is based on interviews with a group of ten of the respondents. Although the generality of these findings is limited, the researcher feels that this assumption is warranted.

Table XV: Number and percentage of college freshmen who named a person from one of the following categories of significant others first in response to "Name those persons you feel are most concerned about how well you obey the rules and regulations of honesty."

	-	Males		Females		Total
		(n=21)		(n=49)		(n=70)
Significant Others	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Parents or People Their Age	17	81.0	4 3	87.8	60	85 .7
People Their Own Age	3	14.3	5	10.2	ឋ	11.4
Ego (Self)	1	4.8	0	0.0	1	1.4
Unclassifiables (society, God, Pet, etc.)	0	0.0	l	2.0	1	1.¥
Total	21	100.0	49	100.0	70	100.0

their own age (14% of the males, 10% of the females, and 11% of the total sample). Thus the data in Tables XIV and XV support Hypothesis III; that is, the tables indicate that this college freshman sample is more responsive to parents or to people their parents' age than to people the respondents' own age.

The existing relationship can better be described by replacing the categories utilized in Tables XIV and XV with a set of more delineated categories. Table XVI summarizes the number and percentage of students in the freshman sample who named at least one person from the

following categories of significant others as being concerned about how well they obey the rules of honesty: parents, adult relatives, unrelated adults. age level relatives, peers (unrelated), ego (self), and unclassifiables. The data in this table indicate that about 90% of the college freshman sample named both parents when asked to name those persons most concerned about how well they followed the rules and regulations of honesty; approximately 97% named at least one parent. Peers were the next most frequently named group with 57% of the sample mentioning at least one peer. Age level relatives (30% of the sample named at least one) and adults, other than parents (27% of the sample named at least one adult relative, and 23% named at least one unrelated adult) were named half as frequently as were peers. In short, a rank ordering of the significant others by frequency of listing would be as follows: parents, peers, age level relatives, adult relatives, and unrelated adults. In addition, Table XVI indicates that females are mentioned as significant others more often than are males; this is especially true for non-relatives.

As a group, males tended to name fewer persons than did females (see Table XVI). There seems to be no difference in the percentage of females and in the percentage of males who named at least one parent (98% of

-85-

	X	les	ł	males		Ê
	5	الکت	J	(6 ≯≖ u)		Ë
Simificant Others	No.	Percent	<u>No.</u> 1	ercent	Nor	2
Parent: Male	ţ	c v			:	
Temale	4 R	95.2	404	93.9 04.0	35	
Both Parents	191	85.7	45	8,19		
At Least One	20	95.2	48	98.0	3 8	
Adult Relative:						
Male	8	9.5	13	26.5	15	
Feede	2	9.5	7	28.6	16	
At least One	8	9.5	17	34.7	19	
Unrelated Adult:						
Male		4.8	2	14.3	60	
Temal o	~	14.3	6	18.4	12	
At Least One	e	14.3	13	26.5	16	
Age Level Relative:						
Male	2	9.5	11	22.4	72	
Female.	4	19-0		22.4) ;	
At Least One	4	19.0	11	34.7) 2	

Number and percentage of students in freshman sample who named at least one person from the following categories of significant others as being concerned Table XVI:

	X	ales	R	an les		Total
	•	n=21)	Ŭ	(6 %≖ u)		(0 ,≖ 2)
Simificant Others	No.	Percent	No. I	ercent	No.	Percent
Peers (Unrelated): Male	•	28.6	20	807	26	1.75
Female At Laast One	٥٢	42.9	えを	0.64		47.1
Ren (Salf)	9 0		ې د ۲	2010	4	
The least fish a	ł		ł		4	1•0
(God, Society, Pet, etc.)	•	14.3	Ħ	22.4	7	20.0
Total	21	100.0	49	100.0	02	100.0

Table XVI (Continued)

rules and			Significant Others	Perent: Both Perents Male Only Total	Peers (Unrelated): Male Female Total	Unrelated Adults: Male Female Total	Age Level Relatives: Male Female
I regulations of	X I	r)	No.]	沒이니간		00 0	00
r honesty."	les	¤≠21)	<u>Percent</u>	76.2 0.0 81.0	4.8 9.5 14.3	0.00	0°0
	Pe	5	No. P	&പപ 1 4	หน เ ส	סמןמ	40
	nales	u=49)	ercent	79.6 2.0 83.7	4.1 4.1 8.2	0.0	2°0
	•		No	28 N N 23	w4 r	סמןמ	10
	otal	n=70)	ercent	78.6 1.4 2.9 82.9	4.3 5.7 10.0	0.0 2.9 2.9	1.4

Number and percentage of students in freshman sample who named a person from one of the following categories of significant others first in response to "Name those mersons you feel are not concerned about boy well you obey the Table XVII:

-88-

(Continued)
IIAX OLAN
F

	٣	ales	ľ.	enales		Total
	~	n=21)	•	(u= 49)	_	(0‰=u)
Simificant Others	No.	Percent	No. 1	Percent	No	Percent
Ego	ч	4.8	Ο	0•0	L	1.4
Unclassifiables (Society, God, Pet, etc.)	O	0°0	ч	2,0	Ч	1.4
Total	21	100.0	49	100.0	02	100.0

•

the females, and 95% of the males did so). However. the male respondents named a smaller percentage of peers (61% of the females named at least one peer, while only 48% of the males did so), age level relatives (35% of the females named at least one age level relative, and 19% of the males did so), unrelated adults (at least one unrelated adult was named by 27% of the females and $1\mu\%$ of the males). and adult relatives (35% of the female respondents named at least one adult relative, but only 10% of the males did so). Furthermore, male respondents tended to name members of their own sex less often than did the female respondents. This was especially true for unrelated peers: 山9% of the females named a female peer. and 11% named a male peer: conversely, 13% of the males named a female peer, while only 29% named a male peer.

Table XVII summarizes the number and percentage of students in the college freshman sample who named a person from one of the following categories of significant others first when asked question fifteen:7 parents, peers, unrelated adults, age level relatives, ego, and unclassifiables.

⁷ Question fifteen is as follows:

¹⁵⁾ Name those persons you feel are most concerned how well you obey rules and regulations of honesty. Name How is this person related to you?

Number and percentage in pretest sample who named at least one person from asch of the following categories of significant others Table IVIII:

-91-

	Ma	6	Fe	males	-	Total
	(n)	(12	ÿ	n≖19)		(0 7=¤)
Significant Others	No. P	ercent	No. P	ercent	No	Percent
Peers (Unrelated):						
Male Warel	100 \	38.1	9	31.6	7	35.0
remaie At Toort Out	00	28 . 6	~	36.8	ม	32.5
010 3400 AV	DT	Q•1.4	6	47.4	19	47.5
J.Co	ы	4.8	0	0•0	Ч	2.5
Unclassifiable						
(Society, God, Pet, etc.)	2	33 . 3	m	15.8	10	25.0

Table XVIII (Continued)

.

A vast majority of the students named both parents first (76% of the males, 84% of females, and 79% of total sample); or they named at least one parent (81% of the males, 84% of the females, and 83% of the total sample). Peers were the next most frequently mentioned group; however, only 10% of the total sample (8% of the females, and 14% of the males) named a peer first. Two persons named unrelated adults, and one named an age level relative. Thus the data in Tables XVI and XVII support the third hypothesis.

Table XVIII summarizes the number and percentage of students in the pretest sample who named at least one person from the following categories of significant others as being concerned with how well the students obey the rules of honesty. The results are similar to those reported in Table XVI for the college freshman sample: a majority of the students named at least one parent (95%), about half of the students named peers (50%), and only a small percent named adult relatives (18%), unrelated adult females (28%), and age level relatives (8%). The major discrepancy between the data reported for the pretest sample and the college sample was the great percent of students in the pretest who

-93-

named unrelated adult males.⁸ Never-the-less, the data in Table XVIII support Hypothesis III.

In summary, Hypothesis III suggests that adolescents are most responsive to their parents when dealing with problems of honesty. The data of this study support this contention.

⁸ This discrepancy can be accounted for. The high school utilized for the second pretest of the instrument was located in a predominate Catholic community. Most of the Catholic students had at one time attended a Catholic School. Thus many of the Catholic students in this group named their local parish priests. However, this did not hold true for the Catholic respondents in the college sample.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

SUMMARY

Throughout recorded history, scholars have sought to explain and understand criminal and deviant behavior.¹ Since the early nineteenth century, there has been a long succession of criminological theories; most of which have not stood the test of time. These theories can be classified into three theoretical orientations: biological and constitutional theories, psychological theories, and sociological theories. Most of these

¹ The concepts criminal behavior and deviant behavior are not synonymous. Although most criminal behavior is considered to be deviant behavior, all deviant behavior is not considered to be criminal. However, theories of deviant behavior should be applicable to criminal behavior. Furthermore, deviant behavior, as identified in current sociological literature, is closely related to the same span of behavior as that identified as criminal behavior. For example, one of the more popular textbooks dealing with deviant behavior includes the following topics: drug addiction, crime, delinquency, alcoholism, suicide, and mental disorders. (See Marshall Cinard, Sociology of Deviant Behavior (New York, 1963.) Another example is Albert Cohen's article on deviant behavior in which he closely aligns criminal behavior and deviant behavior. (See Albert Cohen, "The Study of Social Disor-ganization and Deviant Behavior," in Robert Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard Cattrell, Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects (New York, 1959) pp. 461-484.) In addition, theories of deviant behavior and theories of criminal behavior are based on the same basic assumptions. Consequently, this author categorizes these two types of behavior into one.
theories are based on three premises: first, deviance is the result of a malfunctioning in the individual and/or in the society; second, the deviant is the critical variable for the analysis of deviant behavior; and third, human behavior can be described in terms of a behavioral continuum ranging from deviant behavior through tolerated behavior to ideal behavior with the largest proportion of behavior falling between these two extremes.

The first two assumptions have been questioned by the developing perspective of the sociology of deviant behavior as labeling. First, this perspective contends that deviance is not a property inherent in behavior, but that deviance is a property conferred upon these behaviors by the social audiences through a process of labeling. Consequently, the critical variable is the social audience rather than the individual actor. since it is the audience which eventually determines whether or not any particular episode of behavior or any particular actor is labeled deviant. Second, this perspective contends that deviance promotes the solidarity in the social group by functioning as a boundary maintaining force. Thus deviance need not be the result of a malfunctioning in the individual and/or in the social group, but it may be the result of a functioning social system.

Recent research hypothesized and emperically demonstrated that human behavior can be placed on a continuum ranging from strict adherence to criminal codes to serious violations of that code; furthermore. this research has demonstrated that most human behavior falls between these two extremes. The traditional interpretation of this continuum is that it ranges from deviant behavior through tolerated behavior to ideal behavior; thus this interpretation gives rise to the notion that the majority of the people are "law-abiding law-breakers." Cavan has suggested an alternative interpretation of this phenomena: as it seems doubtful whether so much admiration is really accorded the over-conforming group as most criminolists imply, Cavan's behavioral continuum ranges from condemned underconforming behavior through various decreasing degrees of disapproved behavior to normally conforming behavior and then through increasing degrees of disapproved behavior to overconforming behavior which is also condemned.

The purpose of this study is to empirically examine the validity of the two alternative interpretations of the behavioral continuum. Specifically, the study focuses on three research hypotheses. First, the normally conforming segment of the late adolescent population reacts unfavorably both to underconformity and to overconformity. Second, the reactions of the normally conforming segment of the late adolescent population to deviations varies

-97-

in severity according to the degree of either overconformity or underconformity. Third, adolescents will tend to name parents as those most concerned with their observance of the rules of honesty.

The data for this study were obtained from a questionnaire survey of all the single freshmen who reported no prior legal involvement and who were under twenty years of age enrolled in a large section of a social problems class at Michigan State University. The data consisted of demographic information, list of significant others, degree of delinquency as measured by Short and Nye's scale, and attitudinal reactions to various degrees of overconformity - conformity underconformity. These data support the three hypotheses given above, with one exception: the individuals used in this sample did not react with the same severity to over-conformity as they did to under-conformity.

LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT STUDY

The first limitation relates to the problem of sampling. One difficulty is that of sample size. 197 students completed the questionnaire, but only those 70 students who were freshmen, who were single, who were under 20 years of age, and who reported no prior conviction records were utilized for this study. This sample size reduces the utility of certain statistical

-98-

modes of analysis, and reduces the practicality of including a large number of control variables. A small sample also increases the likelihood of chance variation. Another difficulty is that of the generality of the findings based on the sample. That is. the utilization of a college freshman sample limits the applicability of the results to college-enrolled populations. While criticism of the sampling procedure and of the size of the sample might be justifiable. we must not lose sight of the fact that the major concern of this study was to empirically determine the validity of alternative conceptions of the nature of the behavioral continuum. Consequently, an increase in sample size would not have increase either the precision or validity of the findings to the degree that would warrant that increase even through such an increase would have increased the types of statistical analysis possible. Furthermore, although there are differences between the college-enrolled population and the American population and other sub-populations of the American population, there is no empirical or theoretical basis to assume that the conception of the type of behavioral continuum would differ in this population as compared to other populations. In short, when the sampling factor is considered with the factors of time, expense. and the research purpose and design, the sample

-99-

size and sampling procedures utilized for this study are best described as limitations of this study but not as grave shortcomings of the study. However, interpretations of the results of this study should reflect the sampling limitations.

The second limitation relates to; the compatibility of the samples utilized for the first two pretests and the final sample. The instrument underwent a series of testings before it was administered to the final sample. The first two pretests utilized high school samples. but a college freshman sample was utilized in the final data gathering process. One might argue that the differences between the population of high school seniors and the population of college freshmen are great enough to destroy the usefulness of employing an instrument pretested in a high school sample for a college sample. But on the other hand, even though differences do exist between the two populations, it is unlikely that these differences are great enough to eliminate the possibility of utilizing an instrument so tested. In order to ascertain the applicibility of an instrument so tested for a college freshman sample, the instrument underwent an informal testing using a college sample before the final draft was constructed. The instrument was then modified to fit the college sample. Therefore, the degree of incompatibility between the pretest samples and the final sample seems to be a limitation of this research but not a serious shortcoming.

Admittedly, the measures utilized are crude, the techniques - mostly percentages and comparisons of medians - are rudimentary, and therefore the results are only approximate. At worst, the data do demonstrate that the hypotheses are plausible; at best, the data demonstrate that the hypotheses are valid and tenable. But in either case, the data suggest that the assumption of a behavioral continuum ranging from deviant behavior to ideal behavior, underlying much of the criminological theory and research is highly questionable.

IMPLICATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR NEEDED RESEARCH

The analysis of deviant behavior in terms of the underconforming deviant-conformer- overconforming deviant continuum has several implications on the understanding of deviant behavior. Analysis in these terms clarifies certain problems connected with the definition of criminal behavior, with theoretical formulations of deviant behavior, with research in the field of deviant behavior, and with penology.

One implication of the analysis of deviant behavior in terms of Cavan's continuum is a need for the clarification of the definition of criminal behavior.

-101-

A recurrent controversy rages over who should sociologically be identified as criminal: that is. what criteria should be employed to operationally specify criminality. Some contend that any act which by omission or commission runs counter to the criminal law should be considered as criminal behavior. Others argue that the criteria for criminality should be arrests. convictions. or incarcerations.² Short and Nye contend that reported behavior should be used as the bases for designating delinguency.³ The data from this study would suggest that none of the above definitions are appropriate from a sociological perspective. Not everyone who violates the law is considered to be criminal, not everyone who is arrested for violating the law is labeled as criminal. and not everyone who is convicted for a criminal violation is thought to be criminal.4 In fact, the findings of this study indicate that in order for an individual to be considered "normal". he must be willing to circumvent the intent of the law and

³ James Short and Ivan Nye, "Reported Behavior as Criterion of Deviant Behavior," <u>Social Problems</u>, V (Winter, 1957-58), 208-213.

⁴ See Richard Schwartz and Jerome Skolnick, "Two Studies in of Legal Stigma" in Howard Becker, The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance (New York, 1964), pp.103-118.

² For a complete discussion of the various definitions of criminality, see Howard Becker, <u>Outsiders</u>: <u>Studies in the Sociology of Deviance</u> (New York, 1963), pp. 1-18; Albert Cohen, <u>Deviance and Social Control</u> (Englewood Cliffs, 1966), pp. 1-22; and Walter Reckless (New York, 1961), pp. 17-29.

on occasion openly break the law. That is, the normally conforming segment of a society considers individuals who stringently observe the legal codes to be deviant. Thus in order for a definition of criminal behavior to be fruitful for sociological analysis, it must take into account not only the episode of behavior, and the actor, but the social audience as well. One definition which might be sociologically relevant would be that, to paraphase Howard Becker,⁵ criminal behavior is that behavior which is labeled as criminal behavior.

Another implication of the analysis of deviancy in these terms is on the area of research and methodology. Research studies of deviants sometimes compare underconformers (Areas A and B)⁶ with overconformers (Areas F and G) ignoring the central area of modal behavior. One such comparison is Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck's much discussed study, <u>Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency</u>.⁷ The Gluecks matched each of 500 correctional-school boys with a boy of the same age, intelligence, and social background, whose behavior was near-perfect. The control

⁵ <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 3.

⁶ See Chapter I, p. 10.

7 Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, <u>Unraveling</u> <u>Juvenile</u> <u>Delinquency</u> (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 22-39.

-103-

boys were without police, court, or correctionalschool records. In fact. 71% of the boys were without any known delinquency of even a minor nature. As the Gluecks had difficulty in finding 500 such overly good boys, they eventually had to include a few boys guilty of such misbehaviors as smoking in their early years. hopping trucks, once or twice swiping much desired articles from stores, crap shooting, sneaking into movies. occasional truancy, being stubborn to their mothers, and a very occasional occurrence of staying out late at night. using vile language, drinking alcoholic beverages. and running away from home. Many of the delinquencies of control boys were very trivial and had occurred when the boys were seven or eight years old. Thus the Gluecks were comparing boys from areas A or B with boys from areas F or G. However, the Gluecks conclude that, whereas the delinquent or deviant boys tended to be active, aggressive, impulsive, and rebellious, the control group of "nondelinguent or non-deviant" boys tended to be neurotic, fearful of failure or defeat, and submissive to authority. They failed to note that their sampling procedure completely ignored the majority of boys with normal conformity (Area D), who live within the tolerance limits of the community. Consequently, the control group was fully as deviant as the delinquent group, but in the opposite direction. An interpretation of the data reported by the Glueck study should be made with this idea in mind. In

short, the current study suggests that, to be fruitful criminological research must take greater care in operationally specificing the populations under study. In other words, studies should specify which populations are being compared: a "normally conforming" population with a "delinquent" or "criminal" population, or a "overconforming" population with a "delinquent" or "criminal" population, or a "non-delinquent" or "non-criminal" population with a "delinquent" or "criminal"

A third implication of the evaluation of the behavior continuum is on the expectations of behavior for delinquents and criminals on probation or parole. Usually probation or parole involves a number of stringent restrictions on the behavior of the probationer or parolee. Such conditions as the following are typical: regular school or work attendance, daily curfews, restrictions on movement from home community, and avoidance of disreputable companions and places.⁸ The penalty for violating this conditions is often commitment or recommitment to a correctional institution. On the other hand, strict observance of these requirements for parole or probation is overconformity by the parolee or probationer's standards; thus the requirements are virtually impossible for the parolee or probationer to follow if he is to

⁸ For an enumeration of these requirements, see Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association, <u>Guides for Sentencing</u> (New York, 1957); and Paul Tappan, <u>Contemporary Correction</u> (New York, 1951), pp. 304-397.

remain in the community and not be isolated from his social groups. The result of this dilemma is disregard for the requirements and deception on the part of the parolee or probationer. Probation and parole might more often be successful if the probationer and parolee were required to meet reasonably conforming standards.

A fourth implication of the behavior continuum of deviant underconformity-conformity-deviant overconformity is on the theoretical formulations of crime and delinquency. It is one of the major themes of this thesis that a theory of delinquent-criminal behavior cannot be isolated from a concern with the analysis of behavior that is defined as socially acceptable or from a concern with the analysis of behavior that is defined as overconforming deviance. A most important consequence of conceptualizing underconformity, conformity, and overconformity together is the realization that these types of behavior are not necessarily as different as one would tend to believe. The difference perhaps lies only in the manner in which society has chosen to define and treat certain aspects of social action as deviant (underconformity or overconformity) and other aspects as representing a commitment to social norms and values. Furthermore, this behavior continuum suggests that deviance is not an either or affair, but is a matter of degree and is the result of interpersonal interaction. Thus both deviance and conformity must be analyzed in terms of the dynamic

-106-

reciprocal relationship existing between the actors, the rule makers, and the rule enforcers.

A fifth implication of the findings of this research is suggested needed research. This study focused on the attitudinal responses to various degrees of underconformity or overconformity. An assertion of this thesis is that the behavioral reactions would correspond to the attitudinal reactions. One suggestion for further research is the examination of the behavioral reactions of the normally conforming segment of the population to the various degrees of either underconformity or overconformity. Another suggestion for additional research is the relation of social class and the behavioral continuum. Chapter II suggested that each social class or other large subcultural group has its own definition of what behavior falls into the area of tolerance, what is disapproved mildly or seriously, and what is condemned. The differences between the various social class definitions of approved and disapproved behavior should be the topic of further researches.

APPENDIX

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

A Study of Social Rules and Regulations

WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT

The youth of a community are, in many respects, the most important element of their society.

There is a great deal written and said about this age group, but much of it is not based on facts.

This study is intended to supply important information about the behavior of young people with respect to social rules and regulations.

INSTRUCTIONS

Most of the questions can be answered by circling the number after the answer you choose.

In those cases where you are asked to write out your answer, space is provided for you to do so.

REMEMBER

This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers (except a few questions about your age, class, marital status, etc.)

Your experiences and attitudes are the facts of this study.

You will not place your name on this questionnaire, and no attempt will be made to identify you through your answers.

Thank you for your co-operation.

1) Your class: Freshman - - -1 2 Sophomore-----3 <u>4</u> 5 If other, specify:_____ 2) Your age at last birthday: 16 or less - - - - -1 2 3 18 _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ <u>4</u>56 78 22 - - - - - --If 24 or more, write in age:_____ 3) Your sex: 1 2 山) Marital status: 1 2 3 h If other, specify: 5) What is your religious affiliation? 1 If Protestant, indicate denomination: 2 Greek Orthodox Catholic- - - - -3 <u>4</u>5 Other----------If other, specify:

If your religious affiliation is different than either of your parents, specify:

-110-

6) How often do you attend Church? Once a week, or more often - - - -1 2 Once or twice a month- - - - - -Less than once a month - - - - -3 Ī1 7) Your race: 1 Negro- - - -White------2 3 8) Where was your father born? In this country- - - - - - - 1 If other country, specify: -9) Where was your mother born? In this country- - - - - - 1 If other country, specify: -10) Up to this point, where have you spent most of your life? On a farm------1 In a small town------2 In a city smaller than Lansing - -3 Ĺ In another city about the size 56 In a city larger than Lansing- - -In a very large city like Detroit-In a suburb of a city- - - - - -Sometimes people talk about middle, lower, working, 11) or upper classes in the community, and say that a family is in one or another of these classes. Which one of the following "classes" would you say your parents or the folks you live with, belong to? 2 3

12) Who contributes most to the financial support of your family?

a) How far did this person mentioned in 12 above go in school? (Answer for father if both father and mother contribute equally.)

No schooling - - - - - - - - - 2 Some grade school - - - - 2 Graduated from grade school - - 3 Some high school - - - - 4 Graduated from high school - - - 5 Some college - - - - - 6 Graduated from college - - - - 7 Advanced graduate training - - 8 Don't know - - - - - 9

- b) What does this person do for a living? (Write in the complete name or title of the occupation, not the company he or she works for.)
- c) Describe as accurately as possible what this person makes or does on the job. (For example: he supervises the work 1f 15 office clerks; he teaches high school English; he sells from door to door; etc.)

13) Have you ever had any contact with the police? (Include being arrested, picked up, or warned.)

> Yes----l No----2 If yes, specify what contact and why:

Research has found that everyone is concerned about the way others feel toward him. Some peoples' opinions about you are very important to you, while other peoples' opinions are not as important. Below you are asked to list the names of those people MOST IMPORTANT to you.

14) Name those people most important in your life.

Name

How is this person related to you?

15) Name those persons you feel are most concerned about how well you obey rules and regulations of honesty.

Name How is this person related to you?

FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS

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

- 16) 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.
- 17) Taken little thing (worth less than \$2) that did not belong to you? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (μ) no.
- 18) Bought or drank beer, wine, or liquor? (Include drinking at home.) (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 19) Skipped school without a legitimate excuse? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 20) Purposely damaged or destroyed public property that did not belong to you? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 21) Defied your parents' authority (to their faces)? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- Has sex relations with a person of the opposite sex?
 (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 23) "Run away from home?" (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 24) Taken little things of medium value (between \$2 \$50)? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 25) Taken things of large value (worth more than \$50)?
 (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 26) When asked, refused to join others in a game played on private property? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.

- 27) When you knew that someone cheated on a test, reported that cheating to the teacher? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 28) Reported someone for taking a small item not belonging to them? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.
- 29) When given a chance, refused to join others in the taking of fruit, vegetables, or flowers from other people's property? (1) very often; (2) several times; (3) once or twice; (4) no.

If the following people were students in your school and/or residents in your dorm, how would you feel about them?

30) Both Ed and Bill were seniors in their last term of college. In order to graduate they had to pass their examinations in all their classes. They were both able to pass all the final examinations except the one in a chemistry class. Ed asked no one for help; on the other hand, Bill asked Glen who sat next to him to give him some of the answers. Joe saw Glen give Bill the answers, and reported the cheating to the teacher.

How would you react to Ed's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Bill's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Glen's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Joe's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

31) On a warm summer afternoon, Dick suggested that a group of boys living in the same dorm go for a swim in a private lake. As the boys were unable to obtain permission, neither George nor Sam would go. Sam reported the group of boys to the caretaker. George spent the afternoon in the library studying and did not report Dick and the others to anyone else.

How would you react to Dick's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to George's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (l_{\perp}) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Sam's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

32) One evening, Dave suggested that a group of boys from a dorm raid Mr. Smith's watermelon patch and "steal" enough melons for the entire group. Jim and Tom would not go with the others to take the melons, but they did ask Dave to bring back a melon for them to eat. Carl would not go with the group either, but he reported the group to Mr. Smith.

How would you react to Dave's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Tom and Jim's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Carl's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

33) Earl asked his roommates to join him to break into a local gas station where they could steal \$100. Bruce said that he would help Earl with the burglary. Jack would not help Earl but would not report him either; on the other hand, Pete refused to join the two boys and reported them to the police.

How would you react to Pete's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Earl's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval. How would you react to Jack's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Bruce's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval. 31, One night, a group of five boys found a car with the keys in the ignition. John suggested that they "borrow" the car for a joy ride. Two of the boys decided to go with him. Larry decided that stealing an automobile was too serious for him so he would not join them. Bob did not approve of taking the car either. but he reported the theft to the police.

How would you react to John's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Bob's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

How would you react to Larry's behavior? (1) strong approval; (2) approval; (3) no opinion; (4) disapproval; (5) strong disapproval.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Associatio. <u>Guide for Sentencing</u>. New York: National Probation and Parole Association, 1957.
- Barber, Bernard. Social Stratification. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1957.
- Becker, Howard. The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Becker, Howard. Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- Blalock, Herbert. Social Statistics. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1960.
- Bloch, Herbert and Frank Flynn. <u>Delinquency</u>. New York: Random House, 1956.
- Bogardus, Emory. "Race Relations by Sexes," <u>Sociology</u> and <u>Social Research</u>, XLIII (July-August, 1959), 439-441.
- Bogardus, Emory. "Social Distance Changes in the United States During the Past Thirty Years," <u>Socialogy</u> and <u>Social Research</u>, XLIII(November-December, 1958), 129-135.
- Bossard, James and Eleanor Boll. The Sociology of Child Development. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Brookover, Wilbur, Jean Le Pere, Don Hamachek, Shailer Thomas, and Edsel Erickson. "Improving Academic Achievement Through Students' Self-Concept Enhancement," <u>U. S. Office of Education</u> Cooperative Research Project #1636, (East Lansing, 1965).
- Brookover, Wilbur, Don Hamachek, and Edsel Erickson, "Relationship of Self-Concept to Achievement in High School," <u>U. S. Office of Education Cooperative</u> <u>Research Project</u> #2831, (East Lansing, 1966).

- Brookover, Wilbur, Ann Paterson, and Shailer Thomas. "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement," <u>U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research</u> <u>Froject #845</u> (East Lansing, 1962).
- Caldwell, Robert. Criminology. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1965.
- Cavan, Ruth Shone. Juvenile Delinquency. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1962.
- Cavan, Ruth Shone. <u>Readings in Juvenile Delinquency</u>. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1964.
- Cavan, Ruth Shone. "The Concepts of Tolerance and Contraculture as Applied to Delinquency," <u>Sociological Quarterly</u>, II (January, 1961),243-258.
- Centers, Richard. The Psychology of Social Class. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.
- Clinard, Marshall. <u>Sociology of Deviant Behavior</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1963.
- Cloward, Richard and Lloyd Ohlin. <u>Delinquency and Op-</u> portunity. New York: The Free Press, 1960.
- Cohen, Albert. <u>Delinquent Boys</u>. New York: International Universities Press, 1955.
- Cohen, Albert. <u>Deviance and Control</u>. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1966.
- Coleman, James. The Adolescent Society. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Elliott, Mabel and Frances Merrill. <u>Social Disorganiza-</u> <u>tion</u>. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1950.
- Erikson, Kai. "Notes on the Sociology of Deviance," Social Problems, IX (Spring, 1962), 307-314.
- Faris, Robert. Social Disorganization. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1955.
- Glaser, Daniel. "Criminality Theories and Behavioral Images," <u>American</u> Journal of Sociology, VXI (May, 1956), 430-450.

- Goffman, Erving, Stigma, Englewood Cliffs New Jerse
- Goffman, Erving. <u>Stigma</u>. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1963.
- Goode, William and Paul Hatt. <u>Methods in Social Research</u>. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1952.
- Horrocks, John. <u>Psychology of Adolescence</u>. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1951.
- Josselyn, Irene. The Adolescent and His World. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1952.
- Kitsuse, John. "Societal Reactions to Deviant Behavior," Social Problems, IX (Winter, 1962), 247-257.
- Lundberg, George A., Clarence Schrag, and Otto N. Larsen. Sociology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Maddox, George and Bevode Mc Call. Drinking Among Teen-Agers: a Sociological Interpretation of Alcohol Use in a High School. New Brunswick: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1964.
- Matza, David. <u>Delinquency</u> and <u>Drift</u>. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Merton, Robert. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1957.
- Merton, Robert, Leonard Broom, Leonard Cottrell. Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1959.
- Murphy, Fred, Mary Shirley, and Helen Witmer. "The Incidence of Hidden Delinquency," <u>American Journal</u> of Orthopsychiatry, XVI (October, 1946), 686-696.
- Neumeyer, Martin. Juvenile Delinquency in Modern Society. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- Porterfield, Austin. Youth in Trouble. Fort Worth: Leo Potishman Foundation, 1946.
- Reckless, Walter. The Crime Problem. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, 1961.
- Remmers, Herman and D. H. Radler. <u>The American Teenagers</u>. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1957.

- Riley, Matilda. Sociological Research. New York: Harcourt, Brace, World, Incorporated, 1963.
- Schur, Edwin. Crimes Without Victims. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1965.
- Shaw, Clifford and Henry Mc Kay. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Shaw, Marvin and Jack Wright. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Short, James and Ivan Nye. "Extent of Unrecorded Juvenile Delinquencies: Tentative Conclusions," Journal of Criminal Law, IL (November-December, 1958), 296-302.
- Short, James and Ivan Nye. "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior," <u>Social</u> Problems, V (Winter, 1957-58), 208-213.
- Short, James and Ivan Nye. "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXII (June, 1957), <u>326-341</u>.
- Siegel, Sidney. <u>Nonparametric</u> <u>Statistics</u> for the <u>Behavioral</u> <u>Sciences</u>. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Stone, L. Joseph and Joseph Church. Childhood and Adolescence. New York: Random House, 1957.
- Sutherland, Edwin and Donald Cressey. <u>Principles of</u> <u>Criminology</u>. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1960.
- Sykes, Gresham. <u>Crime and Society</u>. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Taft, Donald. Criminology. New York: The Mac Millan Company, 1956.
- Tappan, Paul. <u>Contemporary Correction</u>. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1951.
- Thrasher, Frederic. The Gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Vedder, Clyde, Samual Koenig, and Robert Clark. <u>Crimi-</u> nology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1953.

- Vold, George. Theoretical Criminology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Wallerstein, James and Clement Wyle. "Our Law-Abiding Law-Breakers," National Probation, XXV (April, 1947), 107-112.
- Whyte, William. <u>Street Corner Society</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

