22122323

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN EXAMINATION OF THE VALUES OF
DELINQUENT AND NONDELINQUENT
YOUTH

presented by

KURT REO BOCKES

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Masters degree in _Criminal Justice_

Major professor

Date _May 20, 1988_

AN EXAMINATION OF THE VALUES OF
DELINQUENT AND NONDELINQUENT
YOUTH

By

Kurt Reo Bockes

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Criminal Justice

1988

ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF THE VALUES OF
DELINQUENT AND NONDELINQUENT
YOUTH

By

Kurt Reo Bockes

The question of why some youth choose to break the law and others do not has perplexed researchers and practioners alike for years. The purpose of this study was to examine the values of delinquent and nondelinquent youth to determine if any differences existed. The subjects selected for the study were 92 male and female 9th - 12th graders attending an urban high school and 36 male and female 9th - 11th graders residing in a juvenile detention facility. A values questionnaire was administered to both groups. The two groups differed significantly on 16 of the 113 questions ($p < .05$, .01, .001). The results indicated that there does appear to be differences between the values of the two groups.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Youth In Trouble

Youth in trouble, not something new in our society, or in other societies around the world. For years people have pondered the causes of crime in youth and possible ways to alleviate it. Youth acting out is not a relatively new phenomenon. In fact acting out or misbehaving has been a relatively common occurance among youth throughout history. The concept of juvenile delinquency is a relatively new concept in relation though. It came about in this country about the time the first juvenile court was established in Cook County Illinois in 1899 (Gibbons & Krohn, 1986). The development of the court was a reflection of a new belief about youth and about juvenile law breaking in general. Youth delinquency was no longer seen necessarily as an evil rooted in the soul of the child but more or less caused by forces outside of the child (Gibbons & Krohn, 1986; Trojanowicz & Morash, 1983); forces over which the child had no control.

What emerged was the development of the child saving movement, providing for legislation which called for a separation of youthful lawbreakers from adult ones. As stated before, the causes of crime shifted from the individual to forces outside the control of the individual, i.e., society. Families were seen as contributing to the problem as well as community disruption and disorder. Child saving institutions were developed to bring about the necesssary reform. It was espoused that if the child was removed from the environment causing the problem, they could be rehabilitated (Trojanowicz & Morash, 1983).

1

As a result, the plans were set in motion for reform. For the next several decades programs sprung up everywhere all advocating the notion that the child could be saved, rehabilitation wasn't just an idea, it was a reality and they were set out to prove it (Gibbons & Krohn, 1986; Shover, 1979; Trojanowicz & Morash, 1983). As the years rolled along very little was done in the way of evaluating the results of the various approaches put into practice in the various programs until the 1960's. The results weren't encouraging. It appeared that very few programs had any over all effect of rehabilitating delinquent youth or preventing crime (Gibbons & Krohn, 1986). Crime rates continued to rise in the United States and youth were soon identified as one of the main sources (Strasburg) .

The 1960's were a time of political and social turmoil. With the developments in Vietnam, the "hippie" movement, the drug culture, cults, and student radical movements, youth were seen as young rebels, no longer abiding by the teachings and values of previous generations. "Between 1960 and 1975, juvenile arrests rates grew by nearly 300%, more than twice the adult rate" (Strasburg, p. 2). The largest growth was in the area of violent crimes, i.e. robbery, assault, and homicide. Youth accounted for more than 43% of all serious index crimes in 1975 (Strasburg). In analyzing the data trends it appears that youth crime rates hit their all time high by 1975. However, the war on youth crime was just beginning to take hold. Through media scourges and hosts of legislative acts launched to curb the problem, public

opinion and sentiment rallied behind the idea that youth were out of control. As reported by Strasburg, a public opinion survey done in 1982 showed that 87% of the people polled nationally agreed that there has been an increasing and steady climb in the rates of serious juvenile crime. Yet statistically speaking, the opposite seems to be true. The large increase in juvenile arrests as seen in the 1960's and 1970's had largely begun to level off, and in some respects decline (Strasburg).

The literature (Caldwell & Black, 1971; Gibbons & Krohn, 1983; Hirschi, 1969; Trojanowicz & Morash, 1983) seems to point out and is in general agreement that adolescent youth crime is a problem in our society. It also suggests, that some youth in particular are prone toward criminal activity.

The question becomes why do juveniles act out and break the law? Many theories of delinquency have been developed and tested over the years, unfortunately yielding little success in curbing juvenile crime or in providing us with a thorough understanding as to its causes. Many have come to the conclusion that juvenile crime is more often than not a function of age. "Ah its just a phase they are going through," is heard quite often, implying that the acts of deviance may be quite normal in some respects for adolescents. In examining youth crime statistics there seems to be some support for this proposition. Yet the question which must be raised is whether this is really a valid conclusion. If maturity is seen as a "cure" for juvenile delinquency, than why

do such a large percentage of adolescents seem to avoid acts of wrong doing? Why is it that a large percentage of adolescents have been able to say no to breaking the law? What is it that separates these youth from those who choose to act out and break the law? These are questions we are constantly faced with daily in attempt to gain a further understanding of juvenile delinquency.

NEW VIEWPOINT

The present study takes a different viewpoint and focus in explaining juvenile deviance and delinquency. It is not uncommon to hear frustrated adults lament the unscrupulous behavior of a youth with such statements as "kids today have no values." "They have no sense of right and wrong." The focus of this study is upon the difference between the values of delinquent and nondelinquent youth. One may ask why the concern for values? Rokeach (1972) puts forth the proposition that values should become a main focus in research because they occupy a more central and influential role within the individual's cognitive-affective system. The concern for understanding values and development is also important if the assumption held by many that the "values of the young are more malleable than those of adults is...[also true]" (McLellan, 1970, p. 2).

The importance of values according to McLellan (1970) "is twofold: for the individual, and for society" (p. 1). Values are the basic foundation on which we as humans base our decisions to act or not act. We are taught from day one those things which

our parents or society consider to be right and wrong, and which are important to the survival of the community. Sociologist argue that values are a prerequisite if a society is to maintain order and survive. One would naturally agree there is an assumption that a general consensus exist of what is right and wrong, what is good and bad, a sense of uniformity in our way of thinking. And yet, there are clearly acts of law breaking by juveniles that occur. The question that this delemna poses is why? If there is uniformity in agreement as to what is right and wrong, than why do juveniles choose to break laws? Are they aware of the consequences of their actions? Do those who choose to break the law subscribe to the values upon which the laws are based? Or is there actually a lack of consensus about what is right and wrong? In breaking the laws of our society, are the youth involved actually reflecting a different value structure or system by their outward actions?

What this seems to be leading us towards is an assumption that delinquent youth are acting from a different value structure than those who are nondelinquent. Or put another way, the delinquent subculture may be based upon a set of values which are not entirely consistent with the values of larger society or that of youth who are nondelinquent.

CURRENT WORK

Research in this field is limited though growing. One form of application of the recent developments in value research has been to teach the students the valuing process (McKinney & Moore,

1982) Many have focused upon avenues for building resistance to what some coin as the "unavoidable stresses that many youths face in todays society" (Gullotta & Adams, 1982, p. 420). For example, the combining of affective education with drug awareness education as was done in project DARE in California (DeJong, 1986). According to Gullotta and Adams (1982), affective education is concerned with developing a sense of values for students. With the help of the classroom instructor, students focus on developing interpersonal skills and fostering their own self-esteem. Other practices have fallen under the names and labels of value clarification, value analysis, and value education. All focusing to some extent in dealing with controversial value issues (McKinney & Moore, 1982). Other work in the area of values in youth has been done on prescriptive and proscriptive value orientations of youth and parents by McKinney and associates, subcultural value theory, and Sykes and Matza's proposal of delinquent youth commitment to misdeeds and drift.

CONCEPTS OF BELIEFS, ATTITUDES, VALUES

Beliefs, attitudes and values are terms about which there is relatively little consensus, they are often used arbitrarily and interchangeably. However, "an implicit assumption among those who study cognitive concepts such as beliefs, attitudes, and values, is that there is some correspondence between behavior and these [concepts]" (McKinney & Moore, 1982, p.550). Researchers have come to recognize that beliefs, attitudes, and values are linked together to form a functionally integrated system (Rokeach, 1972). Thus if a change occurs in one part of the system, that change in the long run will have an affect on the other parts as well (Hollen, 1967; Rokeach, 1972).

Beliefs

According to Rokeach (1972) a persons beliefs represent certain basic truths about reality. Rokeach sees reality existing in three parts, physical reality, social reality, and the nature of the self. According to Rokeach these three areas represent a subsystem within the total system. It is within this subsystem that a person places their heaviest of commitments. A persons beliefs are assumed to be developed and formed very early in life. Rokeach feels that they are undoubtedly first learned in the early parent child interaction. According to Rokeach as the child grows older, the child soon learns that they are certain beliefs that are held by everyone, beliefs that only he holds, and beliefs that are important only to others. Taken together these beliefs which come about and are formed as a result of the child's various interactions, form a system which

is designed to help a person maintain a sense of ego, and group identity.

Attitudes

McKinney and Moore (1982) defined attitudes as "hypothetical constructs which serve as internal guides for [behavior]" (p. 549). Unlike values, attitudes are less global. Rokeach (1972) stated that an attitude is constructed of and represents several beliefs. It can be seen as a conglomerate, an organization of such that is formulated by various beliefs, which in turn influences how one will respond. It is generally believed that a person can have thousands of attitudes toward specific objects and situations. Hutcheon (1972) saw attitudes as mere surface, a reflection of the underlying value.

Values

Rokeach (1972) considers a value to be a type of belief centrally located at the core of ones belief system, a determiner of how one should or should not act, or about some ultimate goal or end state worth attaining. A common consensus among the researchers (McKinney & Moore, 1982; Rokeach, 1972) is that values are global abstract concepts, ideals which serve as guides to decision making. McKinney (1975) differentiated values from attitudes by stating that values refer "to a broader class of behaviors or objects than an attitude" (p. 804). Attitudes are seen then as the definer of values. Values are seen as surpassing specific objects or situations. They are in essence the determiner of both beliefs and attitudes.

Hierarchical Structure

Many writers have observed that values tend to be organized along a hierarchical structure and substructure line. The rank ordering occurs along a continuum of importance (Rokeach, 1972). Hollen in 1967 pointed out in his research that an individual's values are not autonomous from one another. Rather, they form a personal value system through being interrelated and organized hierarchically. Any change then in one part of the system due to its interrelated nature would result in a change in another part.

Instrumental and Terminal Values

Throughout the literature on values there is a distinction drawn between preferable modes of conduct and end-states v. non-preferable modes of conduct and end-states. The distinction may be defined more precisely as a distinction between values representing means and ends, between what Rokeach (1972) defines as instrumental and terminal values. An Instrumental value according to Rokeach (1972) "is defined as a single belief that always takes the following form: `I believe that such and such a mode of conduct (i.e. honesty, courage ) is personally and socially preferable in all situations with respect to all objects'" (p. 160) "A terminal value takes on a comparable form: `I believe that such and such an end state of existence (i.e. world peace) is personally and socially worth striving for'" (Rokeach, 1972, p. 160). If we accept Rokeach's definitions, we can postulate then that two value systems exist, one existing as a mean the other existing as an end. Each system is no doubt

ordered along some sort of continuum, and is connected to the other in some sort of fashion (Hollen, 1967; Rokeach, 1972).

To say then that a person has a value is essentially to say that person believes that there are certain ways of behaving or certain ends worth attaining which are more worthwhile than others. According to Rokeach (1972) once the value is internalized it takes on the role of a guide. It becomes a standard by which behaviors are judged, our own as well as others. It becomes a standard by which comparisons are made particularly in relation to comparing our self with others. Homant (1967) referred to values as either preferential or normative. Preferential values were seen as goals to achieve and normative as qualities used as a standard to judge.

Values as Schematic Representations

McKinney (1975) has taken a slightly different approach in his understanding of values. He looked upon values as being understood as schematic representations of earlier behavior. These schematic representations in turn serve as guides for new behavior much the same way Rokeach's (1972) internalized instrumental and terminal values do. According to McKinney (1975), the person is seen as an active agent whose values are influenced by the feedback from his or her self-initated behavior. Thus McKinney is drawing a parallel between values and schemata in that they both develop along the same lines in terms of previous experiences. In order to understand McKinney's parallel it may be helpful to define his usage of schematic

representations, and schemata. In its simplest form a scheme can be defined as some type of diagram or arrangement organized in such a way to give us an organized frame work to aid us in our understanding of events. In other words it can be viewed as a blue print which gives us a frame of reference to work from. McKinney used the analogy of the bodies central nervous systems representation of active behavior to explain his point. According to the work of Held (1961), "a vital component of the development of the schema is the self-produced movement of the body or...[particular] part in question, and the associated reafference, or sensory feedback" (McKinney, 1975 p. 801). McKinney's translation of this theory into social psychology of values, showed that "for a subject to develop a value (schema), he or she must freely choose (self-produced movement) and perceive the stimulus changes contingent on his own behavior (reafference)" (McKinney, 1975 p. 801). In other words, one would perceive that they are responsible for their own behavior, that it is self-produced. In support of McKinney's proposition of a schematic representation of values is the research of Caro (1966) on the values of middle and working class youth attached to various occuapations; Rodmans (1963) work on lower class value stretch; and Thompson and Gardners (1969) work in comparing delinquent and nondelinquent boys and girls on measures of telenomic (value characteristics of happy-successful or an unhappy-unsuccessful person) trends (McKinney, 1975).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF VALUES IN YOUTH

Learning theorist would argue that an individuals values are a product of socialization; reflective of both the culture and the personality of the individual (Hollen, 1972). Maccoby (1968) points out that "from the standpoint of larger society, one of the objectives or goals of the socialization process is to produce individuals who will not only conform to the socially prescribed rules of conduct but will, as members of society accept them as their own values" (p. 230) There are three major theories in the field of psychology which attempt to explain the acquisition of values and morals in children.

Psychoanalytic Theory

Psychoanalytic theory focuses on the role of the parent in shaping and determining the values and character of children. What psychoanalytic theory proposes is that the child faces frustrations from the environment which prevent the child from getting what ~~they~~ want and generally results in ~~the venting of~~ unacceptable behavior. The parents role is one of bringing the childs behavior around into an acceptable realm approved of by society. The childs response to this control is one of anger and hostility toward the parent, however due to the fear of loss of love, the child learns to repress his anger. The result is the adoption of the parental rules and values. The child learns to internalize these rules and values. Whenever the child breaks the rules or goes against the values, he feels guilt feelings (super-ego functioning); whenever the child follows the

proscribed rules he feels satisfaction (ego-ideal functioning). The super-ego and ego-ideal make up the childs conscious (Hoffman, 1973).

Learning Theory

Learning theorist posit the notion that values are learned through imitation. Some, see children primarily learning through imitating behavior; others sees the child learning through imitating conformity to parental ethical promptings (Homant, 1967). As pointed out by Homant (1967) there seems to be some discrepancy as to what the child learns first, "the concept of a particular value or the behavior which accompanies that value..." (p. 3) In addition in order for a value to become conscious, researchers would argue that the child must be able to infer it from his own behavior.

Learning theory sees parental interaction as important in the acquisition of values. The idea is that certain sanctions and punishments bring about feelings of anxiety, fear, and the inhibition of acts outside of the realm of acceptable behavior. Appropriate responses are reinforced, and the child learns to habitually internalize the proscribed modes of conduct (Hoffman, 1973). Learning theory supports the notion of modeling and the internalization of the acquired knowledge. Franz Adler's work supports the notion that values are learned components of personalities and that they are defined in terms of behavior (Hutcheon, 1972).

Cognitive-Developmental Theory

The cognitive-developmental approach was brought to the forefront through the works of Piaget, and Kohlberg. Unlike the two previous theories, there is less emphasis placed here on the role of the parent. However, Piaget doesn't rule out the importance that the parent can play, rather he emphasizes the notion of the parent moving more toward a less authoritian role, one in which the interaction is more peer like. Piaget felt that authoritian roles served to keep the child at a pre-moral stage of development. In order for the child to develop morally the peer-like role is seen as helping the child move from a condition of moral heteronomy to a condition of moral autonomy (Hoffman, 1973). The child then "forms moral values through a process of peer relationships" (Hoffman, 1973 p. 4).

According to Piaget, as a child develops and is exposed to new stimuli (i.e. social experiences) the capacity for certain cognitive functions develop. The child moves from a state of perceiving everything as rigid and unchangeable, to a state where he begins to perceive himself as an individual. He begins to realize that others may view things differently than he does. The concept of authority changes from that of an omnipotent parental rule to a more broadly defined concept of authority. As the childs thinking changes so does his pattern of moral thoughts and values. This change in moral and value beliefs is seen as the result of the reorganization of cognitive structures due to the facilitated interaction with peers and the

environment;   not something imposed by the childs parents (Hoffman, 1973).

Systems Development

From the moment of birth the young child receives various stimuli from the environment. These stimuli are accompanied by various experiences, some good, some bad. Through the connection the child makes between the various experiences and the stimuli, the child begins to organize his experiences into a system (Hutcheon, 1972). The young child progresses from random selections to belief construction. He learns to know and to value as he organizes the incoming information. This information includes such things as ideals, norms, feelings, and the established knowledge of his culture (Hutcheon, 1972). The assumption which this model leads us to is that values are learned criteria, stemming from our experiences and serve as guides for our actions (Hutcheon, 1972). " They emerge from the inextricably intertwined affective and cognitive belief systems" (Hutcheon, 1972, p. 180). Attitudes and behaviors are then seen as results or manisfestations of the underlying values. Thus when a person makes a conscious choice, it is the previous organization of values which serve to define who that individual is, and which determine the selection of an appropriate response (Hutcheon, 1972). The point that Hutcheon is trying to bring forth is that "at the moment of conscious choice, it is not merely the ideals and norms as objectified in the culture, but the individual's entire value system which combines with the

immediate stimuli to determine his behavior" (p. 181). In other words a persons behavior can be exemplified by his value system which is the result of the sum total of past knowledge and experiences.

Prescriptive and Proscriptive Value Orientation

McKinney (1971) has pointed out that the development of behavioral values has been seen as a twofold process, "one aspect dealing with pride for doing what is right, and the other dealing with guilt for doing what is wrong" (p. 71). In looking at both psychonalytic theory and learning theory, McKinney says youth appear to develop values as they are rewarded for doing good, and punished for doing bad. McKinney has modified this twofold process into a fourfold model. McKinney has defined this model as a prescriptive - proscriptive model. Prescriptive values are seen as "thou shalt" types of reinforcement and proscriptive values are seen as "thou shalt not" types of reinforcement. According to McKinney, children acquire a prescriptive orientation when they are rewarded for doing what is right, and punished for not doing what is right. They acquire a proscriptive orientation when they are punished for doing wrong and rewarded for not doing wrong. The difference lies in the emphasis placed on the type of sanctions or rewards given. To test this theory out, several studies have been done on various age groups (McKinney, 1971; McKinney 1973; McKinney, Chin, Reinhart & Trierweiler, 1985; McKinney, Hotch & Truhon, 1977; Olejnik & McKinney, 1973; Truhon, McKinney & Hotch, 1980). The

results show "that children growing up with parents who are more rewarding than punitive, tend to express prescriptive values as young adults" (McKinney, Chin, Reinhart & Trierweiler 1985 p. 315-316). "Young adults who are proscriptively oriented report that their parents were more punitive in their child-rearing practices" (McKinney, Chin, Reinhart & Trierweiler, 1985, p. 316)

<u>Object</u> <u>and</u> <u>Person</u> <u>Constancy</u>

Object and person constancy are seen as important components in the early development of the child. They are seen as two necessary prerequisites for developing a sense of self constancy. The role of object and person constancy is one which provides a child with the basic minimum trust that the physical world will stay put and also that people can be depended upon to react in a constant manner (Rokeach, 1972). For example, a child learns that an object which he sits on and has four legs is called a chair. He internalizes this concept chair, it takes on physical as well as mental meaning, and is not expected to change. Likewise "a child depends [upon the women he calls mother] to remain his mother, his family... to remain his family [and his social group to remain his social group]" (Rokeach, 1972 p. 7). According to Rokeach (1972) it appears that children need and strive for far more person constancy than what seems to be provided by the physical environment. This stronger dependence upon person constancy may be a result from the childs earliest interactions, that with parents, particularly the mother, which generally form the childs earliest reference group.

Rokeach (1972) assumed that any inexplicable disruption of object and person constancies, would lead an individual to question their own understanding, or worth. Or, put another way any attack upon a primary belief supported by one's most basic values would leave a person quite shaken, possibly causing them to question their own self identity. McKinney (1968) poses the question "does environmental stability, including such things as changes in the family structure, frequent changes in geographic location, etc. affect the permanence with which a child will state a preference?" (p. 82) In addition what effect does this have on the stability of the childs value system which serves as a guide for behavior?

As a child moves into adolescence, in addition to the various physical changes he or she encounters, they also go through changes in their cognitive functioning as well. "While attitudes, [beliefs], and values also change, they [also] play an important role in the maintaining of identity, and continuity for the adolescent" (McKinney & Moore, 1982, p. 549). Values come to be seen as stablizers, serving as internal guides for the individual, insuring that behavior is less random, more directed, and as a result, more predictable (McKinney & Moore, 1982).

Identity and Self Attitude

Hoffman (1973) expanded upon the concept of identity and self attitude and it's relationship to outward behaviors. He felt that evaluative self attitudes are significant determinants

of social behaviors. In examining the work of Coppersmith (1967) Hoffman noted that some sort of correlation existed between self attitudes and the persons values. "Coopersmith suggests that persons who regard themselves negatively will be inclined to be intropunitive and passive in adapting to environmental demands and pressures; while those who place a higher value on themselves will adopt a more active and assertive position" (Hoffman, 1973, p. 6). Hoffman felt that a childs identity and perception of himself was greatly determined by the feelings of those around him. Consequently, a childs values also may be heavily influenced by those around him.

INTERNALIZATION, VALUES AND MORAL REASONING

Internalization

McLellan (1970) points out that both Kohlberg and Maccoby have noted that the most prevalent conceptualization of moral value development has been the increasing internalization of basic cultural rules of social action. The work done by Hartshorne and May from 1928-1930 on moral behavior was based upon the premises that internalization was a type of internally motivated conformity or resistance to temptation (McLellan, 1970). Kohlberg in a paper presented at a Human Development Symposium at the University of Chicago stated: "The basic assumption of most...is that moral development is a matter of internalizing external cultural standards through reinforcement or identification" (Cited in McLellan, 1970). "The judgemental or cognitive aspect of internalization of a value suggests an

understanding... and a... valuing of it" (McLellan, 1970, p. 9). The value then becomes a standard by which judgements are made and behavior justified.

Moral Reasoning

Piaget

Flavell (1963) in his book The developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget, stated that if we are to understand Piaget, we need to understand that for Piaget, rational morality and general morality develop along the same lines. Piaget saw a strong relationship between morality and thought. In looking back on the previous discussion on Piaget, we notice that his work on development focuses on the succession of stages. As the child moves along in his development the environment imposes itself upon the child resulting in a constant pattern of interaction between the child and the environment. This interaction plays a key role in the cognitive changes and functioning of the child. McLellan (1970) in examing Piagets work points out that there are two identifiable stages in the early development of the child relating to the moral reasoning; the heteronomous stage and the autonomous stage. Prior to the heteronomous stage the child has not internalized rules of conduct at all. They are perceived as being entirely external to the child. During the heteronomous stage a partial internalization of rules that were previously external to the child begins to occur. When the child enters the autonomous stage full internalization of rules occurs.

Piaget's cognitive developmental theory consists of four stages of development. The child starts out in the sensori-motor stage, moves through the preoperational stage, the concrete operational stage, and finally into the formal operational stage (Flavell, 1963; McLellan, 1970). By age 7 the child has moved into the concrete operational stage of development. Here the child begins to differentiate means and ends. Means are seen by the child as instruments. Prior to this stage the child was not able to differentiate means and ends. The child stays in this stage until approximately age 11 or 12. It is this stage of development which coincides with Piaget's autonomous stage of moral judgement. According to Piaget (McLellan, 1970), even though the child in the concrete stage successfully internalizes rules that were previously external to himself, moral development in the child is not complete. It is not until the child enters the formal operational stage that it is complete. Up until this time the child's thinking is limited, they are not able to think abstractly. In formal operations the child, now an adolescent is able to think in abstract terms. He is able to take moral concepts learned during the concrete stage and apply them to various situations he is likely to encounter. The adolescent thus is able to formulate social ideas and principles (McLellan, 1970). They are able to take such statements as "don't do harm to your neighbor" and realize that it just doesn't apply to the person next door but rather understands that "neighbor" refers to everyone.

Kohlberg

"Kohlbergs conceptualization of moral judgement suggests...that morality develops within a frame work of general cognitive growth which imposes restriction on the judgemental abilities of the child" (McLellan, 1970, p. 14). Kohlberg identified six stages of moral development. They are:

I. Preventional Level

Stage 1.: The punishment and obedience orientation.

Stage 2.: The instrumental relativist orientation.

II. Conventional Level

Stage 3.: The interpersonal concordance or "good boy nice girl" orientation.

Stage 4.: The law and order orientation.

III. Postconventional Level

Stage 5.: The social contract, legalistic orientation.

Stage 6.: The universial ethical principle orientation.

Kohlberg concluded that moral internalization relates closely to the cognitive development of moral concepts. At the first two stages standards of judgement and motivation are external rewards and punishments. At the middle two stages, the standards the child uses are...external. He has internalized much of his motivation to conform where he feels it neccesary to maintain the expectations of the family, group or nation.

At the highest stages, the motivations and standards have become internal to the individual. It is at these stages that the individual becomes truly moral for Kohlberg (McLellan, 1970, p. 16).

.

For Kohlberg values play an important and vital role in development. In looking at Kohlberg's six stages of development, values take on various significant roles as one progresses through the six stages. Let us follow for example the value of honesty.

At stage one the reasoning for honest actions or behavior is based strictly on the consequences of the actions. There is no regard given to the goodness or badness of being honest. In stage two the reason for one to be honest is purely self interest. The focus is on the individuals needs and occasionally the needs of others. Stage three the individual is concerned with meeting the expectations of others, thus the need to be honest is interpreted in relation to not disappointing others, of acquiring their approval. Stage four the law and order stage focuses on doing ones duty. Being honest is seen as right because it shows respect for what is right, its what authority figures want. Stage five focuses upon the legal point of view. The social utility of an act is very important, honesty is seen as being important because it is right for society as well as personal needs. Stage six focuses on the universal principle of honesty. It is a path chosen because it meets with the ethical principles and values of the individual. There is not one set of

rules which defines the need for honest behavior, rather the principles are abstract, they focus on the universal aspect of the individual as a human being, an individual person. Honesty is seen as a need because it is an ideal state. (McLellan, 1970)

The Relationship of Values and Moral Reasoning

Given any cultural context there is bound to be universally held agreements of what is right and wrong. Implicit in this assumption is that if Kohlbergs theory holds true we can expect that individuals at the same level of moral reasoning will share certain commonalities in their concepts of right and wrong. However, individuals may value a particular end-state, but for very different reasons. A value may then come to take various meanings depending upon the level of reasoning an individual may be at, at any given time. McLellan (1970) anticipated that there would be certain differences among individual who utilize differential reasoning for maintaining their values.

Let us once again take a look at the value honesty in this following example to stress the above point. Tom and Joe both place a high priority on the value honesty. We may say though that Tom values honesty more than Joe does because Tom is at a higher level of reasoning, lets say level five of Kohlbergs theory, than Joe who may be at level three. Implicit in the notion presented is that honesty may be more internalized for Tom than Joe. The stronger the internalization, the more stable the value, the less likely it would be influenced by external stimuli. If Joe values honesty less in comparison due to the

re
fe
in
ma
Je
in
re
s
in
h
in
s

c
ac
s
ba
sa
re

Ro

reasoning level he may be at, we can say that the internalization for Joe is less and that Joe may be more susceptible to external influences. In all probability, depending on the situation Joe may find himself in, other values may come to take precedent. Joe may find himself in a situation where he finds it more important to save face rather than be honest, and chooses as a result to tell a lie. Though Joe may value honesty, in the situation cited above, other values become the determining factor in influencing Joes behavior. Behavior then comes to be seen as highly situational, highly influenced by the level of internalization, level of reasoning, the environment and or situation.

For Kohlberg, values of an individual at the preconventional or conventional levels (stages one through four) are largely accidental or culture-bound. But as one moves into level five or six, Kohlberg argues that the ideal principles of any society are basically similar (McLellan, 1970). In essence what Kohlberg is saying is that values become so internalized that their level of reasoning transcended all cultural bounds.

Maccoby (1968) provides us with the following excerpt on Kohlberg and his views on values:

> If values are being internalized... should it not be true that they guide behavior? Kohlberg recognizes the importance of the issues involved in the mesh between moral values and moral behavior. He does insist that moral judgements are of importance in their own right,

that society cares not only about what an individual does but cares also about the nature of the moral judgements an individual is able to make concerning his own behavior and that of others. He points out that law requires that the individual shall be able to distinguish right from wrong before he may be punished for a deviant act and that futhermore, the law judges behavior in terms of the intent as well as the consequences of an individuals actions. Therefore, it is important to understand the development both of concepts of right and wrong and of the ability to judge on the basis of intentionality, even if these aspects of moral development are unrelated to overt deviant or conforming behavior...[or actions] (p. 239-240).

Kolberg essentially found in his research "that youth who understand justice act more justly...(1968, p. 30)."

YOUTH DELINQUENCY & VALUES

In the field of delinquency, many have subscribed to the notion that delinquents share certain sets of values which may be in opposition to the prescribed rules of society. The work of Cressey and Sutherland, Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin (Lerman, 1968; Trojanowicz & Morash, 1983) have all stressed the notion that youth who are delinquent subscribe to a set of values which differ from the traditional societial norms. The subcultural theorist propose that the approval of delinquent activities by delinquent youth are normative within their subculture. Others

have suggested that the normative standards of delinquents differ from nondelinquents as a result of ineffective internalization of cultural values (Hindelang, 1970).

According to Hindelang, (1970) Sykes and Matza (1961) rejected the explainations put forth by the subculture theorist. According to Sykes and Matza delinquents and nondelinquents alike view illegal behavior as wrong. Sykes and Matza explain:

> Many delinquents are...essentially in agreement with the larger society, at least with regard to the evaluation of delinquent behavior as wrong. Rather than standing in opposition to conventional idea's of good conduct, the delinquent is likely to adhere to the dominant norms in belief but render them ineffective in practice by holding various attitudes and perceptions which serve to neutralize the norms as checks on behavior.
> (Hindelang 1970, p. 502)

In a study conducted by Hindelang in 1970, Sykes and Matza's notion of delinquency drift was looked at. The results obtained by Hindelang seemed to refute Sykes and Matza's proposal. It appeared that there was a significant connection between delinquent involvement and the approval of delinquent acts. The results showed that those engaging in a delinquent activity differed from those not engaging in delinquent activity in relation to the evaluation of the activity along an approval-disapproval continuum (Hindelang, 1970). There exist here support for the notion that there is a difference in value

structures of delinquent and nondelinquent youth.

In looking at the concept of moral reasoning, we stated that those individuals who are at a higher level of reasoning will have a stronger internalization of their values than those at a lower level. Work in the area of internal and external locus of control shows that externally oriented individuals see their behavior as being contingent upon external circumstances; and internally oriented individuals perceive their behavior to be an offshoot of what they do, think and feel. Various studies done by Kendell (1978), Beck (1978), and Gilmore (1978), showed that delinquent youth were more externally oriented than nondelinquent youth (Shaver, 1982), giving support to the notion of the relationship of behavior and moral reasoning. Furthermore, Jessor, Graves, Henson and Jessor (1968) found that parential techniques had a major influence as to whether a child was internally or externally oriented (Shaver, 1982).

THE PRESENT STUDY

This study is an investigation of those values which are the basic foundation on which we as humans base our decisions and behavior on. A value here is defined as a belief located at the core of ones total belief system, hierarchically organized along a continuum, which determines how one should or should not act in relation to an end state worth attaining. In particular this study will attempt to look at those values which are considered to be of extreme importance in determining the behaviors of delinquent and nondelinquent youth. This study will also attempt to determine if delinquent and nondelinquent youth differ in their perception, ranking and utilization of values, and examine the moral reasoning level of delinquent and nondelinquent youth. For the purpose of this study delinquent youth are defined as those who have been adjudicated by the juvenile court and reside in a juvenile facility. Nondelinquent youth are define as those who have not been adjudicated by court and reside elsewhere than a juvenile facility.

HYPOTHESES

A. Delinquent youth will subscribe to a different set of values than nondelinquent youth.

B. Delinquent youth will rank order values differently than nondelinquent youth.

C. Delinquent youth will utilize a lower level of moral reasoning than nondelinquent youth.

Subjects

Initial contact was made with the superintendent of a juvenile detention center, and the assistant superintendent of a school district in an urban midwestern community for the necessary permission to conduct the study.

The subjects selected to participate in the study were male and female 9-12th graders attending an urban high school, and male and female 9-11th graders in a juvenile detention facility. For the purpose of this study delinquent youth were classified as those youth adjudicated and residing in a juvenile detention facility; nondelinquent youth were classified as those subjects who attended regular high school. Names of the individual subjects participating were not acquired to ensure that the identity of each subject participating in the study was kept anonymous.

Procedure

All youth in the juvenile detention facility participated in the study. The assistant principal of the high school selected, with the permission of the teachers in each class four classrooms, grades ranging from 9-12th. The level of the classes selected ranged from advanced studies to remedial studies to ensure a complete cross section of the student population. The procedure for administering the questionnaire in the juvenile detention facility and the high school was identical. The experimenter, reading from a set of instructions to ensure that each class was handled identically introduced himself to the

class and explained his reason for being there and the purpose of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was then handed out to each student. The students were told that they were under no obligation to complete the questionnaire if they chose not to. The students were then instructed to begin filling out the questionnaire and to return it to the experimenter when finished. Each questionnaire received a letter code ("A" for the high school,"B" for the detention facility) by the experimenter as they were handed in to distinguish the subjects of the juvenile detention facility from the subjects of the high school. Each researcher was given a list of possible anticipated questions which the students might have asked. Along with each question went a standard answer to be given to ensure uniformity. When the students were finished the experimenter thanked them for their time and efforts and departed.

Instrument

The questionnaire used consisted of 113 objective (multiple choice, true and false) and three open-ended type questions designed to elicit responses to compare the perception, understanding, and ranking of specific values relating to the subjects (delinquent & nondelinquent) behavior as adolescents. The values which were looked at in this study were the instrumental and terminal values as defined by Rokeach (1972). The questionnaire was broken down into five value areas. Section one was concerned with the subjects knowledge of specific values. These values were: people, honesty, respecting others property (not stealing), respect for authority, and respect for others

(not hurting or assaulting). Section two looked at the ranking of values. It was divided up into two sections, terminal values, and instrumental values. Section three dealt with where the subjects perceived they learned values from. Section four was concerned with identifying whom the subject perceived their values to be most like. Section five looked at the values of personal responsibility, love, and the values the subject perceived to be needed in life. The questionnaire was designed in such a way that questions from the various sections were mixed together. This was seen as important in order to control for set patterned responses, i.e. assuming and answering all the responses for "honesty" as true without reading them all.

In section one, 17 questions related to the value of people, 9 questions dealt with the concept of honesty, 17 questions dealt with the concept of respect for others property, 25 dealt with the concept of respect for authority, and 7 questions dealt with the concept of respect for others in relation to the concept of assault.

In section two the subjects were asked to rank a list of terminal and instrumental values. 16 terminal values were given and 8 instrumental. The subjects were asked to select and rank the 4 most important and the 1 least important terminal values and rank in the order of importance the 8 instrumental values. Section three consisted of 1 multiple choice question dealing with where the subjects learned their values from. Section four consisted of 4 likert style questions concerned with identifying

who the subjects perceived their values to be most like. Section five consisted of 3 open ended questions concerned with identifying what the subjects perceived to be the necessary values need in life, 4 questions dealing with the concept of personal responsibility for one actions, 1 question designed to illicit responses as to why youth do things they know to be wrong and 4 questions dealing with the concept of love and the subjects understanding of it.

Statistical Design

General frequencies were run on the data to determine if any of the results had the appearance of being significant. After identifying those variables which appeared to be significant, crosstabulations were performed on the variables to determine if there was any significant difference between the responses of the subjects in both groups. The statistical test chosen was the Chi-Square. The chosen level of significance was .05 or greater. Specific comparisons were made between nondelinquent youth and delinquent youth as a whole and nondelinquent males and delinquent males. Comparisons between nondelinquent and delinquent females were not performed due to the lack of equivalence of subjects within this category.

RESULTS

Demographics

An examination of the responses between the youth from the high school and the youth from the detention home yielded the following results. The total number of participants in the study was 128. Of the total participants from the high school 43.47% were males; 56.52% were females. Of those participating from the detention home 94.44% were males; 5.55% were females (see table 1).

In looking specifically at the demographic data presented in tables 1., 2., and 3., we see in comparing the high school youth against the detention home youth that the high school youth are on the average a year older, and one grade ahead in school. The high school youth also tend to have less siblings and less single parent homes.

Demographics of Male subjects Only

In looking at only the male subjects from each group we see that the demographic results follow the same pattern as outline above. However, we see an even larger spread between the two groups when examing the number of single and two parent homes.

Results of All Youth Participating In The Study

Section One, Knowledge of Specific Values

In comparing the responses between the youth from the high school and the youth from the detention home we find the following results. Section one of the questionnaire was concern with identifying any differences between the two groups in relation to their respective knowledge and understanding of

TABLE 1.

Demographic Statistics of All Youth
Participating in the Study

TOTAL PARTICIPANTS = 128

	MALES	FEMALES
HIGH SCHOOL	40	52
DETENTION HOME	34	2

AGE	HIGH SCHOOL	DETENTION HOME
RANGE	14 - 18	12 - 17
MEAN	15.63	14.77

GRADE IN SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL	DETENTION HOME
RANGE	9th - 12th	6th - 11th
MODE	10th	9th

SIBLINGS	HIGH SCHOOL	DETENTION HOME
RANGE	0 - 6	0 - 6
MEAN	2.15	3.02

	HIGH SCHOOL	DETENTION HOME
*SINGLE PARENT HOMES	17.39%	41.66%
*TWO PARENT HOMES	64%	22%

*(Includes natural parents only)

TABLE 2

Age, School Grade, and Number of Siblings Statistics
for High School and Detention Home Male Subjects

Subjects	Age		School Grade		Siblings	
High School Males (Ss = 40)	Range	= 14-18	Range	= 9-12	Range	= 0-6
	Mean	= 15.9	Mode	= 10-11	Mean	= 2.52
Detention Home Males (Ss = 34)	Range	= 12-17	Range	= 6-11	Range	= 0-6
	Mean	= 14.73	Mode	= 9	Mean	= 3.02

TABLE 3

Number of High School and Detention Home Males Residing
in Either Single or Two Parent Households

Subjects	*Live with Single Parent	*Live with Two Parents
High School Males (Ss = 40)	12.5%	60%
Detention Home Males (Ss = 34)	41.17%	23.5%

* Includes natural parents only

specific values.

Values of People

The two groups differed on 4 of the 17 questions dealing with the concept of valuing certain groups of people. The subjects were asked to identify in question B1 (see appendix for complete copy of questionnaire) which pair was more valuable, boys or girls. The high school youth responses indicated that 89.13% felt they were of equal value, 6.52% said boys were more valuable, and 4.34% said girls were more valuable. In contrast, 50% of the youth from the detention home said that they were of equal value, 5.55% said boys were more valuable and 44.44% ranked girls as being more valuable. The responses indicated (see table 4) that there was a significant difference between the two groups in their valuing of boys and girls ($p < .001$). High school youth tend to value boys and girls equally. However when the scores are compared to those of the detention home youth we see a marked decline in the number of detention home youth who value boys and girls equally, and an increase in the number who value girls.

The subjects were asked to identify in question B2 whether fathers or mothers were more valuable. The responses indicated that 80.89% of the high school youth said that they were of equal value, 13.48% said mothers were more valuable, and 5.61% said fathers were more valuable. In contrast 52.77% of the detention home youth said that they were of equal value, 41.66% said mothers were more valuable, and 5.55% said fathers were more valuable. These results indicated (see table 4) that there was

a significant difference between the responses of the two groups (p<.01). The results seem to show that high school youth tend to value mothers and fathers equally. The majority of the detention home also felt that mothers and father were of equal value. However, when scores of the high school youth are compared to the detention home youth there is a sharp decline in the number of detention home youth who see mothers and fathers as being of equal value, and a greater increase in those who see mothers as being of more value.

Question B5 looked at how the two groups valued juvenile delinquents and regular kids (nondelinquent). The high school youth responses showed that 39.56% felt they were of equal value, 58.24% said regular kids were more valuable, and 2.19% said delinquent kids were more valuable. The responses of the detention home youth indicated that 54.54% said the two pairs were of equal value, 30.30% said regular kids were more valuable and, 15.15% said delinquent kids were more valuable. The results indicated (see table 4) that there was a significant difference between how the two groups valued delinquent and regular kids (p<.01). The majority of high school youth see regular kids as being of more value. In contrast the majority of detention home youth are saying that there is no difference, that the two groups are of equal value.

In question B10 the concern was with identifying whether rich people or poor people were more valuable. The responses of the high school youth indicated that 91.20% felt the two groups

Table 4

Questions Found to Reveal Significant Results Where the Subjects
Were Asked to Determine Who Was More Valuable.

Question B1	Boys	Girls	Same Value
High School	6	4	82
Detention Home	2	16	18

x^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ = 128) = 31.73410, $\underline{p}$<.001*

Question B2	Father	Mother	Same Value
High School	5	12	72
Detention Home	2	15	19

x^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ = 125) = 12.21030, $\underline{p}$<.01*

Question B5	Juvenile Delinquents	Regular Kids	Same Value
High School	2	53	36
Detention Home	5	10	18

x^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ = 124) = 12.16805, $\underline{p}$<.01*

Question B10	Rich People	Poor People	Same Value
High School	6	2	83
Detention Home	7	5	24

x^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ = 127) = 12.40256, $\underline{p}$<.01*

* Chi Square Analysis

were of equal value, 2.19% said that poor people were more valuable, and 6.59% said rich people were more valuable. The detention home responses indicated that 66.66% felt that the groups were of equal value, 13.88% said poor people were of greater value, and 19.44% said that rich people were of greater value. The results indicated (see table 4) that there was a significant difference between the responses of the two groups ($p<.01$). The responses seem to be showing that though both groups value rich and poor alike equally, the detention home youth seem to do so less and rate rich people slightly higher than the high school youth.

Honesty

The results of the questions dealing with the value honesty showed that the two groups differed on 2 of the 9 questions. Question C4 dealing with the definition of honesty asked the subjects to determine whether the following statement was true or false: "honesty means it is important that people trust me." The responses of the high school youth showed that 100% of them felt the statement was true. The responses of the detention home youth showed that 75% felt that the statement was true and 25% felt it was false. The responses indicated (see table 5) there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p<.001$). The results seem to suggest that for the high school youth, the concept of honesty and trust go hand in hand. For the detention home youth the results seem to indicate that this is less so. There seems to be a marked difference here between how the two

---

Table 5

Results of Question C4,
"Honesty Means its important that People trust me"

	True	False
High School	92	-
Detention Home	27	9

x^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 128) = 21.06284, $\underline{p}$<.001*

* Chi Square Analysis

---

groups look upon the relationship between honesty and trust.

Moral Reasoning Related to Honesty

Question D1 examined the moral level of reasoning the two groups were using in relation to the value honesty. The subjects were asked to choose one out of a possible six reasons as to why someone should be honest. Each response corresponded to a specific moral level of reasoning as defined by Kohlberg (one being the lowest, six being the highest). The results for the high school youth indicated that 6.52% were at stage one, 4.34% at stage two, 16.30% at stage three, 1.08% at stage four, 19.56% at stage five, and 52.17% at stage six. In contrast 19.44% of the detention home youth were at stage one, 5.55% at stage two, 30.55% were at stage three, 2.77% at stage four, 8.33% at stage five, and 33.33% at stage six. The results indicated (see table 6) that there was a significant difference between the two groups responses ($\underline{p}$<.05). Over 72% of the high school youth selected

stage four or higher. In contrast only 44.44% of the detention home youth selected stage four or higher, a much smaller percentage.

Respect For Others Property

The results of the responses to the questions dealing with the value of respecting others property revealed that the two groups differed on 3 of the 17 questions in this section.

Moral Reasoning Related to Stealing

Question E1 was concerned with examining the moral level of reasoning used by the two groups in relation to the value of respecting others property. The subjects were asked to choose one out of a possible six reasons why someone should not steal. Each response corresponded to a specific level of moral reasoning as defined by Kohlberg (one being the lowest, six being the highest). The results for the high school youth indicated that 5.43% of the high school youth were at stage one, 8.69% were at stage two, 8.69% were at stage three, 21.73% were at stage four, 15.21% were at stage five, and 40.21% were at stage six. In contrast 25% of the detention home youth were at stage one, 13.88% were at stage two, 8.33% were at stage three, 27.77% were at stage four, 19.44% were at stage five, and 5.55% were at stage six. The results indicated (see table 6) that there was a significant difference between the responses of the two groups ($p<.001$). Over 77% of the high school youth selected stage four or above, where as only 52.77% of the detention home youth selected stage four or above, once again a smaller percentage.

Table 6

Results of Questions D1 and E1, Where Subjects Were Required to Choose 1 out of 6 Reasons (corresponding with Kohlberg's 6 stages of moral reasoning, 1 being the lowest level of moral reasoning, 6 being the highest) as to Why Someone Should Be Honest and Not Steal

D1 Honesty	Level of Reasoning					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
High School	6	4	15	1	18	48
Detention Home	7	2	11	1	3	12

x^2 (5, $\underline{N}$ = 128) = 11.34471, $\underline{p}$<.05*

E1 Stealing	Level of Reasoning					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
High School	5	8	8	20	14	37
Detention Home	9	5	3	10	7	2

x^2 (5, $\underline{N}$ = 128) = 20.63436, $\underline{p}$<.001*

* Chi Square Analysis

In dealing with the value of respecting others property (question F7), the subjects were asked to determine whether the following statement was true: "some kids are forced to steal in order to get decent clothes." The responses of the high school youth indicated that 57.14% felt that the statement was true, 42.85% felt it was false. The detention home youth responses indicated that 80.55% of the youth felt that the statement was true, 19.44% said it was false. The results indicated (see table 7) that there was a significant difference between the responses of the two groups ($p<.05$). The results of this question seem to be saying that stealing may be seen as option more so for the detention home youth than the high school youth. The responses by the high school youth may also indicate that getting nice clothes is less of a problem for them. One of the research assistants noted how fashionable the high school youth were dressed when filling out the questionnaire. There may be some kind of correlation here.

The subjects were asked in question F10 to determine whether the following statement was true: "some rich people steal and that makes it ok for poor people to steal." The results showed that 4.39% of the high school youth responded true, 95.60% responded false. In contrast 20% of the detention home youth responded true, 80% responded false. The results indicated (see table 7) that there was a significant difference between the responses of the two groups ($p<.01$). Though the majorities of both groups responded false to the question, there was a much

Table 7

Results of Questions dealing With the Value
of Respecting Others Property

Question
F7. "Some Kids are forced to steal in order to get decent clothes."

Subjects	True	False
High School	52	39
Detention Home	29	7

x^2 (1, N = 127) = 5.14926, p<.05*

Question
F10. "Some Rich People steal and that makes it of for poor people to steal."

Subjects	True	False
High School	4	87
Detention Home	7	28

x^2 (1, N = 126) = 5.89047, p<.01*

* Chi Square Analysis

larger percentage of the detention home youth who deemed it ok in comparison to the high school youth. It appears that for some, the actions of one group dictate the actions of another.

Respect

The results of the responses to the questions dealing with the value of respect and respect for authority revealed that the two groups differed on 5 of the 25 questions in this section. Questions K1 through K16 asked the subjects to rank a list of persons on a likert scale ranging from respect most to don't respect at all. The two groups differed on 2 of the 16 questions asked.

Respect for Police

The subjects were asked in question K2 to rank the group police. The responses showed that 35.55% of the high school youth stated that they respected the police most, 44.44% said somewhat, 11.11% said little, 22.22% said least, and 6.66% said they don't at all. In contrast 6.66% of the detention home youth ranked that they respected the police most, 20% said somewhat, 16.66% said little, 33.33% said least, and 23.33% said they don't at all. The results of these responses (see table 8) showed that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p<001$). Over 80% of the high school youth ranked the amount of respect they had for the police as high as compared to only 26.66% of the detention home youth. It appears that the high school youth have a greater amount of respect for police than the detention home youth.

Respect for Teachers

The subjects were asked in question K3 to rank the group teachers. The results indicated that 24.17% of the high school youth ranked that they respected teachers most, 43.95% said somewhat, 27.47% said little, 2.19% said least, and 2.19% said they don't at all. In contrast only 6.06% of the detention home youth ranked that they respected teachers most, 45.45% said somewhat, 24.24% said little, 6.06% said least, and 18.18% said they don't at all. The results (see table 8) show that there was a significant difference between the two groups responses ($p<.01$). It appears that high school youth tend to respect teachers more so than the detention home youth.

Authority

Questions L1 through L9 dealt with the value of respecting those in authority. The two groups differed on 3 of the 9 questions.

Parents

The subjects were asked in question L1 whether the following statement was true: "a kid should respect his/her parents because they are parents." The results showed 56.52% of the high school youth responded true, 43.47% responded false. In contrast 100% of the detention home youth responded true. The responses indicated (see table 9) that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p<.001$). Detention home youth appear to be saying that parents should always be respected. In contrast there seems to be mixed feelings among the high school youth about this.

Table 8

Results of Questions K2 and K3 Indicating
How Much Respect Subjects Had for Police and Teachers

Question K2, Police

	Most	Somewhat	Little	Least	Don't
High School	32	40	10	2	6
Detention Home	2	6	5	10	7

x^2 (4, $\underline{N}$ = 120) = 38.23725, $\underline{p}$<.001*

Question K3, Teachers

	Most	Somewhat	Little	Least	Don't
High School	22	40	25	2	2
Detention Home	2	15	8	2	6

x^2 (4, $\underline{N}$ = 124) = 14.92394, $\underline{p}$<.01*

* Chi Square Analysis

Table 9

Results of Questions Concerned With Measuring Various Levels of Respect Subjects Had for Authority Figures

Question
L1. "A kid should respect his/her parent because they are parents."

	True	False
High School	52	40
Detention Home	36	-

x^2 (1, N = 128) = 20.78805, p<.001*

Question
L3. "Youth should respect police."

	True	False
High School	80	12
Detention Home	19	16

x^2 (1, N = 127) = 13.90298, p<.001*

Question
L9. "There are times when it is ok to not respect authority figures."

	True	False
High School	77	15
Detention Home	18	17

x^2 (1, N = 127) = 12.34607, p<.001*

* Chi Square Analysis

Police

The subjects were asked in question L3 whether the following statement was true: "youth should respect the police." The results showed that 86.95% of the high school youth responded true, 13.04% responded false. In comparison only 54.28% of the detention home youth responded true, 45.57% responded false. The results indicated (see table 9) that the responses of the two groups were significantly different ($p<.001$). High school youth tend to respect the police more than the detention home youth.

Authority Figures

The subjects were asked in question L9 whether the following statement was true: "there are times when it is ok to not respect authority figures." The high school youth responses showed that 83.69% felt the statement was true, 16.30% false. The results for the detention home youth showed that 51.42% responded true, 48.57% responded false. The responses indicated (see table 9) that there was a significant difference between the responses of the two groups ($p<.001$). There seems to be a larger amount of high school youth are willing to agree that there are times when it is ok not to respect authority figures than detention home youth.

Respecting Others

The results of the responses dealing with the value of respecting others (assault, not hurting) revealed that the two groups differed on 1 of the 9 questions in this section.

Table 10

Results of Question M4 Examining Beliefs About Fighting

M4. "Fighting makes a person feel good."

	True	False
High School	23	68
Detention Home	19	15

x^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 125) = 9.06688, $\underline{p}$<.01*

* Chi Square Analysis

The subjects were asked in question M4 whether the following statement was true: "fighting makes a person feel good." The results of the high school youth indicated that 25.27% responded true, 74.72% false. In contrast 55.88% of the detention home youth responded true, 44.11% false. the responses indicated (see table 10) that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($\underline{p}$<.01). The high school youth appear to have a lower regard for fighting than do the detention home youth.

Section Two

Section two of the questionnaire was concerned with identifying how high school and detention home youth rank ordered values. This section consisted of two parts, a terminal value list and an instrumental value list.

Terminal Values

Question N consisted of 16 terminal values. The subjects were asked to select the 4 most important values and the 1 least important value and ranked order them accordingly. The top four values for the high school youth were number one "freedom", number two "love", number three "true friendship", and number four was "self respect". The least important value for the high school youth was "getting married". The top four values for the detention home youth were number one "a good family", number two "love", number three was "a good life", and number four "happiness". The least important value for the detention home youth was "getting married". The results seem to indicate that there are some differences in the rankings (see table 11).

Instrumental Values

Question O consisted of eight instrumental values. The subjects were asked to rank order the list of values. The high school youth chose the following four instrumental values as being most important. Number one was "honesty", number two was "being fair", number three was "respecting parents", and number four was "respecting old people". The detention home youth chose the following as the four most important instrumental values. Number one was "respecting parents," number two was "honesty," number three was "being fair", and number four was "respecting others property" (see table 11). The results seem to show that there is very little difference between the two groups in their selection and ranking of the top four instrumental values.

TABLE 11

Ranking of Terminal and Instrumental Values On A
Scale of 1 to 4, With 1 Being the Most Important Value

DETENTION HOME YOUTH

Terminal Values	Instrumental Values
1. A good family	1. Respecting parents
2. Love	2. Honesty
3. A good life	3. Being fair
4. Happiness	4. Respecting others property

Least= Getting married

HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH

Terminal Values	Instrumental Values
1. Freedom	1. Honesty
2. Love	2. Being fair
3. True Friendship	3. Respecting parents
4. Self respect	4. Respect old people

Least = Getting married

Results of High School and Detention Home Male Subjects Only

Section One, Knowledge of Specific Values

In comparing only the male high school youth with the male detention home youth we see the following results. In section one of the questionnaire we see the two groups differing on 3 of the 17 questions dealing with the concept of valuing certain groups of people.

Value of People

The subjects were asked to identify in question B1 which pair was more valuable, boys or girls. The results showed that 77.5% of the high school males said they were of the same value, 12.5% said boys were more valuable, and 10% said girls were more valuable. In contrast only 47.05% of the detention home males said that they were of equal value, 5.88% said boys were more valuable, and 47.05% said girls were more valuable. The results indicated (see table 12) that there was a significant differences between the responses of the the two groups ($p < .001$). High school males seem to value boys and girls equally. However when the scores are compared to those of the detention home males we see a marked decline in the number of detention home males who value boys and girls equally and a sharp increase in the number who value girls.

The subjects were asked to identify in question B2 whether mothers or fathers were more valuable. The responses indicated that 82.05% of the high school males said they were of equal value, 7.69% said fathers were more valuable, and 10.25% said

mothers were more valuable. In contrast 52.94% of the detention home males said they were of equal value, 5.88% said fathers were more valuable, and 41.17% said mothers were more valuable. The results indicated (see table 12) that the responses of the two groups were significantly different ($\underline{p}$<.01). The results seem to show that high school males tend to value mothers and fathers equally. The majority of the detention home males also felt that mothers and fathers were of equal value. However, when scores of the high school youth are compared to the detention home youth we see a decline in the number who value mothers and fathers equally and and increase in the number who value mothers.

Question B5 looked at how the two groups valued juvenile delinquents and regular kids (nondelinquents). The high school males responses showed that 32.5% of the high school males said they were of equal value, 62.5% said regular kids were more valuable, and 5% said delinquent kids were more valuable. The responses of the detention home males indicated that 51.61% felt they were of equal value, 32.25% said regular kids were more valuable, and 16.12% said delinquent kids were more valuable. The results indicated (see table 12) that the responses of the two groups were significantly different ($\underline{p}$<.05). The majority of the high school males seem to be saying that regular kids are more valuable. In contrast we see the majority of detention home males saying for the most part there is no difference, that the two groups are of equal value.

Table 12

Questions Found to Reveal Significant Results Where the Subjects
Were Asked to Determine Who Was More Valuable
Male Subjects Only

Question B1	Boys	Girls	Same Value
High School	5	4	31
Detention Home	2	16	16

x^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ = 74) = 12.87108, $\underline{p}$<.001*

Question B2	Father	Mother	Same Value
High School	3	4	32
Detention Home	2	14	18

x^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ = 73) = 9.37707, $\underline{p}$<.01*

Question B5	Juvenile Delinquents	Regular Kids	Same Value
High School	2	25	13
Detention Home	5	10	16

x^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ = 71) = 6.99620, $\underline{p}$<.05*

* Chi Square Analysis

Honesty

The results of the questions dealing with the value honesty showed that male high school youth and male detention home youth differed on three of the nine questions. Qustion C3 asked the subjects to determine whether the following statement was true: "it is ok to lie to my parents at times." The responses of the high school males showed that 42.5% responded true, and 57.5% responded false. In contrast 14.70% of the detention home males responded true, 85.29% responded false. The results indicated (see Table 13) that the responses of the two groups were significantly different ($p < .01$). The results seem to show that the detention home males feel more strongly about lying to their parents, they tend to view lying as being less acceptable. In contrast a significant amount of high school males seem to feel less strongly about it.

The subjects were asked in question C4 to identify whether the following statement was true: "it's important that people trust me". The responses of the high school males showed that 100% of them felt the statement was true. The responses of the detention home males showed that 73.52% felt that the statement was true, and 26.47% felt it was false. The responses indicated (see table 13) that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p < .001$). The results seem to suggest that for the high school males the concepts of trust and honesty are interrelated. This seems to be less true for the detention home males.

Table 13

Results of Questions C3 and C4, Male Subjects Only

"It is ok to lie to my parents at times."

Question C3	True	False
High School	17	23
Detention Home	5	29

x^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 74) = 5.53064, $\underline{p}$<.01*

"Honesty means its important that People trust me."

Question C4	True	False
High School	40	-
Detention Home	25	9

x^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 74) = 9.70380, $\underline{p}$<.001*

* Chi Square Analysis

Moral Reasoning Related to Honesty

Question D1 examined the moral level of reasoning used by the two groups in relation to the value honesty. The subjects were asked to choose one out of a possible six reasons as to why someone should be honest. Each response corresponded to a specific moral level of reasoning as defined by Kohlberg (one being the lowest, six being the highest). The results for the high school males indicated that 7.5% were at stage one, 7.5% were at stage two, 12.5% were at stage three, 2.5% were at stage four, 27.5% were at stage five, and 42.5% were at stage six. In contrast 20.58% of the detention home males were at stage one, 5.88% were at stage two, 32.35% were at stage three, 2.94% were at stage four, 2.94% were at stage five, and 35.29% were at stage six. The results indicated (see table 14) that there was a significant difference between the responses of the two groups ($p<.05$). Over 70% of the high school males selected stage four or higher. In contrast only 41.17% of the detention home males selected stage four or higher; a much smaller percentage.

Respect for Others Property

The results of the questions dealing with the value of respecting others property revealed that the two groups differed on 1 of the 17 questions in this section.

Moral Reasoning Related to Stealing

Question E1 examined the moral level of reasoning used by the two groups in relation to the concept of stealing. The subjects were asked to choose one out of six possible reasons as

Table 14

Results of Questioned D1 and E1, Where Subjects Were Required to Choose 1 Out of 6 Reasons (corresponding with Kohlberg's 6 stages of moral reasoning, 1 being the lowest level of moral reasoning, 6 being the highest) as to Why Someone Should Be Honest and Not Steal, Male Subjects Only

D1 Honesty	Level of Reasoning					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
High School	3	3	5	1	11	17
Detention Home	7	2	11	1	1	12

x^2 (5, N = 74) = 12.84334, p<.05*

E1 Stealing	Level of Reasoning					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
High School	4	2	4	9	7	14
Detention Home	8	5	3	9	7	2

x^2 (5, N = 74) = 11.35003, p<.05*

* Chi Square Analysis

Table 15

Results of Question K2 Indicating How Much Respect Male Subjects
Had for the Police

	Most	Somewhat	Little	Least	Don't
High School	15	15	3	2	5
Detention Home	2	6	5	9	7

x^2 (4,$\underline{N}$ = 69) = 17.78456, $\underline{p}$<.001*

* Chi Square Analysis

to why someone should not steal. Each response corresponded to a specific moral level of reasoning as defined by Kohlberg (one being lowest, six being highest). The results for the high school males indicated that 10% of the high school males were at stage one, 5% were at stage two, 10% were at stage three, 22.5% were at stage four, 17.5% were at stage five, and 35% were at stage six. In contrast 23.52% of the detention home males were at stage one, 14.70% were at stage two, 7.5% were at stage three, 26.47% were at stage four, 20.58% were at stage five, and 5.88% were at stage six. The results indicated (see table 14) that the responses of the two groups were significantly different ($\underline{p}$<.05). Over 75% of the high school males selected stage four or above, whereas only 52.94% of the detention home males selected stage four or above; once again a smaller percentage.

Respect

The results of the responses to the questions dealing with the values of respect and respect for authority revealed that the two groups differed on 3 of the 25 questions in this section. Questions K1 through K16 asked the subjects to rank a list of persons on a likert scale, ranging from "respect most" to "don't respect at all". The two groups differed on only 1 of the 16 questions in this area.

Respect for Police

The subjects were asked in question K2 to rank the group police. The responses showed that 37.5% of the high school males said that they respected the police most, 37.5% said the respected them somewhat, 7.5% said they respected them little, 5% said they respected them least, and 12.5% said they don't at all. In contrast 6.89% of the detention home males said they respected the police most, 20.68% said they respected them somewhat, 17.24% said they respected little, 31.03% said they respected them least, and 24.13% said they don't at all. The results indicated (see table 15) that there was a significant difference between the two groups responses ($p < .001$). Over 75% of the high school males ranked the amount of respect they had for the police as high. In contrast only 27.58% of the detention home males ranked the amount of respect they had for police as high. The results seem to indicate that high school males have a greater amount of respect for police than do the detention home males.

Authority

Question L1 through L9 dealt with the value of respecting those in authority. The two groups differed on 2 of the 9 questions.

Parents

The subjects were asked in question L1 to identify whether the following statement was true: "a kid should respect his/her parents because they are parents." The results showed that 62.5% of the high school males responded true, 37.5% responded false. In contrast 100% of the detention home males responded true. The responses indicated (see table 16) that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p<.001$). Detention home males seem to be saying that parents should always be respected. In contrast high school males seem to disagree.

Authority Figures

The subjects were asked in question L9 to determine whether the following statement was true: "there are times when it is ok not to respect authority figures." The responses of the high school males showed that 80% felt the statement was true, and 20% felt that it was false. The results for the detention home males showed that 51.51% responded true, 44.11% responded false. The results indicated (see table 16) that there was a significant difference between the responses of the two groups ($p<.01$). We see a larger number of high school males willing to agree that there are times when it is ok not to respect authority figures than we do detention home males.

Table 16

Results of Questions Concerned With Measuring Various Levels of Respect Subjects Had for Authority Figures
Male Subjects Only

L1. "A kid should respect his/her parent because they are parents."

	True	False
High School	25	15
Detention Home	34	-

x^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 74) = 13.75536, $\underline{p}$<.001*

L9. "There are times when it is ok to not respect authority figures."

	True	False
High School	32	8
Detention Home	17	16

x^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 73) = 5.42027, $\underline{p}$<.01*

* Chi Square Analysis

Section Two

Section two of the questionnaire was concerned with identifying how high school and detention home youth rank ordered values. This section consisted of 2 parts; a terminal value list and an instrumental value list.

Terminal Values

Question N consisted of 16 terminal values. The subjects were asked to select the four most important values and the one least important value and rank order them accordingly. The top four values for the high school males were, number one "freedom", number two "love", number three "happiness", and number four "wealth". The least important value was "getting married". The top four values for the detention home males were, number one "a good family", number two "love", number three "a good life", and number four "happiness". The least most important value was "getting married". The results point out that there are some differences in the rankings of terminal values but some overlap in the values chosen. What is of particular interest is the importance placed upon family by the detention home youth.

Instrumental Values

Question O consisted of eight instrumental values. The subjects were asked to rank order the list of values. The high school males chose the following top four values. Number one was "honesty", number two was "being fair", number three was "respecting parents", and number four was "respecting old

people".   The top four values for the detention home males were
number one "respecting parents", number two "honesty", number
three "being fair", and number four "respecting others property".
The results indicate that there is little difference between the
two groups in their selection and ranking of the top three
instrumental values.

Perception of Where Values were Learned

Results show that there was no significant difference
between where the high school youth perceive they learn their
values and where the detention home youth perceive they learn
their values.

TABLE 17

Ranking of Terminal and Instrumental Values On A
Scale of 1 to 4, With 1 Being the Most Important Value
Male Subjects Only

DETENTION HOME YOUTH

Terminal Values	Instrumental Values
1. A good family	1. Respecting parents
2. love	2. Honesty
3. A good life	3. Being fair
4. Happiness	4. Respecting others property

Least= Getting   married

HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH

Terminal Values	Instrumental Values
1. Freedom	1. Honesty
2. Love	2. Being fair
3. Happiness	3. Respecting parents
4. Wealth	4. Respecting old people

Least = Getting married

Hypotheses

The results of this study appear to indicate that there are some differences between the values of high school youth and detention home youth; resulting in support for hypothesis "A". In examining the responses of the two groups in relation to how they ranked values, we find the results mixed and too indecisive to provide us with any firm conclusion or support for hypothesis "B". Lastly, the results seem to indicate that high school youth and detention home youth appear to select different levels of moral reasoning, providing support for hypothesis "C".

DISCUSSION

The results of this study are important in terms of furthering our understanding about the similarities and differences between delinquent and nondelinquent youth. For the most part, the two groups seem to be in agreement on a majority of the questions posed to them in the study. This implies that there are a great deal of similarities between the values of the two groups as measured by the values survey.

The differences noted seem to be in the following areas: Detention home youth tend to have a higher regard for females than the high school youth. They are also less likely to regard males and females as equal in value when compared to the responses of the high school youth.

Detention home youth tend to be more accepting of delinquent youth than are the high school youth. This finding seems to correlate with Hindelangs study (1970) which showed that delinquent youth are more approving of individuals involved in delinquent types of behaviors than nondelinquent youth. Both groups show a similar understanding of the value honesty. The only difference observed seems to be in the role that trust plays. For a small percentage of detention home youth, trust was seen as having no connection with honesty. Both groups also responded very similarily on the questions relating to respecting other peoples property. They both view stealing as being wrong. But detention home youth seem to be more accepting of situations in which individuals were forced to steal in order to get decent clothes. A small percentage of detention home youth also justified stealing if the rich were doing it.

The results seem to indicate that detention home youth have a lower level of respect for individuals in positions of authority. Specifically, detention home youth rated that they had very low levels of respect for the police and teachers. High school youth rated police and teacher just the opposite. The one exception to the previous responses was in the ratings received on the question stating "a kid should respect his/her parents because they are parents". The detention home youth responses indicated that they felt that there was no justifiable situation when one did not have to respect parents. In addition, a large percentage of the detention home youth were reluctant to say that there were times when authority figures should not be respected.

Detention home youth and high school youth value different ends (terminal values) but stated similar preferences for instrumental values (see tables 11 and 17). Questions D1 and E1 also showed that detention home youth seemed to state a preference for responses which reflect a lower level of reasoning. The results of the comparisons made between detention home and high school youth as a whole and detention home and high school males showed that there was minimal differences in their responses. There are a number of possible interpretations for the findings this study.

Demographic characteristics of the participants. Sociological theories of delinquency have tended to examine delinquency in light of environmental infuences. Sociologists have noted that poverty, inadequate role models, and lack of

social controls have all been identified as major contributors to delinquency (Trojanowicz & Morash, 1983). If we take a close look at the data gathered on the two groups we find some interesting differences. The results show that the detention home youth come from a much higher percentage of single parent homes. Of these single parent homes the majority are run by the mother. The implication of this finding may account for some of the noted differences in the survey results. McKinney (1968) asked if the stability of one's environment has anything to do with a preference stated by an individual. In this specific study we must ask does the stability of ones family life have anything to do with a stated preference or value? Women tend to be regarded more highly than men by the detention home youth. This finding may be the result of the mother being seen as the dominant person in the youths life. She is perceived as the stable party, the provider, and is thus natually revered and valued more highly. In contrast, the high school youth, coming from a higher percentage of two parent homes may be more likely as a result to perceive both parents as being equally valuable in their life. Problems of single parent homes may also exist in other ways. Due to the economic constrants placed upon one parent in providing for their family they may find that they are not around or actively participating in their childrens lives to the extent that they may wish or which is desirable. Much of their waking hours are spent in providing for the families most basic needs such as food and a place to live. The work of

Bandura and Walters (1963) has emphasized the importance of modeling and its influence upon behavior. Bandura and Walters have identified individuals such as parents, peers and siblings as models after whom youth mold themselves. If a youth lacks the necessary positive role model, ie. parent, in their life they may be more likely to model or copy the behavior of others existing around them who may be less than desirable. Research has shown that youth tend to display aggressive behavior when influenced by models who are rewarded for being aggressive (Trojanowicz & Morash, 1983). Could we not speculate that this concept of modeling can be carried forward to include selection of ones values as well?

We can only speculate on the influence that the youths' age and school grade factor may have had on the results. One common held belief is that, as youth move through and out of adolescence, delinquency rates diminish. One could also speculate that value preferences which play a role in delinquent behavior may also change as youth mature in age. On the average the high school youth were 1 year older and 1 to 2 school grades ahead of the detention home youth. If we could assume that age and school grade are a factor in value preference and permanence, then this lack of such an equivalence may have influenced our findings as well.

Another limtation of the research design had do with definition of delinquency used in the study. In selecting a definition the author found that there is no one acceptable

definition of delinquency. We all have our own notion of what a delinquent youth is. These notions many times overlap each other but there is no middle ground. For instance, if we defined a juvenile delinquent as one who commits a crime, then the possibility exists that all of us at one time or another could have been labled delinquent. The underlying assumption is that all of us at one time or another have done acts which constitute a crime. There is equal difficulty in defining delinquency based upon a precscribed number of crimes. Who is to say that a youth who commits three crimes is any less delinquent than one who commits four crimes? Realizing the problems inherent in coming up with a working definition the decision was made to define delinquency in as simple a manner as possible, resulting in a definition which stated juvenile delinquents were those youth who had been adjudicated by the court and resided in a detention home. The researcher acknowledges that there are definite problems which may crop up with such a definition. One problem inherent in such a definition is that it does not take into account that the youth in the high school could be just as delinquent in their behavior as the youth in the detention home. Nor does it take into account that some of the youth from the high school may have been previously ajudicated by the court.

The research design also did not take into account and control for such factors as socioeconomic background, race and ethnic background. Though studies have shown race to not be a determiner of delinquency (Gibbons and Krohn, 1986), little has

been done to show what if any connection exist between values and race or ethnic background. Studies have shown that there is a connection between socioeconomic background and delinquency (Gibbons and Krohn, 1986). But as in the area of race and ethnic background, little has been done to examine what influence if any that socioeconomic background may have upon value selection and preference. If there is a connection between these factors and values, they also could have accounted for the differences observed.

Moral Reasoning and Development. In examining the results found in the section dealing with moral reasoning levels we find that the majority of high school youth selected responses at stage four or higher. In contrast a significantly smaller percentage of detention home youth selected responses at the same level. Does this mean that detention home youth use lower levels of moral reasoning? Based upon the results obtained from the survey there is some support for such a conclusion. Kohlberg himself said that values of an individual at the preconventional or conventional levels (stages one through four) are largely accidential or culture-bound (McLellan, 1970). It isn't until one moves into stages five and six that cultural bounds are transcended. If Kohlberg's theory is true then differences shown could be interpreted as resulting from the youths up bringing and environmental influences. Factors operating in the home, the neighborhood, school and in the youths personal life could be seen as contributors influencing value selection.

Another explanation has to do with the concept of internalization. We tend to conceptualize moral development through the internalization of cultural values. As a value becomes more internalized it is more resistent to external stumuli and change. Stages one through four of Kohlberg's theory reflect behavior which is are largely the result of external pressures, or influences. At stages five and six the individual is behavior is motivated by ideal principles resulting from an internalization of the value. If this is true, it would be logical to expect individuals at the same level of moral reasoning to share commonalities in their concepts of right and wrong. Thus their responses should be similar. If however, the two groups are operating from differing levels, results should differ. The more internalized the value the more predictable the behavior. The less internalized the value the more likely the behavior may be situational. Research has shown that delinquent youth are more likely to be influenced by external circumstances than nondelinquent youth (Shaver, 1982). We see such an example when we examine the responses to the questions dealing with stealing. Both groups identified stealing as being wrong and yet a small but significant number of detention home youth regarded stealing as being justifiable if the rich were doing it. Such inconsistencies in responses could be reflective of the level of reasoning used.

<u>Perceptions</u> <u>of</u> <u>Authority</u> <u>Figures.</u> The results obtained showing that the detention home youth have very low levels of respect for people in postions of authority such as police and teachers is not suprising. For the most part such figures are perceived as nothing more than disciplinarians, they are the ones who kick you out of class, they are the "narcs", or they take away your freedom. It would be safe to say that the type of contact that the detention home youth have with these figures is generally viewed in a negative light.

What is surprising to note is that the responses in somewhat of a sharp contrast to the above stated results, show that the detention home youth were much more reluctant to say that there were times when authority figures should not be respected. The reason for this may be locked into their understanding of what an authority figure is. In order for one to internalize a value there is a cognitive aspect of the process which suggest an understanding of what the value is (McLellan, 1970). When an individual operates at the first two stages of moral development, the motivation for ones actions are external rewards and punishment. Even at the middle two stages the standards used are external in nature (McLellan, 1970). It is not until the last two stages that the individual behavior is a result of internal motivation (McLellan, 1970). Only at these last two stages could we conceivably note that behavior is a result of not only an internalization of the value, but more importantly, an internalization based upon a cognitive understanding of the

particular value. Thus someone who does not understand a particular value can not internalize it and reacts in a stimulus response type mode. It would be natural then to say that authority figures should always be respected, for when one responds that way they receives rewards for their behavior.

Defining a Value. The instrument was designed in such a way to take into account the using of concepts which the author felt would be understandable and clear to the targeted population. However, there is no clear guarantee that what the author believes to be a value is also what the youth in the respective groups see to be a value.

IMPLICATIONS

The findings of the study are mixed but provide some measure of support for the research questions. As stated earlier, the two groups seem to be in agreement on a majority of the questions posed to them in the study. The implications of such a finding is the notion that the two groups are more alike than different in what they value. We have noted that an individuals values can differ and be influenced in a number of ways. What is of particular importance is what specifically influences and motivates peoples behaviors in specific situations. If we can gain a further understanding of what some groups value and what influences their values then maybe we can begin to find answers as to why some youth choose to break laws and others do not.

Future Research

The experience and information derived from the study have pointed toward continual research in this area. The following are suggestions for future inquiries.

Teaching Values We noted earlier that some of the results obtained suggest a possible lack of understanding of values. If this is so, why not teach youth the necessary values? Many theories to date have shown that values seem to be learned. We have seen some approaches along this line through value clarification exercises done in many schools today (McKinney & Moore, 1982). Work in this area should not only include teaching but also place an emphasis on the understanding and rationale of various values.

Internalization. The degree of internalization of a value may play a very important role in determining whether someone chooses to break the law. The evidence obtained from this study lends some support for this notion. Future inquiries in this area focusing on the role of ones moral reasoning level may show correlations between the amount of internalization of a value and the choices one makes.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. & Walters, R.H. (1963). Social learning and personality development New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Caro, F.G. (1966). Social class attitudes of youth revelant for the realization of adult goals. Social Forces, 44, 492-498.

DeJong, W. (1986). Project dare: Teaching kids to say no to drugs and alcohol. (NCJRS, SNI 196). Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Flavell, J.H. (1963). The developmental psychology of Jean Piaget. Princeton New Jersey: D. VanNostrand.

Gibbons, D. C., & Krohn, M. D. (1986). Delinquent Behavior (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Gullotta, T., & Adams, G.R. (1982). Substance abuse minimization: Conceptualizing prevention in adolescents and youth programs. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11(5), 409-423.

Hindelang, M. J. (1970). The committment of delinquents to their misdeeds: Do delinquents Drift?. Social Problems, 17, 502-509.

Hoffman, V. J. (1973). The relation of parental value orientation to self-esteem of the child. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Hollen, C. C. (1967). The stability of values and value systems. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Hollen, C. C. (1972). Value change, perceived instrumentality and attitude change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Homant, R. J. (1967). The meaning and ranking of values. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Hutcheon, P. D. (1972). Value theory: Towards conceptual clarification. British Journal of Psychology, 23, 172-185.

Kolberg, L. (1968). The child as a moral philospher. Psychology Today, 2(4), 24-30.

Lerman, P. (1968). Individual values, peer values, and subcultural delinquency. American Sociological Review, 33, 219-235.

Maccoby, E. E. (1968). The development of moral values and behavior in childhood. In J.A. Clausen (Ed.), Socialization and society (pp. 227-269). Boston: Little, Brown.

McKinney, J. P. (1968). The development of choice stability in children and adolescents. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 113, 79-83.

McKinney, J. P. (1971). The development of values - prescriptive or proscriptive? Journal of Human Development, 14, 71-80.

McKinney, J. P. (1973). The structure of behavioral values of college students. The Journal of Psychology, 85, 235-244.

McKinney, J. P. (1975). The development of values: A perceptual interpretation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31(5), 801-807.

McKinney, J. P., Chin, R. J., Reinhart, M. A., & Trierweiler, G. (1985). Health values in early adolescence. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 14(4), 315-319.

McKinney, Hotch, Truhon, (1977). The organization of behavioral values during late adolescence: Change and stability across two eras. Developmental Psychology, 13(1), 83-84.

McKinney, J. P., & Moore D. (1982). Attitudes and values during adolescence. In Wolman (Eds.), Handbook of Developmental Psychology (pp. 549-558). New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

McLellan, D. D. (1970). Values, value systems and the developmental structure of moral judgement. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Olejnik, A. B., & McKinney, J. P. (1973). Parental value orientation and generosity in children. Developmental Psychology, 8, 311-

Rokeach, M. (1972). Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change. Jossey - Bass.

Rodman, H. (1963). The lower class value stretch. Social Forces, 42, 205-215.

Shaver, P. (1982). Juvenile delinquents relationship to external locus of control. Unpublished paper.

Shover, N. (1979). A sociology of American corrections. Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Strasburg, P. Recents trends in serious juvenile crime. _Analysis of Delinquency Course Packet CJ 455_ Michigan State University. 1-26.

Thompson, G. G., & Gardner, E. F. (1969). Adolescents perceptions of happy successful living. _Journal of Genetic Psychology,_ _115_, 107-120.

Trojanowicz, R. C., & Morash, M. (1983). _Juvenile delinquency concepts and control_ (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Truhon, S. A., McKinney J. P., & Hotch, D. F. (1980). The structure of values among college students: An examination of sex differences. _Journal of Youth and Adolescence,_ _9_(4), 289-297.

APPENDIX

Values Questionnaire

VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Do Not Reproduce
Without Permission

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document
have not been filmed at the request of
the author. They are available for
consultation, however, in the author's
university library.

These consist of pages:

Values Questionaire   82-91
_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

\#_____

Place a check by the correct or appropriate response.

1. Age
11 _____
12 _____
13 _____
14 _____
15 _____
16 _____
17 _____

6. How many cousins do you live with?

A. 0 _____
B. 1 _____
C. 2 _____
D. 3 _____
E. 4 _____
F. 5 _____
G. 6 _____

2. Class standing or Grade

	(6th)	_____
	(7th)	_____
	(8th)	_____
Freshman	(9th)	_____
Sophomore	(10th)	_____
Junior	(11th)	_____
Senior	(12th)	_____

3. Gender

Male _____
Female _____

4. Who do you live with?

Mother _____
Father _____
Both parents _____
Grandparent(s) _____
Mother/step father _____
Father/step mother _____
Adopted parents _____
Foster parents _____
Other (Specify) _____ _____
Alone _____

5. How many brothers and sisters or half brothers and half sisters, or step brothers and step sisters do you have?

A. 0 _____
B. 1 _____
C. 2 _____
D. 3 _____
E. 4 _____
F. 5 _____
G. 6 or more _____

#_____

B. In each of the following questions below place a check next to what you feel is the most appropriate response.

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PAIRS ARE MORE VALUABLE:

1. Boys ( ) Girls ( ) Both the same value ( )

2. Father ( ) Mother( ) Both the same value( )

3. Smart kids( ) Dumb kids( ) Both the same value( )

4. White( )   Black( ) Asians( ) Hispanics( )   Indians(   )

   Native Americans( ) All the same value( )

5. Juvenile delinquents(   ) Regular kids( ) Same value( )

6. Good looking people( ) Not good looking people( )

   Same value ( )

7. Athletes( ) Non-athletes( ) Both the same value( )

8. Burnouts( ) Non-burnouts( ) Both the same( )

9. Religious people( ) Non-religious people( ) Both the same( )

10. Rich people( ) Poor people( ) Both the same value( )

11. Dropouts( ) People in school( ) Both the same value( )

12. People who go to college( ) People who don't( ) Both the same( )

13. People who work( ) People on DSS/ADC( ) Both the same ( )

14. Young people( ) Old people( ) Both the same value ( )

15. Straight people( ) Gay people( ) Both the same( )

16. Handicapped people( ) Non-handicapped people( ) Both the same( )

17. Drug user ( ) Non-drug user ( ) Both the same ( )

C. TRUE OR FALSE

#_____

HONESTY MEANS:

CIRCLE ONE

1. telling the truth at all times.   T   F

2. not cheating on a test at school.   T   F

3. it is ok to lie to my parents at times   T   F

4. it is important that people trust me   T   F

5. being sincere or genuine, being for real   T   F

6. its ok to lie in order to avoid trouble   T   F

7. its ok to lie as long as no one gets hurt   T   F

8. telling the truth even if it hurts someone   T   F

D. Choose only one of the following, place a check by it.
    One should be honest because:

1. if your're not you can be punished   _____

2. only because it serves my needs   _____

3. others expect me to and I don't
   want to disappoint them   _____

4. the rules of society say so   _____

5. its important for society and everyone in it   _____

6. it is a principle belief that I have,
   a belief I have inside me   _____

E. Choose only one of the following, place a check by it.

   One should not steal because:

1. if you steal you will be punished   _____

2. it doesn't serve my best interest   _____

3. it would disappoint others if I did   _____

4. it is against the law   _____

5. it would hurt others in society   _____

6. it would go against what I believe   _____

_____
(# blank)

F. TRUE OR FALSE   <u>Circle</u> <u>One</u>

1. Stealing means to take someone's things without   T   F
   their permission

2. If a person needs something bad enough he/she can
   steal it if there is no other way   T   F

3. Taking candy or gum from a store without paying is
   not a very bad thing   T   F

4. If a person steals from a store it is only a loss
   to the insurance company   T   F

5. If a person steals and gets caught he/she is
   not very smart to get caught   T   F

6. People have a right to have things without someone
   stealing the things   T   F

7. Some kids are forced to steal in order to get decent
   clothes   T   F

8. Some kids are forced to steal to support   habits   T   F

9. Because there is a lot of stealing, people have
   to be very careful about their things. This should
   change if we are going to have a nicer society   T   F

10. Some rich people steal and that makes it ok for
    poor people to steal   T   F

11. If a kid steals from a store poor people get hurt
    because the store raises prices and the poor folks
    can't afford to by the things they need   T   F

12. It is ok to steal from the rich because they
    won't miss it   T   F

13. It is ok to steal sometimes   T   F

14. It is never ok to steal   T   F

#_____

G. I learned about it being wrong to steal <u>mostly</u> from: (<u>Check</u> <u>One</u>)

   1. my parents   _____

   2. church   _____

   3. friends   _____

   4. school   _____

   5. no one   _____

   6. T.V.   _____

H. I learned that it was ok to steal <u>mostly</u> from: (<u>Check</u> <u>One</u>)

   1. my parents   _____

   2. friends   _____

   3. school   _____

   4. brother/sister   _____

   5. no one   _____

   6. T.V.   _____

I. TRUE OR FALSE   <u>Circle</u> <u>One</u>

1. If I break a law it is my fault   T   F

2. If a person breaks a law it is because someone
   pressured him/her into doing it   T   F

3. A person is always responsible for their actions   T   F

4. No one makes someone do something wrong   T   F

J. TRUE OR FALSE   <u>Circle</u> <u>One</u>

1. Love means a person gets close to another person   T   F

2. Love is when a girl and boy care a great deal,
   or in a special way for one another   T   F

3. Love means having sexual relations with someone   T   F

4. Everyone needs love   T   F

\#_____

K.
Place a check in the most appropriate box. If one of the persons doesn't apply to you check "N/A". For instance if you don't have a sister check "N/A".

Among the people listed below I <u>respect</u>:

	most	somewhat	little	least	don't	N/A
1. my friends						
2. the police						
3. my teacher						
4. my minister						
5. my mother						
6. my father						
7. step mother						
8. step father						
9. mothers boyfriend						
10. fathers girlfriend						
11. old people						
12. young people						
13. my best friend						
14. my brother						
15. my sister						
16. Other:						

\#_____

L. TRUE OR FALSE   <u>Circle</u> <u>One</u>

1. A kid should respect his/her parent because they
   are parents   T   F

2. A student should usually respect the teacher   T   F

3. Youth should respect the police   T   F

4. Youth should respect police because they
   represent authority   T   F

5. It is wrong if we do not obey parents   T   F

6. We should respect old people because they are wise   T   F

7. We should always respect people who are in authority T   F

8. I respect people if I love them   T   F

9. There are times when it is ok not to respect
   authority figures   T   F

M. True or False   <u>Circle</u> <u>One</u>

1. Fighting solves problems   T   F

2. Its better to talk things out rather than fight   T   F

3. Fighting never solves anything   T   F

4. Fighting makes a person feel good   T   F

5. It is ok for adults to hit kids   T   F

6. Kids should never hit adults   T   F

7. Sometimes it is ok for kids to hit adults   T   F

#_____

N. Choose from the 16 values listed below the four most important and the 1 least important. Write the number of the value in the spaces provided.

1. WEALTH   2. GOOD FAMILY
3. FREEDOM   4. PEACE
5. A GOOD LIFE   6. SELF RESPECT
7. TRUE FRIENDSHIP   8. HAPPINESS
9. EQUALITY   10. LOVE
11. BEING GOOD AT DOING SOMETHING   12. DOING WELL IN SCHOOL
13. BEING GOOD AT ATHLETICS   14. BEING POPULAR WITH PEERS
15. GETTING A GOOD JOB   16. GETTING MARRIED

Most Important   1st._____   2nd._____   3rd._____   4th._____

Least Important   _____

N. Rank the following values in order of importance. 1 being most important, 8 being least important. Place the number of the value in the space provided.

1. HONESTY   2. BEING FAIR
3. NOT CHEATING   4. RESPECTING PARENTS
5. RESPECTING OLDER PEOPLE   6. RSPECTING OTHERS PROPERTY
7. RESPECTING AUTHORITY FIGURES   8. WORKING HARD

1st._____ 2nd._____ 3rd._____ 4th._____ 5th._____ 6th._____

7th._____ 8th._____

P. This is a list of values: 1.being honest; 2. not fighting; 3.doing well in school; 4.working hard; 5.respecting others property

Place the number of the value next to the person. For instance if not fighting is what is most important to you place an 2 next to you.

Of the values listed above which of the following do you think is:

1. most important to you   _____
2. most important to your mom   _____
3. most important to your dad   _____
4. most important to your best friend _____
5. most important to a teacher   _____

#_____

Q. Place a check next to the one where you learned your values from. Check only one.

1. Parents   _____

2. Church   _____

3. School   _____

4. Friends/Peers   _____

5. T.V.   _____

6. Brother/Sister   _____

R. Check the appropriate box.

My values are	Most Like	Same As	Least Like
1. Parents			
2. Friends/Peers			
3. Brother/Sister			
4. No one			

S.   Choose one of the following, place a check by it. Make sure to only choose one.

Most of the time when a kid does something wrong it is because they are:

1. not thinking   _____

2. trying to impress someone   _____

3. angry and want to hurt someone   _____

4. bored   _____

5. don't believe what they are doing is wrong _____

6. don't care   _____

7. don't know better   _____

#_____

VALUES NEEDED IN LIFE

Answer the following questions with your own opinion.

1. What are the values needed in life?_____

_____

_____

2. Why are they needed?_____

_____

_____

3. Do you think about these values when you do something good or

bad?_____

_____

_____