THE RELATIONSHIP OF STATUS ORIGINS AND STATUS PROSPECTS TO IN-SCHOOL DEVIANCE AND DELINQUENCY

by

Michael McLean Lombardo

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1975

Approved by

Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser R. H. Wilson

Committee Members J. L. Kerr

John A. Humphrey

Clark L. Dudley

Phyllis E. Bryson

3-6-75

Date of Acceptance by Committee

LOMBARDO, MICHAEL MCLEAN. The Relationship of Status Origins and Status Prospects to In-School Deviance and Delinquency. (1975) Directed by: Dr. Roland H. Nelson. Pp. 128.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of status origins and status prospects to in-school deviance and delinquency. Comparisons were made to indicate whether status origins or status prospects were more related to deviance and delinquency once the relationship between status prospects and status origins was found to be non-significant.

The subjects were 270 ninth grade boys and girls who completed a self-report questionnaire. Data was analyzed by use of Phi coefficients and Chi Square; 2 x 2 and partial tables were analyzed by Lazerfeld's method of multivariate analysis. The significance level was set at the .05 critical value for a two-tailed test.

The major variables used in this study were modal grade point average, status of courses (college or non-college prep), orientation toward school, status origins and status prospects. These were compared to deviance and delinquency measures.

In the deviance analysis, low status prospects and low orientation toward school were related to deviance. None of the other variables were significantly related to deviance. Significant differences on partial tables were that among those in high status courses,

students with low grades were more deviant than those with high grades; among those with low grades, deviants had a lower orientation toward school than non-deviants; and among deviants, those with a low college orientation were less oriented toward school.

Status origins were unrelated to deviance. The only social class difference was that blue-collar students had a lower orientation toward school than white-collar students.

In the delinquency analysis, low grades, low status prospects and low orientation toward school were related to delinquency. Blue-collar status origins, low status courses and low college orientation showed non-significant tendencies to relate to delinquency.

Significant differences on the partial tables were that blue-collar students with high status prospects were more delinquent than white-collar students with high status prospects; and among those students with high status prospects or in high status courses, low grades were related to delinquency.

Deviance and delinquency were related, but the two populations differed in total membership. Seventy-eight percent of the students had committed a deviant act; only 29% had committed a delinquent one.

In this study, status prospects were significantly related to deviance and delinquency. Status origins were not, except in the cases of blue-collar students with high status prospects and white-collar students with low status prospects.

This study supports other studies, all conducted in small- or medium-sized cities, which concluded that status origins have less relationship to deviance and delinquency than do status prospects. The emphasis of other studies was on delinquency as measured by official reports. This study focused on in-school deviance and delinquency utilizing the self-report technique.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Jack Humphrey of the Department of Sociology whose expertise in the field of juvenile delinquency was invaluable through all stages of this research.

The author also expresses his gratitude to the members of his advisory committee, Drs. Roland Nelson, Dale Brubaker, and Joseph Bryson of the School of Education, and Dr. Joseph Himes of the Department of Sociology.

The assistance of the Greensboro Public Schools in the conduct of field research was helpful and generous. The author expresses his thanks to Mr. William Johnson and Mr. Howard King of the Greensboro Public Schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

First — 16

Second — 17

Third —15 [1]

These simple yet startling figures underscore the seriousness of juvenile delinquency in America. Sixteen, seventeen, and fifteen represent the three single ages with the greatest number of arrests in 1972. Juveniles (under age 18) were charged with 11% of murders, 23% of rapes, 40% of robberies, 53% of burglaries, 50% of larcenies, and 60% of auto thefts.[2]

During the period 1960-1972, arrests of those under 18 were up 124% compared to 19% for those 18 and over.[3] Nationally, juveniles make up 44% of the arrest totals for serious crimes.

---

[1]Clarence M. Kelley, editor, Crime in the United States, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 126-127.

[2]Ibid., pp. 9-29.

[3]Ibid., p. 122.

[4]Ibid., p. 34.

The increase of delinquency in the public schools has mirrored and in many cases exceeded the national increase. Although no reliable statistics exist to measure this development, certain rough estimates are revealing.

The massive House of Representatives study found that 18% of schools have experienced serious, destructive protests.[5] Another study found that 85% of public secondary schools have experienced disruptions of some sort.[6]

The only study available on in-school delinquency was conducted by the United States Senate in 1969.[7] This study covers the period 1964-1968.[8]

The results are fragmentary. Of the 153 urban school districts surveyed, 43 did not answer, 70 supplied inadequate or incomplete information, and only 40 responded in full. Although the results are not definitive, they indicate a trend paralleling the

---

[5]Stephen K. Bailey, Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools, (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1970), p. 3.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Senator Thomas Dodd, Chairman, U.S. Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, "Hearing Draft #2," (Unpublished), 1969.

[8]Another study is currently underway for the 1969-1973 period.

national rise in delinquency. A few of the most important findings appear below.[9]

TABLE 1
Comparison of Reported In-School Criminal Acts
(1964/1968)

Crime	1964	1968
Murder	15	26
Robbery	396	1,508
Burglary and Larceny	7,604	14,102
Assaults on Teachers	253	1,801

In-school delinquency is increasing. That much can be determined. But, how much does the organization of the schools themselves contribute to this increase?

Theoretical Orientation

Numerous social critics have suggested that the schools share part of the blame for the increase of in-school and out-of-school delinquency. Researchers have consistently found relationships between certain in-school factors and delinquency. These factors have been incorporated into four theories dealing in part with the schools and delinquency.

---

[9]Dodd, pp. 5-7.

Blocked goal attainment theory states that though nearly all youth internalize the goals of educational attainment and financial and occupational success, some youth are at a disadvantage in achieving these goals. Earlier theories stated that these students were usually lower-class in social origin. Recent research indicates that perceived lack of payoff due to poor status prospects or an immediate reaction to failure may be more of a factor than social class.

Lack of commitment to school is a lack of commitment to middle-class values and roles, commitment theorists postulate. Assimilation of lower-class values and imperfect socialization have been offered as explanations. However, several recent studies infer that as achievement in school drops, so does commitment. This finding holds regardless of social class.

Interaction theory states that the school defines both underachievement and misconduct as deviance. Once the student is labeled as deviant, he is treated differentially, perceives himself as being different, and finds his new label difficult to shed. Although this view is logically consistent with studies of police and court processing of juvenile offenders, there is little empirical evidence to validate it in the school setting.

Rebellion theory is an integration and elaboration of the three preceding theories as they relate to the school. Rebellion theorists believe that much delinquency is a result of rebellion against the school.

No study has ever determined whether or not the school and its structure is a causal factor in delinquency. Some researchers feel that the school cannot be a causal factor. Others believe the school may contribute to or alleviate the problem depending on in-school factors. All agree that the task of separating the school from environmental or personal variables of the student's background is nearly impossible.

Although a causal study may be beyond the capabilities of present research, a thorough review of the literature reveals certain factors which have either been related to delinquency in the schools or are logically consistent with non-school delinquency studies.

The school has become a fundamental determinant of adolescent status. Our society is success-oriented, and the schools through their emphasis on achievement and ability grouping define what is successful — occupationally, socially, and academically for the young. The occupational functions of the family have

been transferred to the school, social class decreasingly insulates students from failure or delinquency, and achievement in school determines legitimacy to claims of success. Even if the content of education is irrelevant to future work, the process is not. The more education one has, the better chance of high future status.

Certain factors inherent in school organization define the best route to future status. Studies consistently indicate that almost all youth regardless of race, social class or delinquent status are committed to the importance of education, both intrinsically and as the road to future occupational payoff. When children fail to meet the school's expectations, they feel shunned and excluded. Realizing that the goals they seek are blocked, their expectations of the school experience and of themselves decrease. They form a negative attitude, rejecting their rejectors, and the result of this attitude may be delinquency.

Statement of the Problem

Which matters most? Where a child comes from or where a child is going? More formally, do status origins or status prospects have a greater impact on the delinquency problem? This question is a cause of much

argument in the school setting. If status origins are at the root of the delinquency problem, then the school can do little. If status prospects are more important, then the school is a significant factor.

This research will use the self-report technique to measure the relationship of status origins and status prospects to in-school deviance and delinquency. Representative samples of deviants/delinquents will be used.

Delinquency is defined as any reported in-school act which would be considered criminal for an adult. Deviance is any reported act of misconduct other than delinquency.

Assumptions and Limitations

Self-report questionnaires are the most reliable and valid measures of deviance and delinquency.[10] They are by nature anonymous, and to insure this anonymity, intelligence and personality differences could not be controlled. It was assumed that delinquents do not differ significantly in intelligence or personality

---

[10]James Short and Ivan Nye, "Extent of Unrecorded Juvenile Delinquency: Tentative Conclusions," Juvenile Delinquency, James E. Teele, ed., (Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1970).

traits from non-delinquents and there is much evidence that delinquents form normal distributions in these respects.[11]

For purposes of analysis, it was assumed that ninth-grade students are representative of older age groups. Delinquents fall primarily between the ages of 14 and 17, and an investigation of the literature revealed no differences between the 14- and 15-year-olds used in this study and the older students used in other studies. The factors related to delinquency show constant relationships across ages.

The central limitations of this study are that it is descriptive—as is delinquency research in general—and that it may only be generalized to those students living in small- and medium-sized cities. Research has shown blue-collar status origins to be more related to delinquency in large cities than in small- or medium-sized cities.[12]

---

[11]Ruth Cavan, Juvenile Delinquency, (New York: J.B. Lippincott, 1969), Chapter 5.

[12]Kenneth Polk and Walter Schafer, Schools and Delinquency, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 103; Arthur Stinchcombe, Rebellion in a High School, (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964).

Significance of the Study

This is the first study to compare the relationship of status origins and status prospects to in-school deviance and delinquency. Other studies have used in-school deviance and out-of-school delinquency, and related these to in-school factors.

This study attempts to isolate the school as an institution and measure its relationship to deviance and delinquency. As such, it is both more restrictive and broader than other studies. It is restricted to in-school variables and measures a broader range of these variables than other studies. Statistical controls and intercorrelations are also more rigorously used than in many other studies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Four theories of delinquency causation relate delinquency directly to the school experience. For each, the issue of whether status prospects or status origins is at the root of the problem is an important consideration.

These four theories — blocked goal attainment, lack of commitment, interaction theory, and rebellion theory — show no clear trend toward favoring status prospects or status origins as the major factor relating to the schools and delinquency. Different theorists within each orientation espouse opposing views.

Blocked Goal Attainment

Even though nearly all youth internalize the goals of educational attainment and financial and occupational success, some youth are at a disadvantage in achieving these goals—usually the lower class.[1]

---

[1]Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, (New York: Free Press, 1960).

Collectively, they adopt illegitimate commitments as an alternative status or as a means of striking back at the middle-class world. This theory suggests four ways the school may block goal attainment: (1) poor performance in school; (2) failure to get a good job or failure to perceive that a good job is forthcoming; (3) middle-class students may also experience this blockage; and, (4) the values, attitudes and organization of the school itself may contribute to this blockage.[2]

Cohen states the lower-class youths cannot share in the rewards of school. They come to understand and absorb some of middle-class culture through the school, but are unable to compete on its terms. Cohen charges that teachers are hired to foster the development of middle-class personalities and are almost certain to be middle-class themselves.[3] Furthermore, the school has certain imperatives of its own, from the board of education, parents, etc.; and these imperatives foster the development of well-behaved, conforming individuals.

---

[2]Kenneth Polk and Walter Schafer, Schools and Delinquency, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), pp. 17-18.

[3]Albert Cohen, Delinquent Boys, (New York: Free Press, 1955), pp. 122-118.

Teachers worry most about discipline and achievement, since this is how they are most often judged. Lower-class students lack training in discipline, positive reinforcement, and middle-class behavior patterns. The result, regardless of intentions, is: "It is extremely difficult to reward, however subtly, successful conformity without at the same time, by implication, condemning and punishing the non-conformist."[4]

Lower-class children lack intellectual stimulation and are more likely to be placed in a lower track—no matter what their basic intelligence. Teachers tend both to rate lower those from lower-class origins and to overstimulate those who do not have lower-class origins.[5]

The result is that some lower-class children rebel against the middle-class and its agent, the school. They join a gang or delinquent group to recapture lost status, quell feelings of inferiority and guilt, and adopt values which are directly opposed to middle-class values (i.e. school attendance is a middle-class value; truancy is a delinquent value).[6]

---

[4] Ibid., p.112

[5] Ibid., pp. 191-192.

[6] Ibid.

In a similar view, Cloward and Ohlin state that education is the chief source of mobility in our society and as such is an integral part of one's success goals. This advance toward success goals is blocked for those with little formal education and few economic resources. Their social origins, cultural differences, and the structural barriers of the school block their goal attainment. When delinquent opportunities exceed legitimate avenues of success and goal attainment is blocked by the school, youth turn to delinquency.[7]

Much literature, dating as far back as sixty years, lends support to the blocked goal attainment theories. Studies of school success, status, tracking, and dropouts give credence to this theory.

In an extensive review of the literature, the Silberbergs found a repeated relationship between delinquency, lack of achool achievement, reading problems, and school maladaptation.[8]

Delinquents were often truant, disliked school, teachers and homework, their reading disabilities

---

[7]Cloward and Ohlin, pp. 85-103.

[8]Norman and Margaret Silberberg, "School Achievement and Delinquency," Review of Educational Research, 41 (1), 1971, pp. 17-34.

produced disruptive behavior, and they showed a lack of abstract linguistic ability and verbal fluency.[9]

Kvaraceus found that almost all delinquents repeated a grade, got low marks, disliked school, had unsatisfactory social adjustments, moved often, and were ridiculed by students and teachers because of their clothes and inability to get along with the crowd.[10]

The Gluecks found 85% of delinquents retarded to some degree in school and 62% two or more years behind in grade level (1934).[11] A more recent study (1968) by the same authors found that delinquents revolted against the restrictive atmosphere of the school. They were characterized as careless, lazy, tardy, and disinterested. Four times as many were D and F students and 95% were referred for misconduct.[12]

---

[9]Ibid.

[10]William Kvaraceus, Juvenile Delinquency and the School, (Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y.: World Book, 1945), pp. 135-157.

[11]Silberbergs, pp. 17-34.

[12]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Delinquents and Non-Delinquents in Perspective, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 29-32, 71.

Palmore and Hammond found that children from deviant families were more than twice as likely (71% - 33%) to be delinquent if they were failing in school.[13] Their study also found the same result for deviant neighborhoods. Those successful in school had a 44% delinquency rate; those unsuccessful, 82%.[14] Palmore and Hammond conclude that the more legitimate opportunities a person has, the less delinquent he or she will be. They found that those with least access (blacks who were failing) had a delinquency rate of 71% while those with the most access (white girls succeeding) had a rate of 0%.[15]

Reiss and Rhodes found that upper-class children living in high-delinquency areas and failing in school also had high delinquency rates.[16] Delinquency at the lower-class levels, however, was both more frequent and serious, especially when self-reports were examined.[17]

---

[13]Erdman Palmore and Phillip Hammond, "Interacting Factors in Juvenile Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 29: 848-854, December, 1964.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid.

[16]A.J. Reiss and A.L. Rhodes, "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the Social Class Structure," American Sociological Review, 26:5, pp. 720-732.

[17]Ibid.

Gwagney, in another extensive review of the literature, found poor school adjustment, dislike of school, and truancy to be related to delinquency.[18]

Numerous studies of tracking or sorting students also show the relationship between failure in school and delinquency.

Sexton reported that of the top 30% ability wise, one-third of the boys and one-half of the girls were not in the college prep track.[19] These lower-track students came primarily from lower income and minority groups. Polk and Schafer found, as Sexton did, that socioeconomic and racial background had an effect on track selection independent of either measured ability or achievement in junior high school.[20]

Polk and Schafer found that tracking was quite rigid, with only 7% moving to another track during high school.[21] Since family background, IQ and an accumulated educational deficit could affect achievement, they controlled for these factors in order to measure the independent effect of tracking. This effect

---

[18]William Gwagney, "Do Our Schools Prevent or Promote Delinquency?", Journal of Educational Research, 50: 215-219, November, 1956.

[19]Virginia Sexton, Education and Income, (New York: Viking Press, 1966), p. 172.

[20]Polk and Schafer, p. 37.

[21]Ibid., p. 50.

was significant. Even with the noted confounding factors controlled for, only 4% of the general track as opposed to 30% of the college track were in the top quarter of the class. Thirty-nine percent of the college track and 73% of the general track were in the bottom half.[22] Further, the authors found that tracking had a more independent effect than father's occupation, IQ or previous grade-point average. Grades tended to improve among those in the college track; they dropped significantly for those in the general track.

The 29% of the students in the general track accounted for 70% of those sent to the office. General track students had a delinquency rate of 16%; 6% for the college track.[23] Factoring out the students who were delinquent before high school, the difference among tracks remained, 11% to 5%.[24]

Polk and Schafer postulate that the self-fulfilling prophecy operates through the tracking system. Youth are labeled as dumb, develop that expectation of their ability, and act accordingly. As Cohen and Stinchcombe have also charged, they view youthful rebellion as a

---

[22] Ibid., pp. 41-42.

[23] Ibid., pp. 43-45.

[24] Ibid.

reaction to school and to its promises. Upgrading of educational requirements for job entry have greatly raised the percentage of high school aged students in school (94% in 1968); but for those in the lower track, there is no perceived payoff for achieving, and the result is often delinquency.

Pearl states that "the tracked" feel locked out of the system because of the loss of unskilled jobs, lack of small business opportunities, and the realization that college will probably not be available to them. Instead, they are trained for obsolete trades, with outdated tools, equipment, and techniques. Even though technology is changing rapidly and one trade will not suffice to make a career, present programs are too occupation specific.[25] In short, such children lack a future.

Stinchcombe argues that the status prospects associated with achievement in school are far more important than status origins in determining delinquency. Those falling out of the success track will be more rebellious. This low status will be accompanied by

---

[25]Arthur Pearl, "Youth in Lower Class Settings," Problems of Youth, Muzafer and Carolyn Sherif, eds., (Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1965), pp. 89-109.

maladjustment to school,[26] and delinquency as a result of discouragement over future prospects or as a response to the immediate effects of failure.[27]

Tracked students perceive themselves to be blocked out. They see their prospects and current status as dismal. They tend to be in such courses as introduction to vocations, shop, and home economics rather than the more prestigious algebra, French, and honors English; and they more often rebel.

Relating to tracking studies are the studies which indicate that school maladaptation may have a greater effect on delinquency than social class.

Polk and Richmond note that in Hollingshead's Elmtown study (1949), social class was an effective shield against low grades.[28] None of the upper-class group had failing averages; 25% of the lower-class group did. The authors state that this finding no longer holds. Although more blue-collar students in their study failed (25% against 15% of the white-collar) the correlations were weak. What emerged as the best

---

[26]Joel Montague, "Social Status and Adjustment in School," Clearing House, vol. 27, September, 1952, pp. 19-24. See also Cloward and Ohlin, Cohen, Polk and Schafer.

[27]Polk and Schafer, pp. 103-114.

[28]Ibid., p. 56.

criterion for predicting achievement was college orientation.[29] The class of the student is becoming far less important than academic achievement in determining success. Controlling for grades, the authors found seven times as much variance accounted for by college/non-college orientation than from social class differences.[30]

The authors postulate that parents can no longer give children a final status by rooting them in a structured and dependable social structure. Reliance now is more on achievement in school; and although success in school is no guarantee of success in life, failure in school closes many doors. Failing students pay the price of economic vulnerability, suffer socially, participate in school activities less, are denied privileges, lose esteem with classmates, and are rated lower by teachers on responsibility, industry and emotional stability.[31]

Realizing this identity spoilage, they neutralize their stigma by rejecting the rejectors. Using Matza's observation, the authors state that the failing child deflects these negative sanctions by attacking others.

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 58-59.

[30] Ibid., p. 59.

[31] Ibid., pp. 56-69.

He rates the school as bad and dull, rejects its goals, rejects legitimate means necessary for success, and develops group supports contrary to school norms.[32] The student becomes a double failure—in school and socially. This induces him to neutralize the failure by spending more time with friends, seeking friends outside of school settings, and giving more peer-oriented than school-oriented responses.[33]

In a final and telling analysis, the authors show that delinquency rates in their study are almost identical when grades and social class are compared, but show a large difference between the different levels of achievement. Both white- and blue-collar students with modal grades of A or B have delinquency rates of 4%. Those with modal grades of C have rates of 11% and 12% respectively; those with modal grades of D or F have rates of 20% and 27% respectively.[34] Their conclusion is that success in school is far more important in predicting delinquency than social class.

Dropout studies provide interesting and contradictory findings concerning the school. Several recent

---

[32] Ibid., pp. 62-65.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., p. 88.

studies[35] have found delinquency to be either unrelated to the dropout rate or that dropouts from the lower class experience a marked decrease in delinquent activities upon dropping out of school. These studies infer that frustrations at school can cause delinquency, and leaving school lowers both these frustrations and delinquency.

The problem with these arguments, logical though they may be, is that dropouts account for 60-90% of juvenile court referrals.[36] That their rate is somehow lower is incongruous with these statistics. Also, recent massive studies by Coleman and Jencks[37] bring into question the entire issue of what effect the school has on the dropout problem. Coleman found that areas with the highest dropout rates spend the most on school services, and Jencks found that equalizing opportunity accounts for little of the variance in income

---

[35]"Delinquency Unrelated to Dropout Rate," Nation's Schools, 87:96, June, 1971; Delbert Elliot, "Delinquency, School Attendance, and Dropouts," John Stratton and Robert Terry, Prevention of Delinquency, (London: MacMillan, 1968), pp. 191-199.

[36]Grant Venn, Man, Education and Work, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964); and Bernice Moore, "The Schools and the Problems of Delinquency," Crime and Delinquency, 7:3, July, 1961, pp. 201-212.

[37]James Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1966); and Christopher Jencks, Inequality, (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

levels. When coupled with frequent allegations that most students drop out because of economic and not academic reasons,[38] the premise of the Elliot study seems shaky at best. Jeffery and Coleman, among others, doubt whether the school can much affect the dropout problem.[39] If students drop out for economic reasons—and neither increased opportunity nor increased expenditures can much affect this—the schools are in a bind.

Although the economic side of the dropout problem may be clouded, the academic side of the issue is less so. Students who are failing in school or in the general track are far more likely to drop out. Polk and Schafer found that controlling for father's occupation, IQ and previous grade-point average, the general track had a dropout rate of 19%; the college track, 4%.[40]

Dropout studies examine one variable—a variable which often presents confounding results. If dropping out is a solution, 60-90% of the court referrals should not be dropouts. If students drop out for economic

---

[38]Cloward and Ohlin.

[39]C. Ray Jeffery, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1971).

[40]Polk and Schafer, p. 41.

reasons, there is no evidence that the school can do much about them. The only areas where the school can be clearly indicted is in its tracking practices and in its stunting of status prospects. The school can deliver a perception of increased prospects, but not the solution to the problem; the school is only one of our socio-political institutions, and any study which states that it causes the dropout problem rests on shaky ground.

Blocked goal attainment theorists approach delinquency from two different perspectives. Originally, such theorists as Cohen, and Cloward and Ohlin saw social class as the blockage. Their view found heavy support from achievement and tracking studies, particularly Hollingshead's Elmtown research. There seems to be little doubt that in post-war America social class provided an anchor which affected success in school and delinquency. An upper-middle class child was far more likely to have high grades and be non-delinquent than a lower-class child.

Recent studies by Stinchcombe, and Polk and Schafer have charted the decreasing influence of social class on delinquency. Variables such as status of courses, achievement, and future job prospects, all of which relate to success in school, have been found

to relate to delinquency more than social class. The authors do not view environmental or family factors as having no influence on delinquency, but they do believe that schooling is the child's passport to a better life. Family conditions can promote or retard delinquency, but success in school is the turning point. The school promises at least a chance at future success, and failure to reap these perceived future advantages through present failure in school causes children to turn to delinquency.

In their view, status prospects (where the child perceives himself as going in life) is more critical as a determinant of social status than simply where the child comes from (status origins).

Lack of Commitment

Commitment theory states that lack of commitment to school is also a lack of commitment to conventional, middle-class values and roles, and an identification with a pattern of peer rebellion. Miller argues that this is a simple assimilation of lower-class culture, contradicting the assertion that the lower classes have middle-class aspirations.[41] (This assertion, as will

[41]Walter B. Miller, "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, 14 (1958:3), pp. 5-19.

be shown later, has little evidence to back it up. It may have some credence for bottom status and ethnic groups.) Karachi and Toby's middle-class theory states that lack of commitment occurs through imperfect socialization or simple choice.[42]

There is little doubt that commitment to school is an important factor in delinquency. Studies by Kelly and Pink,[43] Tangri and Schwartz,[44] Short,[45] and Polk and Halferty[46] found a high relationship between lack of commitment to school and high delinquency. The question is, however, does the school have any input into this low commitment? By definition, Miller and Karachi and Toby rule out the school because they

---

[42]Larry Karachi and Jackson Toby, "The Uncommitted Adolescent: Candidate for Gang Socialization," Sociological Inquiry, 32, (Spring, 1962), pp. 203-215.

[43]Delos Kelly and William Pink, "School Commitment, Youth Rebellion, and Delinquency," Criminology, 10 (4), 1973, pp. 473-485.

[44]Sandra Tangri and Michael Schwartz, "Delinquency Research and the Self-Concept Variable," in Rose Giallombardo, Juvenile Delinquency, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972), pp. 169-181.

[45]James Short, "Social Structure and Group Processes in Explanation of Gang Delinquency," In Sherif, pp. 155-188.

[46]Polk and Schafer, pp. 71-90.

believe that delinquent commitments are low to begin with. Only Polk and Halferty and Polk and Schafer present any evidence that the school may cause low commitment. Both studies found delinquency to be more related to achievement in school than social class, which contradicts traditional commitment theory. They also found delinquency to be negatively related to success in school or the commitment to success in school. This infers that as achievement drops, so does commitment, and delinquency increases.

The authors concede that their studies do not adequately test this hypothesis. Still, their logic is consistent with tracking studies which show that once tracked, grades do go down and delinquency goes up. It may be that low commitment is also a function of tracking or unfavorable school experiences.

Commitment theories follow the same pattern as has been found in blocked goal attainment theories. Earlier theories (Miller, Cohen, Karachi and Toby) viewed lack of commitment as a function of social class. Recent research directly contradicts this. Commitment has been found to relate more to success in school than social class.

Modern theorists believe that social class is a factor for bottom status and ethnic groups; but for the majority of American youth, future prospects are more important.

Interaction Theory

The labeling or interactional view of deviant behavior holds that deviance is not inherent in an act but is created by the definitions of those who enforce social standards of behavior. Whether an act is labeled as deviant depends both on the nature of the act and a number of extrinsic factors: who is enforcing the norm; the situation and its social context; and the status, reputation and friendship patterns of the person.[47]

Deviance is an exchange between an individual and some other individual who represents the interests and standards of a particular group. This agent of social control can vitally influence the long-term behavior of the rule-violator.[48]

In the school setting, the school defines both underachievement and misconduct as norms. How the norms are enforced depends on several factors. First, there is a certain tolerance limit on behavior. A good student may be allowed a higher tolerance limit than a poor one, for example. Second, the value orientation

---

[47] Ibid., pp. 95-96.

[48] Edwin Schur, Radical Nonintervention, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 119.

and goals of the school affect what the norms are. Progressive, open, and free schools tend to allow a wider range of behaviors. Third, the nature of the student population affects what these limits are. Junior and senior high schools, and high academic/low academic schools have differing limits. Fourth, situational factors, such as the subject being taught, the behavior and performance of other students, and the personality, social class, race and sex of the teacher affect the interaction. Fifth, characteristics of the student himself such as his status and reputation affect norm enforcement.[49]

The nature of the deviant role is affected by the nature of the rebelling process. During the first step, role entry, the student is seen as different and deserving of special attention. He takes on a new public identity, may have restrictions placed on him, there is increased probability he will be labeled as a deviant in the future, and he may be dropped into a lower track.[50]

The school faces several dilemmas. Identifying deviants helps the school enforce its norms and show

---

[49]Polk and Schafer, pp. 148-152.

[50]Ibid., pp. 152-154.

other students how not to be. It also aids in the early identification of deviants so they may be helped. Ignoring deviant acts may reinforce the act for the deviant or for other students. At the same time, the deviant will probably be treated differently; and a self-fulfilling prophecy may be set up.[51]

The second step involves what happens after a person is labeled as deviant. The school response to underachievement may be helping, outside referrals, discipline, punishing, counseling, or probation. Which response is chosen depends on the assumptions and characteristics of students, teachers, and school already noted.

The school response to behavioral deviance may be corporal punishment, moving the child's seat, persuasion, or referral to someone outside the classroom.[52] Again, what happens is determined by many variables.

The effects of the school response vitally affect the future course of behavior. Polk and Schafer state that there are three causes of deviant behavior in school. First, the student may have low innate capability.

---

[51]Polk and Schafer, pp. 153-154; Stanton Wheeler and Leonard Cottrell, "The Labeling Process," in Donald Cressey and David Ward, Delinquency, Crime and Social Process, (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 608-612.

[52]Polk and Schafer, p. 155.

Second, he may have low commitment to school goals. Third, and by far the most important, he may have low acquired capabilities. The academic skills, both cognitive and classroom, and study habits may be poorly developed. The social skills, relations with school personnel and peer relations may also be inadequate.

If any of these factors are low, the probability of deviance resulting is high. The school's response such as coercive measures (corporal punishment, suspension, use of fear and criticism) may alleviate the immediate problem, but in the long run lower the commitment of the student. Polk and Schafer state that in their research they have found no evidence that deviants differ from non-deviants in the extent they wish to succeed in school. However, this is the usual assumption. The blame is placed on lack of commitment when lack of acquired capabilities is the real culprit.

Deviants have difficulty in shedding the deviant label. They are locked in through official records. Their current reputation may be overly founded on the past. Informal chit-chat, failing grades, denial of extracurriculars, negative parental responses, and lowering of grades for misconduct help to cement the deviant image and self-image.[53]

---

[53] Ibid., pp. 155-162.

The interactionist perspective makes it clear that the school may maintain or generate the very behavior it seeks to eliminate. The problem with this view is that it is exceedingly difficult to isolate the school from environmental or internal factors. Also, research on the effects of school responses on deviants is virtually non-existent.[54] Many scholars raise serious doubts as to what the school can do to alleviate such a complex and interdependent problem. Finally, the school itself does not really define deviance unless school is viewed in the most generic sense. State law, agency input, policy of school boards and community groups, pressure from parents, and educational philosophy have a tremendous impact on how deviance is viewed by any school.

Interaction theories are recent in origin and show an integrated approach to delinquency causation. As underachievement, primarily due to lack of acquired capabilities, most affects the lower classes, interaction theory views these children as most likely to be labeled as deviant. However, the theory concentrates on what

---

[54]See Polk and Schafer; also Ernest Peters, "Public School Attitudes Toward Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 6:1, 1969, pp. 56-62. Peters found that the most common response to school deviance is the use of fear and coercive sanctions.

the labeling process does to decrease and block future expectations, not on which social class is most subject to labeling. As such, it concerns itself with the labeling of children, not the labeling of a particular class of children.

Rebellion Theory

Rebellion theory postulates that much delinquency is a result of rebellion against the school. Stated in its most complete form by Polk and Schafer, the rebellion model is composed of six interrelated factors: school experiences contributing to delinquency; school conditions contributing to educational failure; school conditions contributing to perceived lack of payoff of education; school conditions contributing to low commitment; school sanctions; and rigidity and educational lag.[55]

Polk and Schafer's general perspective on the school and delinquency is that school experience is a fundamental determinant of adolescent status and the manner in which a youngster is identified exerts a basic influence on deviant behavior.[56]

---

[55]Polk and Schafer, pp. 164-239.

[56]To avoid excessive footnoting, Polk and Schafer's argument is contained in Polk and Schafer, pp. 21-28.

Our society is success-oriented and this is what schools do--reinforce this success goal. They process individuals differentially. Even if the content of education is irrelevant to future work, the process is not. The more education one has, the better chance of future status. The school determines avenues to success by locking out as much as locking in. Class and ethnic biases may lock individuals out, but increasingly the process is a matter of ability grouping. Ability determines legitimacy to claims of success. If the dull cannot do a job and it is assumed that the school can correctly identify the dull, then this is the individual's weakness and not the school's. To have winners, there must also be losers. The dull may be identified by finding one limiting factor (reading) and attributing it across the board.

Our society emphasizes academic achievement more than class origins. This can give rise to a meritocracy and the legitimate way to become a member is through the school. Tracking determines the individual's stake in conformity. If one is in a high track, delinquency becomes irrational. Why risk a law career?

Procedures to handle misbehavior are similar to those surrounding ability, except in reverse. Special

adjustment classes for the dumb who are already in the low track reinforce deviance, make it clear that the child is somehow lacking and tell him that success must be somewhere outside the school setting.

The school tells the youngster that he is not wanted. If the child lacks an orientation to the future and does not defer immediate gratification, this may be because he has little future. He relies on fate because no rational course is open. Such children spend most of their time with people outside the school setting. When locked out, they form a loose subculture, which is often delinquent.

The two school experiences which contribute most to delinquency are the accumulation of educational failure combined with a desire for success, and the perceived irrelevancy of education.

Accumulation of Educational Failure Combined with a Desire for Success

Coleman found that most children get pressure to seek middle- or high-level occupations and get a high school or college education. Most parents desire a middle- or high-level of education in school.[57]

---

[57]Coleman, p. 192.

Riessman[58] found that even most lower status parents and minority parents place a high value on school achievement. Fifty percent of white and 70% of black parents said that what they missed most in life and would like their children to have was an education. The remarkable thing about this finding is the interviewees supplied the word spontaneously; it was not picked from a list.

Non-white parents placed as much emphasis on education as whites did, and more in the case of parents of secondary school students who wanted their children to be one of the best in the class.[59]

Educational attainment and success are stressed regardless of socioeconomics or race. Polk and Schafer note studies which show that almost all students want to pass courses, finish high school at least, and accept the success goals of our society. Coleman found that most students "would do anything" to continue school even if conditions were about to force them to drop out.[60]

---

[58]Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child, (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 10.

[59]Coleman, p. 192.

[60]Ibid., p. 278.

Lower-income and non-whites are most unsuccessful in school. They fail, drop out and are more often non-promoted. Two to five times as many blue-collar as white-collar students get D's and F's. They score lower in verbal and non-verbal ability, reading, math, and general information.[61]

This failure results in decreased expectations. These children are shunned and excluded. This blocked goal attainment may cause delinquency. Delinquents with the same intelligence get lower grades and are more negative toward school than non-delinquents. There is no difference, however, in their concern about future jobs or the importance of education.

Regardless of class, educational aspiration, or race, those failing in school have higher delinquency rates. This is not a total rejection; rather, it is an on-again, off-again process.

Irrelevancy of Education

Children who are failing assume that their occupational payoff will probably be low, because to get a good job a good school record is necessary.

---

[61] Ibid., p. 219.

Occupational inheritance has been supplanted by occupational choice.[62] Since students will need to know several jobs to exist in the future job market, school cannot provide these skills to any great degree. What it does do is provide status platforms. In the nineteenth century, children contributed to the economic well-being of the family; today they are dependent because occupational functions have been transferred to the school.[63] Polk and Schafer postulate that this complex economic flow process has caused children to become economically dependent on the school, and the school cannot accommodate this dependency. The danger of this unfulfilled economic dependency is that some youth face a passive and meaningless existence.[64]

If their courses are viewed as irrelevant to future status, failure can result, especially among low track students. These students become hedonistic because they cannot see achievement of long-term goals through current restraint. Since status rise seems blocked, they reject conformity. Delinquency is greater among the non-college bound even when grades are identical.

---

[62]Polk and Schafer.

[63]Ibid., pp. 12-15.

[64]Ibid.

This irrelevance may be independent of low grades, as it is for the non-college bound, or highly related to them. The result is a withdrawal of commitment which the authors say precedes low achievement in school and the possibility of striking back at the institution which should be their benefactor.

Rebellion theory integrates blocked goal attainment, commitment, and interaction theory. It views delinquency largely as a reaction to the school and its promises. Although social class may inhibit or aid one's progress in life, it is rapidly decreasing as a factor in delinquency. Increasingly, where the child sees himself as going—his status prospects—determines whether he conforms or drifts into delinquency.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This research proposes to measure the relationship between status origins and in-school deviance/delinquency and the relationship between status prospects and in-school deviance/delinquency. Comparisons will be made to determine whether status origins or status prospects is more related to deviance/delinquency.

Major Relationships Between Variables

1. To identify in-school factors which are significantly related to in-school deviance/delinquency.

2. To investigate the similarities and differences between social classes (status origins) in regard to selected in-school factors bearing on deviance/delinquency.

3. To investigate the similarities and differences between the future expectations of students (status prospects) in regard to selected in-school factors bearing on deviance/delinquency.

4. To compare the relationship of status origins and status prospects with in-school deviance/delinquency.

Major Research Objectives

1. The relationship between grades and deviance/delinquency.

2. The relationship between status of courses and deviance/delinquency.

3. The relationship between social class (status origins) and deviance/delinquency.

4. The relationship between orientation toward school and deviance/delinquency.

5. The relationship between status prospects and deviance/delinquency.

6. The relationship between status origins and status prospects.

7a. The relationship between grades and deviance/delinquency controlling for status origins.

7b. The relationship between grades and deviance/delinquency controlling for status prospects.

8a. The relationship between status of courses and deviance/delinquency controlling for status origins.

8b. The relationship between status of courses and deviance/delinquency controlling for status prospects.

9a. The relationship between orientation toward school and deviance/delinquency controlling for status origins.

9b. The relationship between orientation toward school and deviance/delinquency controlling for status prospects.

9c. The relationship between orientation toward school and deviance/delinquency controlling for grades.

10a. The relationship between status origins and deviance/delinquency controlling for status prospects.

10b. The relationship between status prospects and deviance/delinquency controlling for status origins.

11. The relationship between deviance and delinquency.

Method of Data Collection

Self-report questionnaires[1] were completed by all students to insure anonymity and to record unreported deviance/delinquency.

Sample

The data for this study was drawn from the population of ninth-grade students at a junior high school in a medium-sized city. The particular school was chosen because of its approximation of the city's racial and socioeconomic mix.

The entire ninth grade was used as a sample. Initially, the sexes were analyzed separately. They

[1]See Appendix A for the text of the questionnaire.

were later combined as no differences were found among delinquent and non-delinquent males and females.[2]

Operational Definitions of Variables

1. Status Origins -- Measurement of status origins was based on father's occupation. The scale used was the Index of Social Position.[3]

2. Status Prospects -- The Index of Social Position was used again to find out what job the student expects to hold ten years from now. As this asked students their perceived future, it is more a measure of their aspirations than their actual prospects. The student was asked whether or not he/she expects to attend college.[4]

3. Grades -- (a) A high modal grade average was considered as a B average or above. (b) A low modal grade average was considered as a C average or below.[5]

---

[2]Boys were more deviant/delinquent than girls, but there were no differences between delinquent boys and girls and non-delinquent boys and girls. For example, delinquent boys and girls had significantly lower status prospects than non-delinquent boys and girls.

[3]Based on the occupational scale in August Hollingshead and Frederick Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958).

[4]Aaron V. Cicourel and John I. Kitsuse, The Educational Decision-Makers (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1963), p. 146.

[5]Kenneth Polk and Walter Schafer, Schools and Delinquency, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 109.

4. Status of Courses — (a) If a majority of subjects taken included the following, the student was considered to be in college prep, high status courses: a foreign language, algebra, advanced band, orchestra, dramatics, or honors English. (b) If a majority of subjects taken included the following, the student was considered to be in non-college prep, low status courses: reading, vocational education, basic math, industrial arts, or lower English.[6]

5. Orientation Toward School — Three measures of orientation toward school were used. These measures were later combined after all were found to differentiate significantly between delinquents and non-delinquents:[7] (a) the perceived importance of getting an education, (b) the perceived importance of schooling, and (c) the perceived importance of grades in obtaining a desirable job.

---

[6]Based on the classifications used by Polk and Schafer and by Virginia Sexton, Education and Income, (New York: Viking Press, 1966).

[7]James Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity, (Washington: GPO, 1966), p. 278.

6. Deviance — Deviance consists of acts of misconduct or underachievement in school other than delinquent acts.[8]

7. Delinquency — Delinquency consists of in-school acts which would be considered criminal for an adult.[8]

Analysis of Data

Data was interpreted by Lazerfeld's method of multivariate analysis. This method allows the direct comparison of variables by use of standard statistical procedures.

Tables were analyzed by use of Chi square to test for statistical significance and Phi coefficients to test for degree of association. Cramer's V was used to adjust the Phi coefficient for larger tables. The significance level was set at the .05 critical value for a two-tailed test.

---

[8]Based on the categories developed by James Short and Ivan Nye, "Extent of Unrecorded Juvenile Delinquency: Tentative Conclusions," Juvenile Delinquency, James E. Teele, ed., (Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1970). Larceny was dichotomized into deviance (stolen little things worth no more than $2 such as a lunch or a Coke); and delinquency (stolen things which were valuable such as books, clothes, large sums of money).

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOLS AND DEVIANCE: RESULTS

The major emphasis of this research was to determine whether status prospects or status origins is more related to deviance/delinquency. Before these relationships could be examined, it was necessary to consider the relationship between status origins and status prospects.

If, for example, students with a white-collar background more often picked a white-collar future occupation, than did blue-collar students, this relationship could influence subsequent relationships to deviance/delinquency.

Such was not the case. Status origins and status prospects were not significantly related. Where the student sees himself as going in life was not as much affected by his social class as has been reported in other studies.

Table 2 demonstrates that lower class children did not set lower job aspirations for themselves. The theory that poorer children are delinquent because they assume they will be janitors or unskilled workers was not supported by this study. Examining the low percentages of this table (not shown in the text), 86%

of white-collar and 77% of blue-collar students expected to hold professional or semi-professional jobs (such as lawyer, teacher, salesman, computer programmer). In other words, the idea "My father was poor, so I'll be poor" was not shown to be true in this study.

TABLE 2
Percentage of Status Origins by Status Prospects.[1]

	Status Prospects	
	WC	BC
Origins	N=178	N=37
WC	64.6	48.6
BC	35.4	51.4
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 2.66$ Phi = -.11 $p < .10$

As Table 3 shows, social class was also unrelated to deviance. The popular notion that lower-class children are more deviant (likely to be sent out of class, kept in, fight a lot) found no support.

---

[1]List of statistical abbreviations: x^2=Chi square; Phi=Phi coefficient; V=adjust Phi; p=level of statistical significance.

List of table abbreviations: Dev=Deviant; N-Dev=Non-deviant; Deliq=Delinquent; N-Deliq=Non-Delinquent; Courses=Status of Courses; Origins=Status Origins; WC=White Collar; BC=Blue Collar; Prospects= Status Prospects; Orient=Orientation toward School; College=College Orientation.

TABLE 3
Percentage of Deviants by Status Origins

Deviance	Status Origins WC N=143	BC N=96
N-Dev	65.7	61.5
Dev	34.3	38.5
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = .66$ V = -.05 p < .71

Although social class was unrelated to deviance, where the students saw themselves as going in life (their job prospects) was related to deviance. If their job prospects were low, they were far more likely to be deviant (54% versus 32%) than children with more favorable job prospects. Table 4 depicts this relationship.

TABLE 4
Percentage of Deviants by Status Prospects

Deviance	Status Prospects WC N=190	BC N=46
N-Dev	67.4	45.7
Dev	32.6	54.3
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 8.87$ Phi = -.19 p < .01

To summarize these findings, children with a perception of a successful future were unlikely to be deviant regardless of their status origins.

Deviants also showed a lower orientation to school than non-deviants. They saw education as being less important, were more indifferent toward the importance of grades to getting a good job, and more often indicated a desire to drop out of school. This lack of orientation or commitment to school is shown in Table 5. To some extent, the "trouble-maker's" negative orientation toward school can be explained by his present failure in school. Deviants tended to make lower grades, and as noted previously, more often saw their future prospects as uninviting.

TABLE 5
Percentage of Deviants by Orientation Toward School

	Orient	
	High	Low
Deviance	N=238	N=32
N-Dev	68.1	40.6
Dev	31.9	59.4
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 8.15$ Phi = -.17 $p < .01$

For the other major research objectives, no pattern emerged. Deviant children were just as likely to be in high or low status courses as non-deviants, and just as likely to want to go to college. In other words, deviants were not identified by the school and placed in non-college courses such as basic math or introduction to vocations. They were allowed to choose courses commensurate with their abilities and interests.

Data on grades, status of courses and orientation toward school was also analyzed to see whether status prospects or status origins was more related to deviance in that particular case. By breaking down the overall relationships it was possible to determine underlying significant relationships which give clues as to why deviance was related to low status prospects and low orientation toward school, and unrelated to any of the other variables.

Grades and Deviance

Although the relationship fell short of significance at the .05 level ($p < .07$), deviants did tend to make lower grades. This finding, however, had nothing to do with the social class or future prospects of the child.

White-collar and blue-collar children were equally likely to be deviant regardless of high or low grades. They were less deviant when grades were high and more deviant when grades were low.

Similarly, children with high prospects made higher grades whether they were deviant or non-deviant. White-collar and blue-collar students with high grades had high status prospects.

In summary, neither grades and social class nor grades and status prospects predicted deviance. The tendency of grades to relate to deviance was not explained by these two variables.

The only finding of any importance in this section was that white-collar students made higher grades. This held regardless of the deviance or non-deviance of white-collar students. Simply stated, white-collar children made better grades no matter how the data was analyzed (73% made high grades as opposed to only 29% of blue-collar students).

Status of Courses and Deviance

As noted earlier, deviants were not placed in lower status courses. One significant relationship appeared, however, among students in high status courses. If a child was in college preparatory classes and making

low grades, he was more likely to be deviant than a child who was making high grades. For those in low status courses, grades were independent of deviance. (The importance of this finding will be explained later.) Table 6 demonstrates this finding.

TABLE 6
Percentage of Deviants by Grades Controlling for Status of Courses

	Status of Courses					
	High			Low		
	Grades			Grades		
Deviance	Low N=61	High N=124	Deviance	Low N=61	High N=12
N-Dev	54.1	73.4	N-Dev	63.9	41.7
Dev	45.9	26.6	Dev	36.1	58.3
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2 = 6.04	Phi = -.18	p < .01	x^2 = 1.25	Phi = .13	p < .26

Again, white-collar students were far more likely to be in college prep classes than blue-collar students.

Orientation Toward School and Deviance

A low or negative orientation toward school, evidenced in such findings as not wanting to continue school or not considering grades important to a good job, was related to deviance.

A desire to go to college and grades also related to this variable and deviance. For deviants, wanting to go to college was related to a positive orientation toward school. Should one drop, so did the other. Very few deviants liked school but did not want to go to college, or did not like school, but wanted to go to college. As a group, deviants were most likely to be negative toward school and have no college plans.

Similarly, of those with low grades, deviants were more likely to be negative toward school than non-deviants. This group was also more likely to choose low status future jobs.

As mentioned earlier, social class was unrelated to deviance. However, social class was related to orientation toward school. Blue-collar students were less positively oriented toward school than white-collar students, and blue-collar deviants reacted less favorably to school than any other group. They were most likely to want to drop out, etc.

Deviance/Status Origins/Status Prospects

No significant differences were found in this section of the research. Both social classes were likely to be equally deviant given the same aspirations. A white-collar student who wanted to be a lawyer showed the same deviant tendencies as a blue-collar student with the same aspirations.

No differences were found within social classes either. For example, white-collar deviants did not differ from white-collar non-deviants in their level of aspiration.

Interpretation

Status prospects clearly were more related to deviance than status origins, which showed no relationship. Blue-collar students did show a lower orientation toward school, but this did not predispose them to be more highly deviant than white-collar students. This was primarily because blue-collar status was related to low grades and low status courses which were unrelated to deviance. Social class was unrelated to status prospects which was related to deviance.

Blue-collar students were most likely to be in the non-college track and making low grades, but neither

of these variables were related to deviance. Low status prospects did relate to deviance, but this held for both social classes, not just one.

Blue-collar students were more negatively oriented toward school, but as social class and deviance were unrelated, the difference between white- and blue-collar attitudes was one of highly positive versus positive. Ninety-four percent of white-collar and 84% of blue-collar students expressed a positive attitude. Only 16% of blue-collar students and 27% of blue-collar deviants had a negative attitude toward school.

Since blue-collar students were more often in low status courses with low grades, it was hardly surprising that their orientation toward school was lower. Deviants also had a lower orientation but the two groups were not composed of the same individuals.

No inferences can then be made about social class and deviance. The inferences which may be made about deviants concern their low job prospects and low orientation toward school. These inferences form a chain which begins with the most favored group in school—those in college prep courses.

Students in high status courses had much to lose. Both their future job prospects and grades were higher and they were more likely to have a positive

orientation toward school. When faced with a strain, the strain of losing this status through low grades, they became significantly more deviant than those who were succeeding.

If their low grades continued long enough, they would end up in low status, non-college courses such as shop. There is no evidence that the school steered them into these courses. The data suggests that the students chose such courses once their grades dropped due to their low job prospects.

Low grades were a catalyst in another respect. Among those not doing well in school, deviants had a lower orientation toward school than non-deviants.

Deviants were also more likely to respond negatively to school orientation questions and not plan to attend college.

The majority of the students in this study were in college prep courses with favorable job prospects. Once that situation was threatened through low grades, both job prospects and orientation toward school dropped, and deviance increased.

The data suggests that what separates deviants from non-deviants is the concept of differential strain. For certain students school paid off as long as grades

were high, they were in college prep courses and expected to get a good job. Once their expectations changed, usually due to low grades, these students turned to deviance as a rebellion against the school and its failure to deliver on its promises.

This relationship holds only for those students in high status, college prep courses. For students in low status, non-college courses, grades were meaningless in terms of deviance. These students had little to lose. They were already in a low track with low job prospects, and high or low grades were not particularly important.

Stinchcombe's theory of differential strain[2] states that those most subject to success pressures (in this case, those who feel they may be falling out of the college prep curriculum) will be the most deviant. The data in this study supports his contention. Students in the college prep courses with low grades were more deviant than students in non-college prep courses with low grades. Their expectations were higher, they had something they wanted, and when this was threatened, they reacted more strongly than those with low expectations to begin with.

---

[2]The theory of differential strain will be more fully discussed in Chapter 5.

The data in this study supports the trend of recent research. Children want to succeed in school so they may succeed in life. When their goals are blocked, they rebel against the school. Commitment drops, they rate the school experience as less important, and much of their increased deviance may be seen as a rejection of the institution which they believe has rejected them--the school.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOLS AND DELINQUENCY

Deviance is usually nothing more than simple misconduct or underachievement in school. The most common deviant acts or results of these acts were being kept in by a teacher, being sent out of class, minor fighting, and being paddled. Conversely, delinquency involves offenses of a serious nature, offenses which would be considered criminal for an adult. The common delinquent acts reported in this study were bringing a concealed weapon to school, taking part in gang fights, beating up on other children for no reason, and assaulting teachers. Slightly less common delinquent acts were theft, strong-arm robbery, using or selling drugs/alcohol.[1]

Even though deviance and delinquency were related as Table 7 shows, the two groups were not the same. Only

---

[1]Using alcohol is not a criminal act for an adult. As this act does not meet the standards set in the definition of delinquency, it was not considered delinquent if it appeared by itself on a questionnaire. However, using or selling alcohol never appeared by itself, so this possible problem did not arise. For the frequencies of deviant/delinquent acts, see Tables 12 and 13 (Appendix B).

56% of deviants were delinquent also. Deviants comprised a larger group, and deviance showed a different relationship to the major research objectives than did delinquence. In general, while deviants may often get in trouble of a minor nature, they are not committing crimes. Delinquents are committing criminal acts, and as modern theory hypothesizes, their reaction against the school should be more strongly negative than that of deviants if the school is a factor in delinquency causation. The data in this study, while not of a causal nature, supports this hypothesis. Delinquents showed a more negative attitude toward school on all of the research variables than did deviants.

TABLE 7
Percentage of Deviants by Delinquency

	Delinquency	
Deviance	Deliq N=78	N-Deliq N=192
N-Dev	31.6	78.5
Dev	68.4	21.5
	100.00	100.0

$x^2 = 51.84$ Phi = .44 $p < .0001$

As with deviance, low job prospects and a more negative orientation toward school characterized delinquents. Low grades, which tended to relate to

deviance, were significantly related to delinquency. As Tables 8, 9, and 10 show, delinquents were characterized as having low grades, not considering school particularly important, and perceiving their future job prospects to be uninviting from a status viewpoint.

TABLE 8
Percentage of Delinquents by Grades

	Grades	
Delinquence	High N=136	Low N=122
N-Deliq	79.4	60.7
Deliq	20.6	39.3
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 10.00$ Phi = -.20 $p < .002$

TABLE 9
Percentage of Delinquents by Orientation Toward School

	Grades	
Delinquence	High N=238	Low N=32
N-Deliq	73.1	53.1
Deliq	26.9	46.9
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 7.18$ Phi = -.16 $p < .01$

TABLE 10
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Prospects

	Status Prospects	
Delinquency	WC N=190	BC N=46
N-Deliq	72.1	54.3
Deliq	27.9	45.7
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 5.66$ Phi = -.16 $p < .02$

Blue-collar status origins, non-college courses, and not planning to go to college, while nonsignificant, showed statistical trends on the tables of major research objectives. When the data was further analyzed on the control tables, several significant relationships were revealed. In certain instances,[2] then, blue-collar (and as will be shown, white-collar) students, students in non-college courses, and students not planning to attend college were more likely to be delinquent than students in other categories. Tables 11, 12, and 13 show the overall relationships of these variables to delinquency.

---

[2]These relationships appeared despite the fact that on control tables, delinquency did not show significant relationships as readily as deviance. Because of its serious nature, there were fewer delinquents than deviants and within the categories most related to delinquency, the numbers were often small. As Chi square is an additive statistic directly tied to cell numbers, often only the overall tables had sufficient numbers to show a significant relationship.

TABLE 11
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Origins

	Status Origins	
	WC	BC
Delinquence	N=143	N=96
N-Deliq	74.1	63.5
Deliq	25.9	36.5
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 3.10$ Phi = -.11 $p < .08$

TABLE 12
Percentage of Delinquents by
Status of Courses

	Courses	
	High	Low
Delinquence	N=189	N=81
N-Deliq	74.1	63.0
Deliq	25.9	37.0
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 2.87$ Phi = -.10 $p < .09$

TABLE 13
Percentage of Delinquents by
College Orientation

Delinquence	College High N=194	College Low N=67
N-Deliq	73.7	61.2
Deliq	26.3	38.8
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 3.17$ Phi = -.11 $p < .08$

Grades and Delinquency

As white-collar students made higher grades than blue-collar students, grades were controlled for to allow comparison of white- and blue-collar students with similar grades.

No differences were found between social classes when grades were controlled for. Within social classes, white-collar delinquents received lower grades than white-collar non-delinquents, but the lowest grades of all were received by blue-collar delinquents.

Low grades were also related to low status prospects for delinquents and non-delinquents, with 84% of delinquents with low prospects receiving low

grades. Among those with high status prospects, delinquents received lower grades.

There was a tendency for delinquents to get lower grades than non-delinquents regardless of college orientation, although the percentage was highest among delinquents with a low college orientation (88.5%).

Status of Courses and Delinquency

No significant social class differences appeared among delinquents in regard to the status of courses, although blue-collar delinquents tended to be in non-college courses more often than white-collar delinquents ($p < .09$).

The social class differences which did appear were related to white-collar students being in college prep courses and blue-collar students being in non-college courses. These relationships were independent of delinquency.

Blue-collar students, regardless of their delinquent or non-delinquent status, were more often in low status courses than white-collar students. White-collar delinquents, however, tended to be in lower status courses than white-collar non-delinquents. Again, this reflects a social class difference and not a difference in delinquent tendencies. Blue-collar

students tended to be in non-college courses regardless of any factor analyzed in this research. Eighty-three percent of white-collar students were in the college prep courses. The statistical tendency of white-collar delinquents to be in lower status courses ($p < .09$) is not meaningful as 73% of them remained in the college prep curriculum (compared to only 54% of the comparable blue-collar group). White-collar students, in general, had a more favored status as far as grades and status of courses than did blue-collar students.

Both measures of status prospects revealed the relationship of high prospects-high status courses and low prospects-low status courses. These relationships reflected the strong relationship between status of courses and status prospects. Those in college prep courses saw their job prospects as brighter than did students in non-college courses.

The most important finding in this section involved the appearance of a relationship noted in the deviance analysis. Of students in high status courses, those with low grades were more delinquent than those with high grades. Among those students in low status courses, neither low grades nor high grades were related to delinquency. (The significance of this finding will

be detailed later.) Table 14 shows this relationship statistically.

TABLE 14
Percentage of Delinquents by Grades
Controlling for Status of Courses

	Status of Courses					
	High			Low		
	Grades			Grades		
Delinquence	High N=124	Low N=61	Delinquence	High N=12	Low N=61
N-Deliq	79.8	62.3	N-Deliq	75.0	59.0
Deliq	20.2	37.7	Deliq	25.0	41.0
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 5.67$ Phi = -.18 $p < .02$ $x^2 = .51$ Phi = -.08 $p < .47$

Orientation Toward School and Delinquency

The social class differences reported for deviance and orientation toward school did not materialize for delinquency although the tendencies were the same. The smaller numbers of delinquents may have accounted for this, or it may have reflected the finding that the overwhelming majority of both social classes were positively oriented toward school.

Certain differences in status prospects were significant. Among those with high status prospects or a high college orientation, delinquents were less oriented toward school than non-delinquents. There was no significant difference among those with low status prospects or low college orientation, although both groups had a lower percentage orientation toward school than their counterparts.

The data suggests that due to their low grades delinquents with high status prospects or delinquents who want to go to college perceive that these wishes are unlikely to occur. They reject the school which is reflected in their low orientation toward school.

Again, students with low job prospects or students who do not plan to go to college have nothing in particular to lose and no strain is created. There is no reason for delinquents and non-delinquents with low status prospects to differ in their orientation toward school.

Delinquency/Status Origins/Status Prospects

Between social classes, blue-collar students with white-collar aspirations were more often delinquent. There was no difference between social classes among those with blue-collar aspirations.

Within social classes, white-collar students with blue-collar aspirations were more delinquent than white-collar students with white-collar aspirations. The same tendency appeared for low college orientation.

No tendencies appeared among blue-collar students with delinquency almost totally independent of status prospects.

Students subject to the most strain, downwardly mobile white-collar students and upwardly mobile blue-collar students, were more delinquent.

Downwardly mobile white-collar students were more delinquent than white-collar students with stable prospects, and blue-collar students with high prospects were more delinquent than white-collar students with high prospects. Tables 15 and 16 demonstrate these relationships.

TABLE 15
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Origins
Controlling for Status Prospects

	Status Prospects: WC			Status Prospects: BC		
	Origins			Origins		
Delinquence	WC N=115	BC N=63	Delinquence	WC N=18	BC N=19	
N-Deliq	77.4	60.3	N-Deliq	44.4	57.9	
Deliq	22.6	39.7	Deliq	55.6	42.1	
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	
x^2=5.59	Phi=-.18	p<.02	x^2=1.69	V=.21	p<.43	

TABLE 16
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Prospects
Controlling for Status Origins

	Status Origins: WC			Status Origins: BC		
	Prospects			Prospects		
Delinquence	WC N=115	BC N=18	Delinquence	WC N=63	BC N=19	
N-Deliq	77.4	44.4	N-Deliq	60.3	57.9	
Deliq	22.6	55.6	Deliq	39.7	42.1	
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	
x^2=8.53	Phi=-.25	p<.01	x^2=.05	Phi=-.02	p<.82	

Interpretation

Stinchcombe's theory of differential strain states that those most subjected to success pressures will be most rebellious. Upwardly-mobile blue-collar students and downwardly-mobile white-collar students experience the most change in expectations and the most strain.

White-collar students, the most favored group in school, were most often in the high track with high grades and a high orientation toward school. Once that favored status changed, low grades, low status prospects, and tendencies toward low status courses and a low college orientation became associated with white-collar delinquency.

As long as the level of success remained high, white-collar students were the least delinquent group in school. Once that level of success changed, they became significantly more delinquent than succeeding white-collar students.

For blue-collar students, the pattern was different. They were more often in the low track with low grades and probably as a result of these factors, a lower orientation toward school.[3]

---

[3]There was no difference between social classes in delinquent tendencies when grades, status of courses or orientation toward school were controlled.

There was no strain because their position was at least stable if not favorable. Therefore, delinquency was unrelated to any of the usual factors. Status prospects, in particular, were independent of delinquency among blue-collar students in the non-college curriculum.

However, once they had something to lose, problems assailed them from two directions. Although blue-collar students were statistically more likely to be in low status courses, 57% were in high status courses and 77% had high status prospects. Both of these factors were highly associated with delinquency when grades were low, and 71% of blue-collar students made low grades.

Further given their high status prospects, the facts that they were far more likely to receive low grades and proportionally to be in low status courses (43% versus 17% for white-collar students) caused them to perceive their status prospects as blocked. The result was, among those with high status prospects, that blue-collar students were more delinquent than the favored white-collar students.

Low grades appeared to act as a catalyst for both social classes. Among those with something to lose (those in high status courses with high status prospects), low grades were related to delinquency. As most of the students in high status courses were

white-collar children, both white-collar and blue-collar students with low grades were more delinquent than white-collar students with high grades.

If low grades served as a catalyst, then blue-collar students should have been most affected as 71% of them made low grades. Blue-collar students also had a lower orientation toward school and slightly lower job prospects. These three variables were significantly related to delinquency so in comparing social classes it must be noted that these factors affected blue-collar students far more than white-collar students.

The two social classes, then, did not have the same school situations confronting them. The typical white-collar student made higher grades, was in higher status courses and had a more positive orientation toward school than the typical blue-collar student. Variables associated with white-collar students were related to non-delinquency. Variables associated with blue-collar students were related to delinquency.

The result of these relationships was a tendency for blue-collar students to appear more delinquent than white-collar students. The reality, however, was a difference in situation. Blue-collar students had all the school variables related to delinquency

stacked against them, yet they were still not significantly more delinquent.

No evidence was found to support the common contention that blue-collar students are more delinquent than white-collar students. Even comparing the social classes without controlling for the difference in situation (white-collar students making higher grades for example), there was no significant difference in delinquent tendencies. Comparing the social classes under similar situations (members of both social classes with high grades, for example) there was no difference whatsoever between social classes on any of the variables.

In brief, even when comparing the raw figures of the overall tables which hide the fact that white-collar students had a more favored status, blue-collar students were not significantly more delinquent. When comparing members of both social classes who were in the same situation, no social class differences appeared at all. Table 17 demonstrates that white-collar and blue-collar students with either high or low grades had virtually identical delinquency percentages.

TABLE 17
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Origins
Controlling for Grades

Grades					
High			Low		
	Origins			Origins	
	WC	BC		WC	BC
Delinquency	N=101	N=26	Delinquency	N=38	N=65
N-Deliq	80.2	73.1	N-Deliq	60.5	56.9
Deliq	19.8	26.9	Deliq	39.5	43.1
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.27	Phi=-.05	p<.60	x^2=.02	Phi=-.01	p<.88

Perhaps instead of associating delinquency with blue-collar students, it is more germane to ask why, with nearly everything against them, blue-collar students were not significantly more delinquent than white-collar students?

The answer seemed to be that most blue-collar students had a high orientation toward school and did not view themselves as locked into a low status future. Even though the currency of the schools, high grades, was denied them (71% of blue-collar students made low grades), they maintained their basic faith in the institution.

Several modern theorists, notably Stinchcombe, and Polk and Schafer, have found status prospects to be more related to delinquency than status origins. This research supports theirs, specifically in the area of in-school deviance/delinquency.

The two major research objectives which were significant in both the deviance and delinquency analysis were status prospects and orientation toward school. The former may be seen as a measure of the perceived future, the latter a measure of the perceived present. Both deviants and delinquents express a low orientation toward present success in school, and less expectation of obtaining a high status job in future years.

The major inferential chain which emerged in this research concerns children with high status prospects. Once they find these prospects blocked as do members of both social classes with low grades, delinquency (deviance) was often the result.

These children had high status prospects, wanted to go to college, and were usually in college prep courses. Once their perception of the future was threatened by low grades, non-college courses[4] or other

---

[4]While being in low status courses was not related to delinquency, it was related to low grades and low prospects which were.

factors not examined in this research (such as being labeled as a troublemaker), their future expectations and orientation toward school dropped, and delinquency increased.

The overwhelming majority of students (88%) thought that school was important, both as an educational institution and as the route to better jobs. Despite their significantly lower orientation toward school, 81% of delinquents also shared this view. However, 63% of delinquents received low grades and they tended as a group to be in non-college courses.

As delinquents have never been found to be less intelligent than non-delinquents, their rejection of school shows a realistic understanding of their situation. Low grades are not likely to provide a springboard to high future status, and this among more aesthetic benefits, is what the school offers. With their legitimate avenues to success blocked, turning to illegitimate avenues is not an unreasonable alternative.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study examined the relationship of status prospects and status origins to in-school deviance and delinquency. Comparisons were made to indicate whether status origins or status prospects were more related to deviance and delinquency once the relationship between status prospects and status origins was found to be non-significant.

Low status prospects and low orientation to school were related to deviance at the .01 level. None of the other measures were significant. Differences related to the significant variables were that among those in high status courses, low grades were related to deviance; among those with low grades, deviants, those with a low college orientation were less oriented toward school.

The only social class difference was that blue-collar students had a lower orientation toward school. This, however, was unrelated to deviance.

Most of the students in this study were in high status courses with high status prospects. Once that situation was threatened, both prospects and orientation toward school dropped, and deviance increased significantly.

Low grades, low status prospects and low orientation toward school were related to delinquency (at the .002, .02 and .01 levels respectively). Blue-collar status origins, low status courses and low college orientation showed non-significant trends in the same direction.

Stinchcombe's theory of differential strain received support from this study. Those under the most success pressures (that is, upwardly-mobile blue-collar students and downwardly mobile white-collar students) were more delinquent although the pattern of relationship was different.

Blue-collar students with high status prospects were more delinquent than their white-collar counterparts, as they were far more likely to have low grades and low status courses blocking these aspirations. White-collar students, the most favored group in school in terms of grades, being in college prep courses, and having a higher orientation toward school, became delinquent once they began to lose their favored status.

Low grades appeared to act as a catalyst for both social classes. Among those with something to lose (those with high status courses with high status prospects), low grades were related to delinquency. As most of the students in high status courses were white-collar children, both white-collar and blue-collar students with low grades were more delinquent than white-collar students with high grades.

Students in low status courses had little strain created. They were already in non-college courses with lower job prospects, and low grades or high grades would make little difference in their status. Blue-collar students were significantly more likely to be in low-status courses, and for them delinquency and status prospects were unrelated.

Low status prospects and low orientation toward school were also highly interrelated. The former may be seen as a measure of the perceived future, the latter a measure of the perceived present. Most of the children in this study had high status prospects, wanted to go to college, and were usually in high status courses. Once their perception of the future was threatened by low grades, non-college courses or other factors not examined in this research (such as being labeled as a troublemaker),

their future expectations and orientation toward school dropped significantly, and delinquency increased.

In summary, 88% of the students in this study thought getting an education was important and wanted to get good grades so they could get a good job. Some, however, found these wishes blocked. The result was a rejection of the school experience which was often delinquent.

Although deviance and delinquency were related, the two populations were by no means the same. Deviance is ordinarily a matter of misconduct and a less exclusive category than delinquency. Seventy-eight percent of the students had committed a deviant act; only 29% had committed a delinquent one.

Conclusions

In this study, status prospects were significantly related to deviance and delinquency. Status origins were not, except in the limited cases of upwardly mobile blue-collar students and downwardly mobile white-collar students. These relationships held only for delinquency.

Status prospects and orientation toward school showed the only significant relationships to deviance.

The same two variables and grades showed the only significant relationships to delinquency.

This study supports other studies, all conducted in small- or medium-sized cities, which conclude that status origins has less relationship to deviance and delinquency than do status prospects. The emphasis of these studies was on delinquency as measured by official reports (police and otherwise). This study focused on in-school deviance and delinquency utilizing the self-report technique.

Our society emphasizes success more than class origins and it is the school which determines the legitimacy of claims to success.[1] Even though the school cannot guarantee a high future status, it does provide a realistic expectation of such through present success in school.

The school has become an important source of status for the young and through grades, tracking and differential treatment, the school identifies the winners and losers in the race for status. As long as a student has high grades and high expectations, there is little reason to be either deviant or delinquent.

---

[1]For a similar argument, see Kenneth Polk and Walter Schafer, Schools and Delinquency, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

Frustration is low, prospects are high, and the methods of obtaining success are accessible and legitimate.

Those who fail in various ways begin to perceive themselves differently. The label they receive identifies them somehow as losers, either formally through tracking or low grades, or informally through the perception that future payoffs are not likely.

The relationship of low future prospects to in-school deviance and delinquency is mainly the acknowledgement that one lacks a future as schools define it, and schools more than any other institution, define what a legitimate claim to a future is. Low orientation toward school is the immediate reaction to these blocked future prospects.

With prospects blocked, the student has several options. He may try harder, he may retreat, he may rationalize, or he may change his orientation away from school toward illegitimate means of achieving success and self-image. He may turn to delinquency.

Methodological and Research Implications

Delinquency studies often present a methodological dilemma. As one cannot be a little bit delinquent, all

the variables pertaining to delinquency are dichotomous ones, and the statistical techniques for dichotomous variables are not powerful. None of the techniques of multiple correlation which show the effects of three or more independent variables on a dependent variable can be applied to this type of research.

As such, estimates of correlation (such as Phi) which give lower values and cannot be used to determine the relative effects of large numbers of variables applied simultaneously, must be used.

There is a need for a multiple correlation technique for use with dichotomous variables. Such a technique would be more practical than constructing delinquency scales which meet the assumptions of interval level data.

Further research is needed to ascertain if deviance and delinquency are indeed becoming less related to social class and more related to status prospects. All of the research to date has been conducted in small- or medium-sized cities where social class seems to be less of a factor.

Research is also needed to further refine the variable of future status prospects and develop other measures of this variable. The relationship between

status prospects and other variables contributing to delinquency need to be clarified and elaborated.

Finally, no research into the delinquency problem has much value unless it is coupled with realistic efforts to neutralize those factors associated with delinquency and guard against their growth through giving all of our children an opportunity for a rewarding future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, Chris. "The Individual and Organizations: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustment." Educational Administration. Walter Hack and others, eds. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Bailey, Stephen K. Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1970.

Berg, Ivar. "Economic Factors in Delinquency." Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. President's Commission on Youth Crime and Administration of Justice. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Blau, Peter and Scott, Richard. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing, 1962.

Brubaker, Dale, and Nelson, Roland. Creative Survival in Educational Bureaucracies. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing, 1974.

Cavan, Ruth S. Juvenile Delinquency. New York: J.B. Lippincott, 1969.

Cicourel, Aaron, and Kitsuse, John. The Educational Decision-Makers. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

Clark, Ramsey. Crime in America. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.

Cloward, Richard. "Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Deviant Behavior." Delinquency, Crime and Social Process. Donald Cressey and David Ward, eds. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Cloward, Richard, and Ohlin, Lloyd. Delinquency and Opportunity. Glencoe, N.Y.: Free Press, 1960.

Cohen, Albert. Delinquent Boys. Glencoe, N.Y.: Free Press, 1955.

Coleman, James S. "Equal Schools or Equal Students?" The Public Interest. 1: 4 (Summer, 1966).

Coleman, James S. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

"Delinquency Unrelated to Dropout Rate." Nation's Schools. 87: 96 (June, 1971).

Elliot, Delbert S. "Delinquency, School Attendance and Dropouts." Prevention of Delinquency. John Stratton and Robert Terry, eds. London: MacMillan, 1968.

Freidenberg, Edgar. The Vanishing Adolescent. New York: Dell Publishing, 1959.

Garrett, Henry, and Woodworth, R.S. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: David McKay, 1966.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Glasser, William. The Identity Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Glueck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor. Delinquents and Non-Delinquents in Perspective. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Gwagney, William J. "Do Our Schools Prevent or Promote Delinquency?" Journal of Educational Research. 50: 215-219 (November, 1956).

Goode, William J., and Hatt, Paul. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952.

Guilford, J.P., and Fruchter, Benjamin. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Haskell, Martin R., and Yablonsky, Lewis. Crime and Delinquency. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1970.

Hatfield, Malcolm. Children in Court. New York: Paeban Company, 1964.

Helmstadter, G. C. Research Concepts in Human Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Hirschi, Travis, and Selvin, Hanan C. Delinquency Research. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Hollingshead, August B. "Two Factor Index of Social Position," New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1957.

Hollingshead, August B., and Redlich, Frederick C. Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

House Select Committee on Crime. Claude Pepper, Chairman. Drugs in Our Schools. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

House Select Committee on Crime. Claude Pepper, Chairman. Street Crime. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

House Subcommittee on Education (Education and Labor). Safe School Act. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

James, Howard. Children in Trouble. New York: David McKay, 1970.

Jeffery, C. Ray. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1971.

Jencks, Christopher. "A Reappraisal of the Most Controversial Educational Document of Our Time." New York Times Magazine. August 10, 1969.

Jencks, Christopher and others. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Karachi, Larry, and Toby, Jackson. "The Uncommitted Adolescent: Candidate for Gang Socialization." Sociological Inquiry. 32 (Spring, 1962).

Kelley, Clarence M., ed. Crime in the United States 1972. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Kelly, Delos H. and Pink, William. "School Commitment, Youth Rebellion and Delinquency." Criminology. 10: 4, 1973.

Kelly, Delos H. "Social Origins and Adolescent Success Patterns." Education and Urban Society. 4: 3, 1972.

Kvaraceus, William C. Juvenile Delinquency and the School. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y.: World Book, 1945.

Mendenhall, William, and Ott, Lyman. Understanding Statistics. Belmont, California: Duxbury Press, 1972.

Miller, Walter B. "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency." Journal of Social Issues. 14:3, 1958.

Montague, Joel B. "Social Status and Adjustment in School." Clearing House. 7 (September, 1952).

Moore, Bernice. "The Schools and the Problems of Juvenile Delinquency." Crime and Delinquency. 7: 3 (July, 1961).

Myers, Jerome, and Roberts, Bertram. Family and Class Dynamics in Mental Stress. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

National School Public Relations Association. Education U.S.A. Washington, D.C. March 2, 1970.

Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Palmore, Erdman, and Hammond, Phillip. "Interacting Factors in Juvenile Delinquency." American Sociological Review. 29 (December, 1964).

Pearl, Arthur. "Youth in Lower Class Settings." Problems of Youth. Muzafer and Carolyn Sherif, eds., Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1965.

Peters, Ernest L. "Public School Attitudes Toward Juvenile Delinquency." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 6: 1, 1969.

Polk, Kenneth, and Schafer, Walter. Schools and Delinquency. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Ramsey, Charles. Problems of Youth. Belmont, California: Dickinson Publishing Co., 1967.

Reiss, A.J., Jr., and Rhodes, A.L. "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the Social Class Structure." American Sociological Review. 26: 5, 1961.

Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Roberts, Joan I. School Children in the Urban Slum. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Schur, Edwin M. Radical Nonintervention. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Sellitiz, Claire, and others. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1959.

Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency (Committee on the Judiciary). Thomas Dodd, Chairman, "Violence in Schools." Draft #2, hearing statement, 1969.

Sexton, Patricia. Education and Income. New York: Viking Press, 1966.

Shaw, Clifford, and McKay, Henry. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Shaw, Otto. Youth in Crisis. New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1966.

Short, James, and Nye, Ivan. "Extent of Unrecorded Juvenile Delinquency: Tentative Conclusions." Juvenile Delinquency. James Teele, ed. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1970.

Silberberg, Norman, and Silberberg, Margaret. "School Achievement and Delinquency." Review of Educational Research. 41: 1, 1971.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Stinchcombe, Arthur. Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964.

"Surging Vandalism: Its Expense to America." U.S. News and World Report. 67 (August 25, 1969).

Tangri, Sandra, and Schwartz, Michael. "Delinquency Research and the Self-Concept Variable." Juvenile Delinquency. Rose Giallombardo, ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Toby, Jackson. "Affluence and Adolescent Crime." Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

Tunley, Raol. Kids, Crime and Chaos. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Venn, Grant. Man, Education and Work. Washington: American Council on Education, 1964.

Winslow, Robert. Juvenile Delinquency in a Free Society. Belmont, California: Dickson Publishing Company, 1968.

Wheeler, Stanton, and Cottrell, Leonard. "The Labeling Process." Delinquency, Crime and Social Process. Donald Cressey and David Ward, eds. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Zelditch, Morris. A Basic Course in Sociological Statistics. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1959.

APPENDIX A

SELF-REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a questionnaire to help in research being done at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Please do not sign your name to this questionnaire.

1. What is your sex?

   1_____Male

   2_____Female

2. Please check the courses you are taking this year. This list does not include all the courses which are offered or all the courses which you are probably taking.

   1_____Lower English

   2_____French or Spanish

   3_____Latin

   4_____Upper English

   5_____Reading

   6_____Introduction to Vocations

   7_____Industrial Arts

   8_____Algebra

   9_____Practical Mathematics

   0_____Advanced band, orchestra, or dramatics

3. What would you say your usual grades are?

   1_____Mostly A(s)

   2_____Mostly A(s) and B(s)

   3_____Mostly B(s)

   4_____Mostly B(s) and C(s)

   5_____Mostly C (s)

   6_____Mostly C(s) and D(s)

7_____Mostly D(s)

8_____Mostly D(s) and F(s)

9_____Mostly F(s)

0_____Don't know

4. I expect to go to a four-year college after graduating from high school.

1_____Yes

2_____No

5. What kind of job do you expect to hold ten years from now? Please answer the kind of job you think you'll actually be doing, not the one you like the most. Please check only one.

1_____Professional work (requiring college, such as doctor, lawyer, teacher, accountant, engineer).

2_____Own or manage a business (be a manager, executive, or supervisor for a company; own a store, filling station, or other business).

3_____Work as a salesman or a salesclerk (insurance, real estate, furniture, car, products of various kinds).

4_____Work in an office doing secretarial, clerical or similar work (such as store clerk, bank teller, secretary).

5_____Work for a government agency as an official (city, state, or federal government with people working under you).

6_____Technician (medical, computer programmer).

7_____Skilled worker or foreman (carpenter, plumber, machine repairman, auto mechanic, electrician, fireman, policeman, painter, welder, radio-TV repairman, mailman, barber).

8_____Mill or factoryworker, truck driver, machine operator, waiter, hospital aide.

9_____Janitor, garbage collector, freight handler, construction worker, gas station attendant.

0_____Housewife

6. If something happened and you thought you might have to quit school, you would:

1_____Do anything to continue

2_____Try hard to continue

3_____Drop out for a while

4_____Be glad to drop out

7. How important would you say grades are to getting the kind of job you want?

1_____Very important

2_____Important

3_____Not very important

4_____Not important at all

8. Look at the following items to see if you have done any of them while at school. If you have, write the number of times you have done each one in the space beside the item. If you haven't done any particular one, just leave the space blank.

How many times?

1_____Done something that a teacher sent you out of class for

2_____Skipped school

3_____Smoked at school

4_____Fought at school

5_____Flunked one or more courses in a semester

6_____Been paddled by a teacher

7_____Been kept in by a teacher

8_____Stolen little things (worth $2 at most) like a lunch or a coke

9. I consider getting an education:

1_____Very important

2_____Important

3_____Not very important

4_____Not important at all

10. What kind of work does your father do? If he is dead or no longer living with you, what kind of work did he do?

1_____Professional work (requiring college, such as doctor, lawyer, teacher, accountant, engineer).

2_____Own or manage a business (be a manager, executive, or supervisor for a company; own a store, filling station, or other business).

3_____Work as a salesman or a salesclerk (insurance, real estate, furniture, car, products of various kinds).

4_____Work in an office doing clerical, secretarial or similar work (store clerk, bank teller, secretary).

5_____Work for a government agency as an official (city, state or federal government with people working under you).

6_____Technician (medical, computer programmer).

7_____Skilled worker or foreman (carpenter, plumber, machine repairman, auto mechanic, electrician, fireman, policeman, painter, welder, radio-TV repairman, mailman, barber).

8_____Mill or factory worker, truck driver, machine operator, waiter, hospital aide.

9_____Janitor, garbage collector, freight handler, construction worker, gas station attendant.

0_____Unemployed. When employed, what is his usual job?

11. Look at the following items to see if you have done any of them while at school. If you have, write the number of times you have done each one in the space beside the item. If you haven't done any particular one, just leave the space blank.

How many times?

1_____Used force (strong-arm methods) to get money from another student.

2____Stolen things which were valuable (clothes, large amounts of money, school equipment).

3_____Taken part in "gang" fights.

4_____Used or sold drugs.

5_____Beat up on kids who hadn't done anything to you.

6_____Brought a weapon to school (knife, gun, razor).

7_____Hit a teacher.

8_____Used or sold alcohol.

Feel free to change any of your answers if you like.
Thank you for taking this questionnaire.

APPENDIX B

TABLES

List of Table Abbreviations:

N-Dev = Non-Deviant
Dev = Deviant
N-Deliq = Non-Delinquent
Deliq = Delinquent
Courses = Status of Courses
Origins = Status Origins
WC = White Collar
BC = Blue Collar
Prospects = Status Prospects
Orient = Orientation Toward School
College = College Orientation

I. MASTER TABLES

TABLE 1
Status Origins by Status Prospects

	Prospects	
Origins	WC N=178	BC N=37
WC	64.6	48.6
BC	35.4	51.4
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 2.66$ Phi = .11 $p < .10$

TABLE 2
Status of Courses by Status Origins

	Origins	
Courses	WC N=143	BC N=96
Low	16.8	42.7
High	83.2	57.3
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 20.36$ V = .29 $p < .0001$

TABLE 3
Grades by Status Origins

	Origins	
	WC	BC
Grades	N=137	N=91
Low	27.3	71.4
High	72.7	28.6
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 43.42$ V = .43 p < .0001

TABLE 4
Orientation Toward School
by Status Origins

	Origins	
	WC	BC
Orient	N=143	N=96
Low	5.6	84.4
High	94.4	15.6
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 6.36$ Phi = .16 p < .02

TABLE 5
Grades by Status Origins Controlling for Status prospects

Status Prospects: WC			Status Prospects: BC		
	Origins			Origins	
	WC	BC		WC	BC
Grades	N=113	N=61	Grades	N=16	N=18
Low	23.9	60.7	Low	50.0	94.4
High	76.1	39.3	High	50.0	5.6
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=23.66	V = .37	p<.0001	x^2=6.46	Phi=.44	p<.01

TABLE 6
Grades by Status Prospects

Grades	Prospects WC N=186	BC N=41
Low	37.1	75.6
High	62.9	24.4
	100.0	100.0

x^2 = 22.92 Phi = .32 p < .0001

TABLE 7
Grades by Orientation Toward School

Grades	Orient High N=228	Low N=30
Low	45.2	63.7
High	54.8	36.3
	100.0	100.0

x^2 = 3.69 Phi = .12 p < .06

TABLE 8
Grades by College Orientation

Grades	College High N=189	Low N=63
Low	37.0	74.6
High	63.0	25.4
	100.0	100.0

x^2 = 28.48 Phi = .34 p < .0001

TABLE 9
Orientation Toward School
by Status Prospects

	Prospects	
	WC	BC
Orient	N=190	N=46
Low	5.3	34.8
High	94.7	65.2
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 35.40$ Phi = .39 $p < .0001$

TABLE 10
Status of Courses by
Status Prospects

	Prospects	
	WC	BC
Courses	N=190	N=46
Low	19.0	60.9
High	81.0	39.1
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 34.07$ Phi = .38 $p < .0001$

TABLE 11
Grades by Status of Courses

	Courses	
	Low	High
Grades	N=122	N=136
Low	83.6	33.0
High	16.4	67.0
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 52.47$ Phi = .45 $p < .0001$

TABLE 12
Number of Students Reporting
Deviant Acts

(N=270)

122	Done something a teacher sent you out of class for
54	Skipped school
48	Smoked at school
100	Fought at school
53	Flunked one or more courses in a semester
68	Been paddled by a teacher
129	Been kept in by a teacher
24	Stolen little things (worth $2 at the most) like a coke or a lunch

TABLE 13
Number of Students Reporting
Delinquent Acts

(N=270)

14	Used force (strong-arm methods) to get money from another student
17	Stolen things which are valuable (clothes, large amounts of money, school equipment)
40	Taken part in "gang" fights
14	Used or sold drugs
22	Beat up on kids who hadn't done anything to you
42	Brought a weapon to school (knife, gun or razor)
19	Hit a teacher
14	Used or sold alcohol

II. DEVIANCE

A. MASTER TABLES

TABLE 14
Percentage of Deviants by Grades

	Grades	
Deviance	Low N=122	High N=136
N-Dev	59.0	70.6
Dev	41.0	29.4
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 3.30$ Phi = -.11 $p < .07$

TABLE 15
Percentage of Deviants by Status of Courses

	Courses	
Deviance	Low N=81	High N=189
N-Dev	59.3	67.2
Dev	40.7	32.8
	100.0	100.0

$x^2 = 1.24$ Phi = -.07 $p < .27$

TABLE 16
Percentage of Deviants by
College Orientation

Deviance	College High N=194	College Low N=67
N-Dev	66.0	61.2
Dev	34.0	38.8
	100.0	100.0

x^2 = .31 Phi = -.03 p < .58

TABLE 17
Percentage of Deviants by
Status Prospects

Deviance	Prospects WC N=190	Prospects BC N=46
N-Dev	67.4	45.7
Dev	32.6	54.3
	100.0	100.0

x^2 = 8.87 Phi = -.19 p < .01

TABLE 18
Percentage of Deviants by
Status Origins

Deviance	Origins WC N=143	Origins BC N=96
N-Dev	65.7	61.5
Dev	34.3	38.5
	100.0	100.0

x^2 = .66 V = -.05 p < .71

TABLE 19
Percentage of Deviants
by Delinquency

	Delinquency	
Deviance	Deliq N=78	N-Deliq N=192
N-Dev	31.6	78.5
Dev	68.4	21.5
	100.0	100.0

x^2 = 51.84 Phi = .44 p < .0001

TABLE 20
Percentage of Deviants by
Orientation Toward School

	Orient	
Deviance	High N=238	Low N=32
N-Dev	68.1	40.6
Dev	31.9	59.4
	100.0	100.0

x^2 = 8.15 Phi = -.17 p < .01

TABLE 21
Percentage of Deviants by Orientation Toward School Controlling for Grades

Grades					
High			Low		
	Orient			Orient	
Deviance	High N=125	Low N=11	Deviance	High N=103	Low N=19
N-Dev	70.4	72.7	N-Dev	66.0	21.1
Dev	29.6	27.3	Dev	34.0	78.9
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.03	Phi = .02	p<.86	x^2=11.62	Phi = -.31	p<.001

TABLE 22
Percentage of Deviants by Grades Controlling for Status of Courses

Status of Courses					
High			Low		
	Grades			Grades	
Deviance	Low N=61	High N=124	Deviance	Low N=61	High N=12
N-Dev	54.1	73.4	N-Dev	63.9	41.7
Dev	45.9	26.6	Dev	36.1	58.3
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=6.04	Phi=-.18	p<.01	x^2=1.25	Phi=.13	p<.26

B. GRADES

TABLE 23
Percentage of Deviants by Status Origins
Controlling for Grades

Grades					
High			Low		
	Origins			Origins	
Deviance	WC N=101	BC N=26	Deviance	WC N=38	BC N=65
N-Dev	68.3	69.2	N-Dev	62.2	55.4
Dev	31.7	30.8	Dev	37.8	44.6
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.02	Phi=.01	p<.88	x^2=.32	Phi=-.06	p<.57

TABLE 24
Grades by Deviance Controlling for
Status Origins

Status Origins					
WC			BC		
	Deviance			Deviance	
Grades	N-Dev N=93	Dev N=46	Grades	N-Dev N=54	Dev N=37
Low	25.8	30.4	Low	66.7	78.4
High	74.2	69.6	High	33.3	21.6
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.14	Phi=-.03	p<.70	x^2=.96	Phi=-.10	p<.33

TABLE 25
Percentage of Deviants by Status Prospects
Controlling for Grades

Grades						
High				Low		
	Prospects				Prospects	
	WC	BC			WC	BC
Deviance	N=117	N=10	Deviance		N=69	N=31
N-Dev	71.8	70.0	N-Dev		59.4	41.9
Dev	28.2	30.0	Dev		40.6	58.1
	100.0	100.0			100.0	100.0
x^2=.06	Phi=-.02	p<.81	x^2=1.98		Phi=-.14	p<.16

TABLE 26
Grades by Deviance Controlling for
Status Prospects

Status Prospects						
WC				BC		
	Deviance				Deviance	
	N-Dev	Dev			N-Dev	Dev
Grades	N=125	N=61	Grades		N=20	N=21
Low	32.8	45.9	Low		65.0	85.7
High	67.2	54.1	High		35.0	14.3
	100.0	100.0			100.0	100.0
x^2=2.48	Phi=-.12	p<.12	x^2=1.39		Phi=-.18	p<.24

C. STATUS OF COURSES

TABLE 27
Percentage of Deviants by Status Origins
Controlling for Status of Courses

Status of Courses: High			Status of Courses: Low		
	Origins			Origins	
Deviance	WC N=119	BC N=55	Deviance	WC N=24	BC N=41
N-Dev	68.9	61.8	N-Dev	50.0	61.0
Dev	31.1	38.2	Dev	50.0	39.0
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.56	Phi=-.05	p<.45	x^2=.36	Phi=.07	p<.55

TABLE 28
Status of Courses by Deviance Controlling
for Status Origins

Status Origins: WC			Status Origins: BC		
	Deviance			Deviance	
Courses	N-Dev N=94	Dev N=49	Courses	N-Dev N=59	Dev N=37
Low	12.8	24.5	Low	42.4	43.2
High	87.2	75.5	High	57.6	56.8
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=2.38	Phi=-.13	p<.12	x^2=.02	Phi=-.01	p<.89

TABLE 29
Percentage of Deviants by Status Prospects
Controlling for Status Of Courses

Status of Courses: High	Prospects WC N=154	Prospects BC N=18	Status of Courses: Low	Prospects WC N=36	Prospects BC N=28
Deviance			Deviance		
N-Dev	69.5	55.6	N-Dev	58.3	39.3
Dev	30.5	44.4	Dev	41.7	60.7
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.87	Phi=-.07	p<.35	x^2=1.58	Phi=-.16	p<.20

TABLE 30
Status of Courses by Deviance Controlling
for Status Prospects

Status Prospects: WC	Deviance N-Dev N=128	Deviance Dev N=62	Status Prospects: BC	Deviance N-Dev N=21	Deviance Dev N=25
Courses			Courses		
Low	16.4	24.2	Low	52.4	68.0
High	83.6	75.8	High	47.6	32.0
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=1.18	Phi=-.08	p<.27	x^2=.61	Phi=-.11	p<.44

D. ORIENTATION TOWARD SCHOOL

TABLE 31
Orientation Toward School by Status Origins
Controlling for Deviance

Deviance					
Non-Deviant			Deviant		
	Origins			Origins	
Orient	WC N=94	BC N=59	Orient	WC N=49	BC N=37
Low	4.3	8.5	Low	8.2	27.0
High	95.7	91.5	High	91.8	73.0
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.61	Phi=.06	p<.42	x^2=5.40	Phi=.25	p<.02

TABLE 32
Orientation Toward School by Deviance
Controlling for Status Origins

Status Origins					
WC			BC		
	Deviance			Deviance	
Orient	N-Dev N=94	Dev N=49	Orient	N-Dev N=59	Dev N=37
Low	4.3	8.2	Low	8.5	27.0
High	95.7	91.8	High	91.5	73.0
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.34	Phi=-.05	p<.56	x^2=4.61	Phi=-.22	p<.03

TABLE 33
Percentage of Deviants by Status Prospects Controlling for Orientation Toward School

Orientation Toward School					
High			Low		
	Prospects			Prospects	
	WC	BC		WC	BC
Deviance	N=180	N=30	Deviance	N=10	N=16
N-Dev	68.9	53.3	N-Dev	40.0	31.3
Dev	31.1	46.7	Dev	60.0	68.7
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=2.14	Phi=-.10	p<.14	x^2=.001	Phi=.01	p<.97

TABLE 34
Orientation Toward School by College Orientation Controlling for Deviance

Deviance					
Non-Deviant			Deviant		
	College			College	
	High	Low		High	Low
Orient	N=128	N=41	Orient	N=66	N=26
Low	5.5	9.8	Low	13.4	34.6
High	94.5	90.2	High	86.6	65.4
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.37	Phi=.05	p<.55	x^2=3.97	Phi=.21	p<.05

TABLE 35
Orientation Toward School by Deviance Controlling for College Orientation

College Orientation: High			College Orientation: Low		
	Deviance			Deviance	
Orient	N-Dev N=128	Dev N=66	Orient	N-Dev N=41	Dev N=26
Low	5.5	13.6	Low	9.8	34.6
High	94.5	86.4	High	90.2	65.4
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=2.83	Phi=-.12	p<.09	x^2=4.80	Phi=-.27	p<.03

E. DEVIANCE/STATUS ORIGINS/STATUS PROSPECTS

TABLE 36
Percentage of Deviants by Status Origins Controlling for Status Prospects

Status Prospects: WC			Status Prospects: BC		
	Origins			Origins	
Deviance	WC N=115	BC N=63	Deviance	WC N=18	BC N=19
N-Dev	67.8	61.9	N-Dev	55.6	42.1
Dev	32.2	38.1	Dev	44.4	57.9
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=1.16	V=-.08	p<.56	x^2=1.60	V=-.20	p<.45

TABLE 37
Percentage of Deviants by Status Prospects
Controlling for Status Origins

Status Origins					
WC			BC		
	Prospects			Prospects	
	WC	BC		WC	BC
Deviance	N=115	N=18	Deviance	N=63	N=19
N-Dev	67.8	55.6	N-Dev	61.9	42.1
Dev	32.2	44.4	Dev	38.1	57.9
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=1.19	V=-.09	p<.55	x^2=2.10	Phi=-.16	p<.16

III. DELINQUENCY

A. MASTER TABLES

TABLE 38
Percentage of Delinquency by Grades

	Grades	
Deliq	High N=136	Low N=122
N-Deliq	79.4	60.7
Deliq	20.6	39.3
	100.0	100.0
$x^2 = 10.00$	Phi = -.20	p < .002

TABLE 39
Percentage of Delinquents by Status of Courses

	Courses	
Deliq	High N=189	Low N=81
N-Deliq	74.1	63.0
Deliq	25.9	37.0
	100.0	100.0
$x^2 = 2.87$	Phi = -.10	p < .09

TABLE 40
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Origins

	Origins	
Deliq	WC N=143	BC N=96
N-Deliq	74.1	63.5
Deliq	25.9	36.5
	100.0	100.0
$x^2 = 3.10$	Phi = -.11	p < .08

TABLE 41
Percentage of Delinquents by Orientation Toward School

	Orient	
	High	Low
Deliq	N=238	N=32
N-Deliq	73.1	53.1
Deliq	26.9	46.9
	100.0	100.0
$x^2 = 7.18$	Phi = -.16	$p < .01$

TABLE 42
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Prospects

	Prospects	
	WC	BC
Deliq	N=190	N=46
N-Deliq	72.1	54.3
Deliq	27.9	45.7
	100.0	100.0
$x^2 = 5.66$	Phi = -.16	$p < .02$

TABLE 43
Percentage of Delinquents by College Orientation

	College	
	High	Low
Deliq	N=194	N=67
N-Deliq	73.7	61.2
Deliq	26.3	38.8
	100.0	100.0
$x^2 = 3.17$	Phi = -.11	$p < .08$

TABLE 44
Percentage of Delinquents by Orientation Toward School Controlling for Grades

	Grades				
	High			Low	
	Orient			Orient	
Deliq	High N=125	Low N=11	Deliq	High N=103	Low N=19
N-Deliq	80.8	63.6	N-Deliq	63.1	47.4
Deliq	19.2	36.4	Deliq	36.9	52.6
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.92	Phi=-.08	p<.34	x^2=1.07	Phi=-.09	p<.30

TABLE 45
Percentage of Delinquents by Grades Controlling for Status of Courses

	Status of Courses				
	High			Low	
	Grades			Grades	
Deliq	High N=124	Low N=61	Deliq	High N=12	Low N=61
N-Deliq	79.8	62.3	N-Deliq	75.0	59.0
Deliq	20.2	37.7	Deliq	25.0	41.0
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=5.67	Phi=-.18	p<.02	x^2=.51	Phi=-.08	p<.47

B. GRADES

TABLE 46
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Origins Controlling for Grades

Grades					
High			Low		
	Origins			Origins	
	WC	BC		WC	BC
Deliq	N=101	N=26	Deliq	N=38	N=65
N-Deliq	80.2	73.1	N-Deliq	60.5	56.9
Deliq	19.8	26.9	Deliq	39.5	43.1
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=.27	Phi=.-05	p<.60	x^2=.02	Phi=-.01	p<.88

TABLE 47
Grades by Delinquency Controlling for Status Origins

Status Origins					
WC			BC		
	Delinquency			Delinquency	
	N-Deliq	Deliq		N-Deliq	Deliq
Grades	N=104	N=35	Grades	N=56	N=35
Low	22.1	42.9	Low	66.1	80.0
High	77.9	57.1	High	33.9	20.0
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=4.68	Phi=-.18	p<.03	x^2=1.42	Phi=-.13	p<.23

TABLE 48
Grades by Delinquency Controlling
for Status Prospects

Status Prospects					
WC			BC		
	Delinquency			Delinquency	
Grades	N-Deliq N=134	Deliq N=52	Grades	N-Deliq N=22	Deliq N=19
Low	30.6	53.8	Low	68.2	84.2
High	69.4	46.2	High	31.8	15.8
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=7.71	Phi=-.20	p<.005	x^2=.68	Phi=-.13	p<.41

TABLE 49
Grades by Delinquency Controlling
for College Orientation

College Orientation					
High			Low		
	Delinquency			Delinquency	
Grades	N-Deliq N=140	Deliq N=49	Grades	N-Deliq N=37	Deliq N=26
Low	32.9	49.0	Low	64.9	88.5
High	67.1	51.0	High	35.1	11.5
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=3.38	Phi=-.13	p<.07	x^2=3.33	Phi=-.23	p<.07

C. STATUS OF COURSES

TABLE 50
Status of Courses by Status Origins
Controlling for Delinquency

Delinquency					
Non-Delinquent			Delinquent		
	Origins			Origins	
Courses	WC N=106	BC N=61	Courses	WC N=37	BC N=35
Low	13.2	41.0	Low	27.0	45.7
High	86.8	59.0	High	73.0	54.3
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=17.31	V=.32	p<.0002	x^2=2.78	Phi=.20	p<.09

TABLE 51
Status of Courses by Delinquency Controlling
for Status Origins

Status Origins					
WC			BC		
	Delinquency			Delinquency	
Courses	N-Deliq N=106	Deliq N=37	Courses	N-Deliq N=61	Deliq N=35
Low	13.2	27.0	Low	41.0	45.7
High	86.8	73.0	High	59.0	54.3
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=2.83	Phi=-.14	p<.09	x^2=.06	Phi=-.02	p<.81

TABLE 52
Status of Courses of Status Prospects
Controlling for Delinquency

Delinquency					
Non-Delinquent			Delinquent		
	Prospects			Prospects	
	WC	BC		WC	BC
Courses	N=137	N=25	Courses	N=53	N=21
Low	16.8	56.0	Low	24.5	66.7
High	83.2	44.0	High	75.5	33.3
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=28.52	V=.40	p<.0001	x^2=12.49	V=.40	p<.002

TABLE 53
Status of Courses by College Orientation
Controlling for Delinquency

Delinquency					
Non-Delinquent			Delinquent		
	College			College	
	High	Low		High	Low
Courses	N=143	N=41	Courses	N=51	N=26
Low	18.2	51.2	Low	23.5	61.5
High	81.8	48.8	High	76.5	38.5
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=16.60	Phi=.30	p<.0001	x^2=9.17	Phi=.35	p<.003

D. ORIENTATION TOWARD SCHOOL

TABLE 54
Orientation Toward School by Status Origins
Controlling for Delinquency

Delinquency					
Non-Delinquent			Delinquent		
	Origins			Origins	
	WC	BC		WC	BC
Orient	N=106	N=61	Orient	N=37	N=35
Low	3.8	9.8	Low	10.8	25.7
High	96.2	90.2	High	89.2	74.3
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=2.55	Phi=.12	p<.11	x^2=2.76	Phi=.20	p<.10

TABLE 55
Orientation Toward School by Delinquency
Controlling for Status Prospects

Status Prospects					
WC			BC		
	Delinquency			Delinquency	
	N-Deliq	Deliq		N-Deliq	Deliq
Orient	N=137	N=53	Orient	N=25	N=21
Low	2.2	13.2	Low	32.0	38.1
High	97.8	86.8	High	68.0	61.9
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=7.23	Phi=-.19	p<.007	x^2=.01	Phi=-.02	p<.90

TABLE 56
Orientation Toward School by Delinquency
Controlling for College Orientation

College Orientation: High			College Orientation: Low		
	Delinquency			Delinquency	
Orient	N-Deliq N=143	Deliq N=51	Orient	N-Deliq N=41	Deliq N=26
Low	5.6	15.7	Low	14.6	26.9
High	94.4	84.3	High	85.4	73.1
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=3.81	Phi=-.14	p<.05	x^2=.85	Phi=-.11	p<.35

E. DELINQUENCY/STATUS ORIGINS/STATUS PROSPECTS

TABLE 57
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Origins
Controlling for Status Prospects

Status Prospects: WC			Status Prospects: BC		
	Origins			Origins	
Deliq	WC N=115	BC N=63	Deliq	WC N=18	BC N=19
N-Deliq	77.4	60.3	N-Deliq	44.4	57.9
Deliq	22.6	39.7	Deliq	55.6	42.1
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=5.59	Phi=-.18	p<.02	x^2=1.69	V=.21	p<.43

TABLE 58
Percentage of Delinquents by College Orientation
Controlling for Status Origins

Status Origins					
WC			BC		
	College			College	
Deliq	High N=118	Low N=23	Deliq	High N=57	Low N=35
N-Deliq	78.0	56.5	N-Deliq	64.9	60.0
Deliq	22.0	43.5	Deliq	35.1	40.0
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=3.60	Phi=-.16	p<.06	x^2=.06	Phi =-.03	p<.80

TABLE 59
Percentage of Delinquents by Status Prospects
Controlling for Status Origins

Status Origins					
WC			BC		
	Prospects			Prospects	
Deliq	WC N=115	BC N=18	Deliq	WC N=63	BC N=19
N-Deliq	77.4	44.4	N-Deliq	60.3	57.9
Deliq	22.6	55.6	Deliq	39.7	42.1
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0
x^2=8.53	Phi=-.25	p<.01	x^2=.05	Phi=-.02	p<.82