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CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM

Introduction:

Any member of any social group learns the proper ways of behaving in his group. He is informed of what might be the consequences and penalties if he violates group rules. The guidelines and rules of a group, for its members, are referred to as the concept of "group norm."

Norms are found in all social groups. Sociology, as a discipline, deals with both the notion of adherence to group norms and the notion of departure from group norms.

Some departures from norms are termed "delinquency." Sociologists and others have defined and explained delinquency to be any behavior of young people or children which a given community, at a given time, considers to be in conflict with its best interests.

Cavan (1962) provided two definitions of juvenile delinquency, "legal" and "nonlegal." As a legal term, she defines juvenile delinquency as misbehavior by children and adolescents which leads to referral to the juvenile court for such acts as are defined in the statutes to be in violation of the law. She defines "non-legal" delinquent behavior as conduct which deviates sufficiently from the social norms to warrant that the delinquent be considered a menace to himself, to his future interest, or to society itself.
The above definitions raise certain questions. Who decides whether the child is a menace to himself or to his future interests? Who decides what constitutes a menace to the community? Answers to these questions could be found in the decisions made by parents, teachers, ministers, youth leaders, police, judges and physicians. These questions regarding decision-making are found in the school of thought known as the "labeling or societal reactions" school, among others.

Juvenile delinquency is also explained in terms of "social pathology." This approach focuses on "unhealthy" variation from the "normal" which is a sign of illness in those who engage in such behavior. Thus mental illness, drug addiction, alcoholism, and criminality are all viewed as signs of sickness because they vary from some "universal" set of norms. Two problems occur with this definition. First, the understanding of what is "normal" varies from culture to culture. Drug use might be considered a sickness in the United States, but it might be used for getting into a trance state in another culture. Secondly, some writers (including Durkheim, 1958; Cohen, 1966; Erickson, 1966) have noted the functions which deviance performs for maintaining and strengthening the group, and, therefore, it may be conceptually limiting to consider most or all behavior which varies from "normal" to be pathological.
I do introduce the concept "know thy place" to refer to the "interacting lines of isolation" between the social class and the delinquents. The labeling of a person as delinquent and the isolation consequently imposed on him often forces him to seek out social groups which will support him, and thus, perpetuate his "delinquency." For example, an alcoholic will make his home in bars, the addict moves to the world of "needle park," the homosexual lives in a "gay" world, the criminal has his "underworld." At this point, the labeling process tends to reinforce and confirm delinquents as "outsiders."

In delinquents' contacts with others within a society, the delinquent experiences reactions of fear, pity, hostility, and so forth. In turn, others in the society withdraw their affection and concern, which further isolates the delinquent.

The reactions resulting in the isolation and rejection of delinquents may occur in many ways. Some societies develop institutionalized ways of reacting to delinquents; for example, protective institutions, such as mental hospitals, rehabilitation centers, and so forth. In other instances, forms of punishment are directed toward the delinquents, e.g., imprisonment, execution or other kinds of punitive measures.

A consequence of these various reactions is the tendency for delinquents to begin to develop negative
conceptions of themselves. The delinquent subculture develops as the group membership increases. That is, the labeled delinquents who feel the pressure of society form a subgroup which welcomes other members of the same social psychological status. They then begin to orient themselves to values and norms of their subculture, which provides them with acceptance and self-justification. As they develop their values and norms, they may feel that they are right in their ways of living and that society is wrong. Indeed, mutually supportive definitions arise within the subculture.

Miller (1958) in "Lower Class Culture as a Generative Milieu of Gang Delinquency" stated one of the two major theories of the development of the lower-class gang. The lower-class boys became gang members because the gang represented a solution to their status problems. Unable to achieve socially acceptable goals, many lower-class boys found an answer to their frustrations in the special values of the delinquent.

Considering the delinquent social group, I define human society as a globe which is composed of conforming and nonconforming social worlds observed through "interaction consciousness" between the conformists and the non-conformists. By "interaction consciousness," I mean the labeled delinquents' awareness of their status, and their relation of developing their values and norms, of their subculture, as a "self-ful-
filling prophesy" of what they are labeled. Figure 1. illus-
trates human social groups.

Figure 1. - Human Society.

\[ CR^1 \] = Cultural roles that people have to abide by.
\[ NC^2 \] = Nonconformists who violate the rules.
\[ C^3 \] = Conformists who are the majority abiding by the
social rules.

Figure 1. shows that, in a human society, people have cul-
tural roles or conventional norms that they have to abide
by (\( CR^1 \)). The majority or the dominant members of the so-
ciety (\( C^3 \)) abide by these rules. The violators of rules
(\( NC^2 \)) are those who have no commitments to the conven-
tional norms.

The non-conformists are being regarded by the
conformists as the rule breakers, who label them as delinquents.

Figure 2. illustrates conflicting reactions between conformists and nonconformists.

Figure 2. - Conformists - Nonconformists' Symbolic Interaction

C^3 ____ C^3 = Conformists' interactive line.
NC^2 +++++ NC^2 = Nonconformists' interactive line.

Figure 2. shows that the labeled delinquents who are conscious of their status in society begin to interact with others of the same status. Their line of interaction has "conflict" with the line of interaction of the conformists' social group. The delinquents begin to experience reactions of fear and hostility. The conformists in the society experience similar reactions to the delinquents.
Figure 3. illustrates societal reactions.

Figure 3. - Disorganized Social Group.

The broken line represents the line of isolation between the conformists and the nonconformists. Figure 3. shows that the nonconformists are isolated from the conformists' social groups. Members of the isolated delinquent group became aware of the rejection by the dominant conformists' groups.

The delinquent subculture then develops as people of the same status meet. They develop values and norms and make their social group a "world of reality" to themselves.

Delinquent norms and values differ from those of the larger society. Thus, what is "delinquent" by norms of the larger society may be "conforming" by the norms of the delinquent subculture and vice-versa.
Another explanation of delinquency as a subcategory of deviance holds that delinquency is a result of "anomie." An ambitious and theoretically sophisticated explanation of delinquent behavior was developed by Robert Merton (1957), who pointed out how the structure of societal values leads to a high rate of property crime among members of the working class. According to Merton, just about everyone wants to have the "good things in life" as identified by the society. Merton notes that whenever there is a conflict between culturally-determined goals and the means by which these goals could be achieved, then "anomie" occurs. Then, there is a breakdown in the social structure, and the individual has to "adapt" in whatever ways he can, to achieve those goals. Delinquent behavior is always a possible outcome of that adaptation. For example, a lower class boy wants to achieve what Merton calls "culturally prescribed goals" such as financial success in order to buy a radio, but he finds the institutional means (job, inheritance, education) denied to him. He then may respond by engaging in some form of delinquent behavior, such as stealing, to achieve his goal.

Merton's main point is that the social structure gives rise to the different adaptations, and those various delinquent adaptations emerge because of the frustrations produced by the social structure. Those people in certain parts of the social structure who experience more frustra-
tion than others are those who are most likely to be judged delinquent.

While Merton's theory of structural frustration does explain why some may adopt "innovation" (e.g., shoplifting) and others choose "retreatism" (e.g., drug use) as modes of adaptation to frustration, the theory does not explain why some innovators choose shoplifting, for example, and others choose robbery. Nor does it explain why some "retreaters" choose to engage in drug use while others use alcohol. Also, the theory does not explain why drug addiction replaced alcoholism as the most common form of retreatism for the young.

Another problem with this explanation is raised by Erikson (1964) who objects to the "anomie" explanation of deviance because it cannot explain why some individuals are more likely to be caught and punished for their delinquent activity than are others. Some researchers have stated that a large number of people commit certain acts which are generally considered to be delinquent, but they are never caught. Wallerstein and Wyle (1947) found that ninety-one percent (91%) of their sample admitted to committing one or more crimes after they were sixteen years old. Other studies (Porterfield, 1946; Kinsey, 1948) also have indicated a similar high rate of deviant activity by members of the population. It would seem that only a very small percentage of activity that violates certain rules ever receives
any kind of punishment or public reaction.

These considerations have led some writers to define delinquency as a violation of a social norm which is followed by the act of conferring a deviant label on the individual. An implication of the "labeling" definition of delinquency is that unless someone has defined behavior as delinquent there is no delinquency. Having long hair is more likely to be labeled "hippie" and to be considered delinquent by members of some social classes than by others. The critical factor, therefore, is determining whether an act which violates some rules is given a delinquent label by some kind of audience which has the power to apply the label. In other words, has there been a certain type of societal reaction to that behavior?

Once a person has been labeled by the social group, he is often induced to play the role associated with that label, even though he may prefer another course. For example, Malinowski (1926), in his study of the Trobriand Islanders, found that an island youth had violated an ancient custom by committing clan incest -- he married the daughter of his mother's sister. Some citizens who were aware of the violation were willing to overlook it under the pretense that they did not know of it. The young bride's discarded lover, however, made a public accusation. The residents of the community could then no longer ignore the violation, but were obligated to ostracize and punish
the young couple. The youth finally committed suicide. The labeling process led the labeled and stigmatized youth to commit the ultimate act of retreat.

The present study deals with juvenile delinquency as a form of deviant behavior, and focuses on labeling or societal reactions as a factor of juvenile delinquency. Society can react to the delinquent in a number of ways, ranging from an expression of mild disgust to severe punishment. When society does take steps to control delinquent behavior, a stigmatization is often involved, and the individual committing a particular delinquent act may be labeled delinquent. Public or individual intolerance towards delinquent behavior results in social distance, and sometimes results in total condemnation, rejection, or isolation of the delinquent from the community or the immediate neighborhood. The labeled individual, thus rejected, may push himself towards affiliation with other delinquents where he feels accepted and secure.

Many theorists (including Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963; Erickson, 1964; Kitsuse, 1962; and Simons, 1965) have contributed to the concept of "societal reaction." This theoretical perspective will be further explained in the next chapter. There has been very little research investigating the societal reaction to deviance in general, but a survey of the literature shows that none has been done specifically on the relationship between labeling and juvenile delinquency.
THE PROBLEM

Juvenile delinquency, delinquent individuals and situations involving delinquent behavior, result not simply from discrete acts of wrongdoing or departure from norms; they also reflect patterns and processes of social definition. When laymen think of "deviants" or "delinquents," they generally have images of "weirdos" and "sexual perverts," but sociologists simply use the words to refer to those who have been "rule violators."

The above considerations and a number of social factors serve to make the problem of delinquency an important topic for our times and call into question the very meaning of the term "delinquent behavior." Considering this, to know and understand delinquent behavior, it is necessary to study it, and to study it requires both practical investigation and the examination of theories of delinquency.

Becker (1963, 1967) has indicated that any researcher who is interested in studying delinquency will generally conduct his study from one of two perspectives. The researcher will examine the perspective of the "delinquent" actor himself, for example, by interviewing a sample of alcoholics or drug addicts. Or, the researcher will study the viewpoints of role enforcers, such as police, judges, or staff of social agencies which deal with drug addicts. Whichever "side" the researcher chooses, whether that of
the rule breakers or that of the rule enforcers, he will be accused of bias for ignoring the viewpoints of the group that he is not studying, and of presenting the viewpoints of his sample in a "sympathetic" light. Becker notes that such accusations are unfair, for the researcher is trying to understand the thought processes, the ways of interpreting and reacting to reality, that are the subject of his study.

The researcher can choose one of the above two perspectives discussed by Becker, or he might choose to study the viewpoints of the general public. The public sometimes agrees with the rule enforcers in their interpretations of what constitutes delinquency and sometimes does not. Various people in different social strata may hold varied opinions and beliefs on what constitutes delinquency. This leads to various attitudes towards delinquents and what constitutes delinquency. (For example, there are many and varied opinions regarding marijuana smoking laws in the United States.)

This present study reports the results of an investigation of attitudes towards various kinds of delinquents. The sample was selected from various social strata of the general population.

This study proposes to serve both theoretical and research functions. The theoretical aspects of this study pertain most directly to that school of thought in the
sociology of deviance known as the "labeling" or "societal reactions" school. The findings of this study will, hopefully, shed some light on the major concept within this school, that of societal reaction, and provide more open ground for the study of juvenile delinquency and of labeling as a subcategory of deviance.

This study has two primary research functions. First, there are very few studies of the attitudes of people toward various kinds of deviants in general, but none has been done on juvenile delinquency as a separate area of societal reaction. The design for this investigation provides a means for studying the attitudes and the reactions of a sample toward various kinds of delinquents, and what constitutes delinquency. In other words, this study investigates what kinds of behavior social class members regard as delinquent, and determines how much they would accept or reject those who engaged in such behavior which they disapproved of.

Research into the labeling process can serve two important functions. One is to help illuminate the basic mechanisms at work in the social construction of deviance. Also useful, particularly from the point of view of public policy, is the capacity of such research to reveal specific beliefs and attitudes about particular types of deviation.

One of the few studies done in this area was conducted by J. L. Simons (1965) in the first of a series of four
pilot studies. Simons pursued his study by asking a sample of 180 respondents, whom he selected by means of a quota formula, to list those acts or groups of persons whom they might regard as being deviant. Simons discovered that 252 different acts were defined as deviant. Homosexuals had a high negative response with 49 percent of the sample identifying them as being deviant. Drug addicts had 47 percent, prostitutes had 27 percent, and criminals rated 40 percent. Simons subdivided his sample by age, sex, and education and found that there were very few variations along the line of these categories. The few variations which Simons found (1965:224) were dichotomized in his article as follows:

Thirty-six percent of the females, as opposed to 18 percent of males, mentioned prostitutes; 54 percent of those with some college, as opposed to 34 percent of those that had finished high school or less, mentioned drug addicts; 19 percent of those over forty years old, as opposed to 7 percent of those under forty, said beatniks were deviant. But all other subgroup variations were too slight to be reliable.

Simons' data provided us with insight into the sociology of deviance and of delinquent behavior. And, specifically, his study gives us the notion that there exist hierarchies of acts which may be regarded as being delinquent, varying by the social characteristics of the respondents. Simons' data show that his sample gave the greatest attention to homosexuality and drug addiction, with frequent mention of prostitution and murder. Such behavior represents violations
of social norms which are considered important by members of this sample.

The study conducted by Simons suggests that subgroups within a society react differently to the various kinds of deviant behavior which may occur in a social system. This statement raises such questions as: Which subgroups disapprove of what kinds of behavior, and why? What social, cultural, or environmental conditions lead to such reactions? From these questions, the present research study was developed.

In the report of his first pilot study, Simons did not explain in detail the proportion of respondents who defined various acts as deviant. For example, 49 percent of his respondents mentioned homosexuals as being deviant, but nothing is said about whether the remaining 51 percent considered homosexuals as deviant. Also, Simons' study does not inform us about his individual respondents' attitudes of acceptance or rejection of homosexuals.

Thus, the main problem in Simons' study is the assumption that those groups of deviants identified most frequently by his sample are the ones disapproved of most strongly. This assumption may or may not be valid. A test of this assumption would help to clarify Simons' concept of identification of deviants and thereby provide useful findings upon which to base future theory and research.

The major purpose of the present study is to tap the attitudes of members of various social classes toward delinquents.
Simons' pilot study has served as the foundation upon which the present study was developed. This study, in part, replicated Simons' study by asking sample members to identify those groups or acts they regarded as delinquent. The subjects were also asked to indicate the extent to which they would be willing to interact with members of certain delinquent subgroups. The concept of social distance in terms of acceptance or rejection of delinquents correlates to what I have called "know thy place." This concept provided a more complete indication of attitudes toward delinquents than was provided by Simons' study.

These two indications of attitudes toward delinquents (that is: identification of delinquents and acceptance or rejection of delinquents) are the dependent variables for this study. This study also includes independent and control variables. I have chosen social class as the independent variable. Social class, in this study refers to the power or wealth that respondents might have, using education as an indicator.

I have chosen liberalism-conservatism as a control variable. This refers to the degree to which an individual member of a particular social class is willing to accept changes in terms of politics, the economy, or other social conditions, for controlling or eliminating the factors of deviancy.

Another reason for choosing social class as an independent variable is that a number of studies show different
social classes as being characterized by different value orientations. For example, Miller (1958) has described the lower class as being concerned with demonstrating toughness, as believing in the consequences of fate and luck, and also as desiring the excitement of thrill, risk and anger. Cohen (1955) has characterized the middle class as respecting the property of others and choosing to control aggression while "desiring wholesome reactions and love" and as cultivating manners and courtesy. Sutherland (1960) indicated that upper and middle class individuals are less likely to engage in crimes such as burglary, but they may engage in "white collar crimes," such as price fixing or income tax evasion.

These findings of various studies let me assume that there are differences among the social classes in terms of what constitutes delinquent behavior. I assume, further, that it is possible that these differences would lead to differences in attitudes toward delinquents.

I have chosen liberalism-conservatism as a control variable because it relates to findings of some studies done regarding social class and various kinds of political and social attitudes. Selvin and Hagstrom (1960) discovered that those students whose fathers were blue-collar workers were more libertarian than students from any other social class background. They also discovered that the differences among students lessened as they grew older. Junior and Senior students in this group were more libertarian than were Fresh-
men and Sophomores. Lipset (1960) found that lower class individuals were more liberal than the upper classes on economic issues, and were more conservative on non-economic issues, such as civil rights, international relations and civil liberties.

The political and social attitudes among different social classes are complex. It appears that liberalism-conservatism is a variable that should be "controlled" in any study such as the present one.

I have treated delinquency as culturally relative and as a function of the application of the label "delinquent" among the respondents. For example, upper class liberals might be more tolerant of marijuana smoking than are liberal members of the lower classes, but there might not be any social class differences among conservatives. All classes of conservatives might disapprove of marijuana smoking, and there might be a tendency for them to disapprove of many other "delinquent" behaviors.

I have examined juvenile delinquency in the context of the sociological "deviant behavior" theory. This study, therefore, investigates social attitudes toward delinquents and perceptions of what constitutes delinquency, using the "labeling" or "societal reaction" perspective, while making an effort to see whether there are differences in social class attitudes toward delinquents.

In outline form, then, the variables used in the
present study are:

1. Independent variable: Social class.

2. Dependent variables:
   a. Identification of delinquents.
   b. Acceptance-rejection of delinquents.


The four variables for this study have been defined conceptually and operationally, and they are discussed in Chapter Three. Chapter Two discusses the theory and research which relate to this study.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The present study relates to that school of thought known as the "labeling" or "societal reaction" school of deviance. Labeling or societal reaction theories are concerned with the effects which negative social reactions have on individual behavior. The societal reaction thesis suggests that delinquency is primarily the result of conformity to negative expectations inherent in "labels" that are applied when one is reacted to as delinquent. Sociologists and other theorists have indicated that acts can be identified as delinquent or criminal only by reference to reactions to them by the public or by the official agents of a politically organised society. Thus, the act of taking drugs or stealing is not considered to be delinquent in itself, but becomes delinquent after some type of societal reaction has taken place and the offender has been labeled delinquent. My theoretical discussion will begin with a consideration of the work of Tannenbaum and chronologically unfold the development of the "societal reaction" school of defiance.

Tannenbaum (1938) noted that behavior defined as deviant arises out of the conflict between a group and the community-at-large. That is, individual behavior, while adjusted to a certain group, may be considered
"maladjusted" to the larger society because that group is at "war" with the larger society. Furthermore, he found that for the children of members of such groups, behavior defined as deviant is mostly random movement in a world with organised institutions that stamp and define their activities. Tannenbaum viewed the conflict over values between the rule-breakers and the community, and found that as the problem develops, the situation gradually becomes redefined, and the attitudes of the community harden into a demand for suppression. There is then a gradual shift from the definition of the specific acts (alcoholism or prostitution, for example) as evil, to a definition of the individual as evil (or delinquent). In this situation, what constitutes delinquency is so characterised by the social audience and then the actor is labeled delinquent. From this point of view, the delinquent becomes "bad" because he is defined as bad. According to Tannenbaum (1938:19f), "The process of making the criminal, therefore, is a process of tagging, defining, identifying, describing, emphasizing, making conscious and self conscious." It becomes a way of stimulating, suggesting, emphasizing, and evoking the very traits that are complained of. Tannenbaum sees the entire process of dealing with the young delinquent as "mischevious" in so far as it identified him to himself or to the environment as a delinquent. This person then becomes the thing he is described as being.
Generalizing from Tannenbaum's view or criminal patterns and careers, it is clear that the "tagging" or societal reaction process is a major factor in affixing deviant patterns. In similar fashion, the agents and agencies of enforcement, punishment and reform contribute to the continuing development of individual delinquents.

One of the first treatments of societal reaction was developed by Lemert in his Social Pathology (1951). Lemert grouped the original causes of initial deviant behavior as social, cultural and psychological factors. He considered deviant behavior to be a product of differentiating and isolating processes where the individual's deviant behavior and his status as a deviant are caused by his maturation within the framework of a social organisation and culture designated as pathological by the larger society. This sort of unconscious process of socialization operates throughout the individual's life history. Organic irregularities constitute a second source of deviation. A third source of deviation results from a way in which social and cultural influences impinge upon and interact with normal hereditary qualities of a person. Lemert generally views social and cultural forces as the primary sources of social deviation. His work is widely known for the conceptual distinction made between primary and secondary deviation.

The primary deviation assumes the internalization of norms and values. The deviant behavior emerges as a
result of internalized norms and values, which shape the perceptions and ultimately the behavior of individuals. The norms and values that are internalized by the individuals are positive since they reflect the norms and values of the individuals and groups expressing them. In short, the individual comes to hold values favorable to engaging in delinquent behavior. Also, the analysis of the societal reaction theories propose that delinquent behavior emerges as a result of an individual's acceptance of, and conformity to, negative behavior expectations inherent in those labels imposed prior to initial acts of delinquent behavior. Considering this, Lemert finds deviations as not significant (from his analytical viewpoint) until they are organized subjectively and transformed into active roles, thus becoming the social criterion for assigning status. Delinquent individuals react symbolically to their own behavior aberrations and fit them into their socio-psychological patterns. Lemert illustrates this by an example of how primary deviations may eventuate in secondary deviation, as a result of social reaction. A school boy engaged in a classroom prank, and his teacher penalized him. At his second disturbance, he was labeled a "bad boy." The boy felt blocked and became hostile and resentful. He decided to assume his role in the class as defined by the teacher. Lemert considers as secondary deviance those alterations in attitudes and actions that result from a particular kind of
societal response.

Lemert's later work on deviance (1973) emphasized the need to begin the analysis with societal reaction, more particularly, social control, rather than with etiology. In 1974, Lemert attempted to bring clarity to the theoretical confusion in the societal reaction school of deviance — to "free up sociological energies." He views his 1951 work, in which he used the term "societal reaction," to comprehend a number of processes by which societies respond to deviants either informally or through officially delegated agencies. In his 1974 work, he concentrated on Mead's views of symbolic interaction, and commented that the significant implication is that societal reaction rests upon a kind of "programmed consensus." This point is made explicit by the concepts employed in many studies of agencies of social control. Lemert then contended that the existing theories of deviance are all suited to account for the complexities of the societal reaction in modern society. For example, the laws contain negative sanctions for marijuana use, and anyone who uses marijuana therefore comes into conflict with the larger society in the form of the juvenile and criminal justice systems. The actor will be labeled delinquent. According to Lemert (1951:76), "When a person begins to employ his deviant behavior as a role based upon it, as a means of defense, attack or adjustment to the overt and covert problems created by the consequent societal reaction to him, his deviation is secondary."
Other sociologists in the labeling school have also used the unequal or multiple-stage model to explain deviant behavior. Becker (1963) in his text, *Outsiders*, is often credited with sparking the popularity and increased attention given to the societal reaction perspective in the study of social deviance. Becker's formulation is primarily a restatement of ideas firmly laid by Tannenbaum and Lemert. He assumes that "delinquent" behavior may emerge in only two ways. The first way is a result of the individual never having become entangled in alliances with conventional society. Becker finds this "delinquent" behavior in a person who may be free to follow his impulses because he lacks a reputation to maintain or has no conventional job to keep. This will allow the "delinquent" to follow his impulses because he has nothing at stake on continuing to appear conventional. Secondly, Becker assumes that since most people are sensitive to conventional codes of conduct, they must deal with that sensitiveness in order to engage in the rule-breaking act for the first time. Thus the individual rationally neutralizes this sensitiveness by providing valid justification for his behavior.

Sociologists have begun to ask new questions about "delinquent" behavior. Why are rules broken? How are people chosen for inclusion in that category called "delinquent"? This is based on a distinction created by Becker
between the rule-breaker and the delinquent. The former refers to persons who violate social rules, the latter includes only those who have been labeled as "delinquents."

In Becker's frequently cited study, "Becoming a Marijuana User," (1963) he sees one of the most critical steps in the process of patterning rule-breaking behavior as likely to be the experience of being caught and publicly labeled a "delinquent." Whether the individual continues in delinquent behavior depends not so much on what he does as on what other people do, on whether or not they enforce the rule he has violated. Social response operates to generalize the symbolic value of the initial act so that people automatically assume that the individual possesses other undesirable attributes associated with delinquent acts. In other words, the recognition of the initial delinquent act evokes the application of what Becker calls a "master status." Becker finds that the application of a generalized delinquent label (master status) in the process of interaction pushes the individual into a position where only "delinquent" acts are acceptable or when further "delinquency" alone fulfills expectations. At this point where the individual is labeled "delinquent," he may it comfortable to join a delinquent group. The notion of a social audience creating "delinquency" appears real. Becker believes that then the public label leads to a self fulfilling prophesy and thus actually creates a "delinquent" career. Becker's argument
shows that the labeled "delinquent" is imprisoned in the "delinquent role," that this bad feeling of rejection and worthlessness pushes the "delinquent" into the peer group "delinquent" career.

These and other theorists in the "labeling" school have made some important contributions to the sociologists' understanding of deviance. Labeling theory is also critically analyzed. Gibbs (1966) claimed that labeling analysts fail to specify what kind of social reaction is necessary and how much social reaction is required before an act or an individual can be considered delinquent. Gibbs is particularly worried by the "secret" deviant and the falsely accused, both of which categories have been recognized by Becker (1966). Gibbs asserted that if labeling theorists were to be consistent, they:

...would have to insist that behavior which is contrary to a norm is not deviant unless it is discovered and there is a particular kind of reaction to it. Thus if persons engage in adultery but their act is not discovered and reacted to in a certain way (by the number of the social units, then it is not deviant. Similarly, if a person is erroneously thought to have engaged in a certain type of behavior and is related to "harshly" as a consequence, a deviant act has taken place. (Gibbs 1966:19)

Gibbs' critical charge is that no unequivocal basis for distinguishing what is "delinquent" from what is not has been established, yet, as proponents of labeling theory would rightly insist, the attempt to make such a clear cut distinction is misguided. It is a central tenet of the labeling perspective that neither acts nor individuals are "delinquent" in the sense
of immutable objective reality without reference to processes of social definition.

Goffman (1959) has perhaps done the most penetrating analysis of social reaction processes. He comments that the "craziness" or "sick behavior" claimed for mental patients is, by and large, a product of the labeler's social distance from the situation that the patient is in; it is not primarily a product of mental illness. He noted that some "initial behavior" considered to be symptomatic of mental illness is a product of compliance to the norms of a subculture that is already judged "delinquent" for ethnocentric or political reasons. Like Tannenbaum and Lemert, Goffman regards the beginning of "delinquent behavior," in a significant sense, as separate from similar behaviors which have not been so labeled, as occurring when some complainant takes action against the offender. In this sense, regardless of the origins of a form of behavior, or specific symptomatic attributes of it, the important factors determining the cause of an individual's behavior are a part of the societal reaction process. For example, if a runaway girl leaves home because of poverty, and gets into prostitution to make money or becomes alcoholic because she has no job, her alcoholism when taken to the treatment center will be diagnosed with delinquent behavior of being alcoholic. The delinquent act is not because of home poverty but because she drinks and she is noticed and labeled by a social audience.

My critical argument of the labeling theory is that it
bases its labeling processes on the consequence of an act and fails to examine the primary factor of the delinquent behavior; whether it really "fits" or "determines," labeling perspective. Stated generally as a result of societal reaction individual rule-breakers or norms violators are redefined to the extent that they often become the kind of "delinquent" they are defined as being. Goffman clearly believes that often the effect of imposed negative definitions by high-ranking labelers "pushes" the person to take the same view of himself (Asylums, 1959:150). Goffman's discussion of the effect of being treated as a mental patient serves as an extreme example of the potential power he accords societal reaction processes. He notes that persons who become mental hospital patients vary widely in the kind and degree of illness that a psychiatrist would impute to them, and in the attributes by which laymen would describe them. Goffman seems to suggest that the uniformity of treatment can induce conversion patterns of response among groups containing the widest assortment of "multi-formities," those in asylum. Goffman views the patterned "delinquents" as substantially a product of definitions imposed by empowered agents. The "delinquent," therefore, becomes what he is defined as being by force of circumstances when the negative social reaction is sustained in exclusion of contradictory definitions of the situation.

Scheff (1966) in his book Being Mentally Ill presents one of the most systematic theories within the societal reaction approach. Since rule-violating behavior is extremely prevalent
among the "normal" population and is usually transitory, it is wise to ask what accounts for the small population of individuals who go on to patterned career deviance. To Scheff, the most important single factor in the patterning of deviant behavior is the societal reaction or the labeling process. Scheff argues that if the rule-breaking or the circumstances surrounding it evoke a readiness to act on the part of others, a crisis has developed. Then the traditional stereotypes of any particular form of "delinquency" become the guiding imagery for action, both for those reacting to the delinquent and, at times for the "delinquent" actor. Therefore, when enforcement agents, and others around the "delinquent" react in uniform ways, in terms of these traditional stereotypes, what was originally amorphous and unstructured rule-breaking tends to crystalize in conformity to those expectations. The "delinquent's" behavior becomes similar to the behavior of other "delinquents" classified as mentally ill and stable over time. (Being Mentally Ill, p. 82). Scheff assumes that the delinquent individual is the product of labeling processes which fit the behavior into a public stereotype, rendering the individual psychologically receptive to the delinquent role preferred by the reactors, and finally force conformity to the expectations of others to be "delinquent" in stereotyped ways. It is interesting to note Scheff's answer to the critic's question: What determines how long and how severe the negative societal reactions will be?

Scheff identifies seven variables which have an effect
upon societal reaction to rule-breakers.

1. The "degree" of rule-breaking
2. The "amount" of rule-breaking
3. The visibility of rule-breaking
4. The "relative power" of the rule-breaker as compared to the reactors
5. The "social distance" between the rule-breaker and the reactors
6. The "community tolerance level" for rule-breaking
7. The degree of "availability" in one's group or culture of nondeviant-roles to play

(Being Mentally Ill, 1966:96-97)

If all or some combinations of these factors "stack up" negatively around a given actor's rule-breaking, societal reaction can be predicted. Scheff believes that the stabilization of "delinquent" behavior is the result of a dynamic process, and the factors contributing to patterned deviance seem, to him, to be almost deterministic. That is, once the process of labeling is begun, the effects are to produce "delinquency," and in a way that the "delinquent" personality becomes fixed. In his specific studies of mental illness, Scheff provides theoretical explanations of how the societal reaction perspective may be used to explain how a person becomes mentally ill. He notes that the culture of the group provides a vocabulary of terms for categorizing many norm violations, such as crime, drunkenness and bad manners. Scheff terms this type of violation "residual rule-breaking" and then indicates that it is the violation of these diverse kinds of rules that may lead to someone's being labeled as mentally ill. He notes that we can categorize most psychiatric symptoms as instances of residual rule-breaking or residual deviance.
According to Scheff, there "are an unlimited number of sources" of rule-breaking. Scheff (1966:31-54) holds that 1) acts of residual rule-breaking are frequent and they are committed by a very wide segment of the "normal" population; 2) they are caused by diverse factors; and 3) they should not be taken to indicate personal abnormality or categorized with the act of residual deviance or its cause, but that instead we need to focus on the reactions of others to acts of residual deviance. Scheff explicitly states that societal reaction is the single most important factor in the stabilization of mental illness.

To explain the public's reaction to an act of residual rule-breaking, Scheff turns to the public stereotype of mental illness. He notes that "stereotype images of mental disorder is learned in early childhood and that these stereotypes of insanity are continually reaffirmed, inadvertently in ordinary social interaction" (1966:67-68). According to Scheff, an important component of the public stereotype of insanity is an unreasoned fear of the mentally ill which makes the public unwilling to take risks that would routinely be accepted in ordinary living. However, if for some reason of "delinquency" the individual becomes a "public issue," the traditional stereotype of insanity becomes the guiding imagery for action.

Quinney's (1970) theory of the social reality of crime represents a more recent and somewhat different version of the societal reaction orientation. To Quinney, the conception of
crime, the formulation and application of laws and the changing nature of crime is the product of a highly integrated social and legal process. Extending this to apply to deviance in general and delinquency in particular, the content of any rule-breaking behavior (to Quinney) is learned in the normative systems of certain social and cultural settings. To Quinney, human behavior is intentional, in pursuit of selected goals and engaged in with an awareness of the possible consequences of the choices made, as compared to alternative behavior. Both the socio-cultural settings and the reactions of other persons influence the continuing behavior of the individual. During the interactions between those empowered to define "delinquents" and those defined as "delinquents," Quinney assumes that the latter may develop deviant action patterns partly because they are negatively defined. More specifically, he argues that the person may develop a way or pattern of behavior, including a supporting style of life, and a self-conception that takes its reference from the deviant definition imposed in negative social reaction. For example, parents might label their daughter as being a prostitute, and tell her to leave their home. The parents isolate her because she engages in the act of prostitution. This action of isolating her tends to cause the girl to continue in that "role" of a prostitute. One reason might be to support herself through making a living from prostitution. Another reason might be to play the role of what she was labeled. Quinney notes that these patterns continually develop as the
"delinquent" moves from one experience to another, and it is the development of these patterns that gives the "delinquent" behavior "its own substance." That is, the "delinquent" constructs individual action patterns, while participating with others in particular social and cultural structures, and constructs them as he does as a result of the reactions of others to individual behavior.

Quinney, like other societal reaction theorists, implies the greater importance of social reaction processes over structural inducements in the development of deviant behavior patterns. He indicates that those who have been defined as criminals began to conceive of themselves as criminals, to adjust to the definitions imposed upon them, and then to learn to play the role of a criminal. Because of others' reactions, therefore, persons may develop action patterns that increase the likelihood of their being defined as criminal in the future.

Quinney, in this sense, means that increased experience with criminal definitions increase the probability of developing actions that may subsequently be defined or labeled as criminal.

A number of investigations have been made on societal reactions and stereotyping and public images of deviant acts and societal reactions. Simmons (1969) asked students in his social problem class to characterize homosexuals, beatniks, adulterers and marijuana smokers. He found that more than two-thirds of the respondents wrote highly stereotyped portraits of each group and these stereotyped descriptions were extremely
similar.

A more systematic questionnaire, listing seventy traits extracted by content analysis of these open-ended responses found that for each type of deviation a very small number of traits accounted for most responses. Simmons found that some of the more educated respondents expressed what may be considered "more sophisticated stereotypes."

In the third pilot study of his research Simmons examined the amount of public intolerance or rejection of various kinds of deviations. A questionnaire designed to measure the degree of social distance that respondents would keep between themselves and members of five ethnic groups and thirteen deviants or semi-deviants, ranging from homosexuals to intellectuals was administered to a sample of 280 adults. The most significant finding was a strong association between intolerance toward ethnic minorities and intolerance toward deviating individuals.

Another very useful discussion of the labeling implications of stereotyping is provided in Scott's (1969) study, "The Making of Blind Men." Scott focused on the combination of a personally discreditable departure from expectations and the eliciting of certain stigmatizing reactions, including isolation or avoidance. In this context, considering disability as (at least potential) deviance makes sense. Scott has commented that there is wide acceptance of a set of attributes applied to the blind; they are seen as having a distinctive
personality. Certain characteristics presumably set them apart from "sighted" people. Scott mentioned helplessness, dependency, melancholia, docility, gravity of inner thought and aestheticism as the things that our "common sense" views tell us to expect of the blind. In what Scott calls "the blindness system," he observed the "agencies for the blind" and found some aspects of "social reaction" to the blind, and noted that the "creation" of blind men by blindness organizations represents the elaboration or exacerbation of such reactions. Of the agency programs themselves, Scott has declared that personnel tend to hold notions about blindness different from those of newly blind people. They view blindness as one of the most severe of all handicaps, the effects of which are long-lasting, pervasive and extremely difficult to ameliorate.

Juvenile courts illustrate some of the major organizational factors influencing "delinquency" outcomes. Platt (1969) noted ironically that the juvenile court, largely created by social reformers who sought to curb the early stigmatization of youth in trouble, is a major arena for the labeling process. The social, and to a considerable degree, organizational product of the juvenile court system is delinquents.

These structural, specifically organizational, problems have been closely analyzed in Emerson's (1969) study of a juvenile court in a large Northern metropolitan area. Emerson found that both internal staff relations and relations with outside forces and agencies affected the court's work. The
proceedings of the court were dominated by the judges and court staff who depended upon police reports. In the study Emerson noted the court's stigmatizing role, and in the context of these pressures, he commented:

In part the juvenile court produces delinquents by validating the prior judgments and demands for action of local institutions encountering problems of control from troublesome youths. The juvenile court's label represents the end product of the efforts of such institutions to deal with troublesome cases. From this perspective, the juvenile court not only labels delinquents, but it also resists labeling by refusing to validate complainant's judgment and to follow their proposed course of action. (Emerson, 1969:275)

Marshall and Purdy (1972) examined some of the implications of hidden deviance studies and labeling theory for the crime of drinking and driving. They found that the higher rates of deviance are almost entirely responsible for the over-representation of certain social categories in official conviction statistics. The authors assert discrimination to be the basic cause of over-representation in the convicted groups and that members of such particular categories are more likely to be arrested and convicted than are others who commit the same rule-violating acts to the same degree. That is, various control agents "do not like" members of certain social categories and consequently deal more harshly with them.

Becker (1967) notes that almost all juveniles commit delinquent acts but only a few are officially judged to be delinquent. Members of minorities and the poor are more likely to wind up in the official statistics as being delinquent.
Lacking power in the form of either financial clout or knowledge, the disadvantaged are less able to fight the official labeling process. Because of this lack of power, and not necessarily because of their greater delinquent activity, the disadvantaged are over-represented in the official statistics.

Deviance theorists claim that a public deviant label generates special consequential difficulties for the person. This is presumed to occur because conventional people reject the labeled delinquent and project negative attributes onto him. Fisher (1972) studied groups of juvenile school students who have acquired the public label "delinquent" for their academic grade average. Fisher found that the delinquents' label with their negative evaluation in school resulted in their being more frequently viewed negatively by peers. The labeled delinquents then showed even more negative changes in academic performance and began to perceive themselves as delinquents, and to be treated as delinquents leading to increased violations and degree of isolation. This then begins a deviation amplifying system wherein the delinquent group develops its own values. The delinquents still face the reactions and the act of isolation of the social group they belong to.

If the reaction is of a certain kind, then and only then is the act delinquent. Related to this idea, Kitsuse (1962) indicates that the forms of behavior, per se, do not differentiate deviants from nondeviants and that it is the response of the conventional and conforming members of the society who
identify and interpret the behavior as "delinquent," which, sociologically transforms "juveniles" into "delinquents."
Kitsuse asked his respondents, mostly students, whether or not they had ever known individuals who had been involved in various specified kinds of deviation, and, if so, to trace the circumstances under which they had recognized the deviance, what they had thought of it and how they reacted to it.

Kitsuse and Cicourel (1973) further investigated this issue. They found that the rates of deviant behavior are produced by the reactions made by persons in the social system which define, classify and record certain behavior as deviant.

Other sociologists, like Erikson (1962), have commented that deviance is not a property conferred upon these forms by the audience which directly or indirectly witness them. Waller (1936) related his early comments to this issue, indicating that in spite of all attempts to define social problems objectively and denotatively, it is the value judgments passed by someone upon them which is the only way of identifying the condition of social problems.

The continuous perspective is that acts are identified as delinquent by the character of reactions to them. Reiss (1970) applied labeling perspective in studying premarital sex as deviant behavior. Reiss viewed Lemert's (1951) idea of "secondary deviation" as the product of societal reaction. He found in his study that it is largely the parents who define premarital coitus as deviant behavior. He also found that
labeling from within the peer group affects premarital sexual permissiveness. For example, a girl who is labeled by the boys or others in her school or in her peer group as an "easy mark" may react to this label by deciding to continue or increase her sexual activities.

The labeling process has succeeded in separating the labeled individual from the nonlabeled and also puts those with similar labels into social contact with one another. That is, the labeled individuals are isolated from everyone except others who are similarly labeled. These "isolated" delinquents then form a different world for themselves. I would suggest that this delinquent world is real to the delinquents and they may see the world of the societal majority as a world of "fantasy." The concept "know thy place" relates to "identification of delinquents" and isolation which leads to the creation of a delinquent world, which is real to them.

Conclusion

The theme of this approach centers around the societal reaction or labeling process. It is the internalization of beliefs which ultimately shape delinquent behavior patterns in the socialization process. The crucial factors for societal reaction theorists in the explanation of patterned delinquency revolve around the application of delinquent labels and their effects on individual behavior patterns. The source, severity, persistence and exclusiveness in terms of how widely the label
is applied in the individual's circles of associations determine the effectiveness of bringing on conformity to the expectations inherent in the label.

It is the view of these theorists that the origin of first instances of delinquent behavior and its patterning is more a result of the societal reaction processes than of any other set of factors. Initial acts of delinquent behavior emerge as a result of conformity to expectations inherent in ascriptive labels attached to certain individuals negatively differentiated from the definers.

The societal reaction perspective does not view the delinquent as someone who is suffering from an intra-personal disorder but as someone who, through a set of circumstances, becomes publicly labeled as "delinquent" and who is forced by societal reaction into a deviant role. The argument of the social reaction theorists is that persons who have passed through a degradation ceremony and have been forced to become members of a delinquent group have experienced a profound and frequently irreversible socialization process. They have acquired an inferior status and have developed a delinquent world view—and the knowledge and skill that go with it. And perhaps equally important, they have developed a delinquent self image based upon the image of themselves they received through the reactions of others. Labeling theory or the societal reaction approach shows that those who define the situation, either officially or unofficially, have an important role in creating the social
reality of delinquency. This accounts not only for patterns of delinquency and the social psychological process of becoming delinquent but also explains the role of the juvenile justice system in delinquency.

As already noted, this labeling school of thought pertains to the concept of societal reaction to various kinds of delinquent behavior. There are also many subcultures within the society based upon such diverse criteria as age, social class, sex, occupation, religion, and education. Whether each of these subcultures or groups reacts in a similar manner to each type of delinquent behavior or not, I do not know. It appears that they do not. Elaboration of the concept of societal reaction would offer an explanation of how each subculture or group reacts to each type of delinquent behavior.

The present study explored the manner in which differences in social class are related to attitudes toward various types of delinquents. Chapter Three will present the hypotheses which this study will test.
CHAPTER THREE

HYPOTHESES AND VARIABLES

The general outline of this chapter is as follows:

A. Definition and discussion of concepts.
B. Hypotheses to be tested.
C. Operationalization of variables.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of a sample of individuals, by social class, towards various kinds of delinquents and delinquent behaviors.

Social Class: Sociologists have used a variety of criteria to distinguish among social classes, such as occupation, income, house type, residential location, and amount of education. Putting all these into categories of wealth, prestige and power, the question is, "Are social class members with these criteria influenced by these factors to approve or disapprove certain kinds of behaviors?" If it is so, "Do these attitudes of approval or disapproval of certain behavior differ from class to class?"

Cavan (1962), in her study of social class values, mentioned differences in attitudes and values from class to class. She explained the lower class methods of attaining objectives, maintaining that their high values are placed on the ability to outsmart others. Hard work of academic successes are less
valued than cleverness and dupery as roads to success. The smart, shrewd person is admitted, the gullible person or one who works for his money has lower status.

The middle class values of success are of a material nature. They believe in many years of education as a normal preparation for success. Hence their children are taught to plan for the future, save money, avoid any kind of disgrace, and curb impulsive actions.

Cavan, in her 1953 study of "The American Family," maintained that the impress of the upper class subculture on children comes with the weight of authority and tradition. In the upper class, pride of family acts as a restraint upon the child's behavior. The upper class people believe that motivation is not for future individual success (as in the middle class), but for the maintenance of family prestige and honor. It is a part of the upper class mores that money should be conserved and increased, and no need to scrimp or sacrifice immediate pleasures for future financial needs. Profligacy is discouraged among members of this class, but expenditures on the scale normal within their subculture are expected and encouraged.

These class differences in beliefs, attitudes and values could cause differences in their perception of what constitutes delinquency. These differences are likely to create different degrees of labeling or societal reaction to delin-
quent groups.

**Power:** This is social power in which an individual social class has the capacity to make decisions which direct and shape the lives of others, as well as their thoughts and actions. It is this power that guides the people to determine what norms the social groups should abide by and the deviations are regarded as delinquency.

Power is a fascinating concept that stimulates numerous questions: Who has the power? How did they get the power? How is the power used? Some critiques of American society have focused on the amount of power concentrated in the hands of few people who are not directly responsible to others. Mills (1959) for example, saw classes or layers of power in society. At the top, power lies in the hands of "the warlords, the corporation chieftains, and the political dictatorial" who tend to work together to form the power elite in America.

According to Mills, what decisions are made in this country are made by a few people, and they govern a fragmented mass of people which is important in any power sense. Mills contends that a system in which so much power is held by a few who are not responsible to anyone, but themselves, is both immoral and irresponsible. If the decision makers are the lawmakers and the determinants of group norms, then those who deviate from the norms are labeled delinquents and sanctions applied.
Wealth: Wealth refers to all the economic assets of society. The distribution of wealth is reflected by place of residence, education and occupation.

Sociologists confirm that wealth does affect the nature of one's relationship with others in the society, and also evokes certain characteristics of social behavior.

Social Control: Sociologists define social control as a process by which restrictions are imposed on an individual behavior in order to motivate people to conform to the norms of a group or society. The social control is of two basic forms: a) negative social control which depends on the punishment, ranging from laws to folkways, the violations of which brings ridicule, social disapproval, and finally rejection; b) positive social control, which depends on the positive motivation of the individual to conform. This may be affected simply through the promise of rewards, ranging from tangible material benefits to social approval. The second point above, "positive social control," is the one relevant to this study.

If an individual, by social class, is willing to accept changes in the power structure, social and economic structures, in order to favor women and minority groups, illegitimate ways
of achieving goals will be diminished and juvenile delinquency will be controlled.

Many of the current theories are attempting to explain delinquent and criminal behavior as based on social class position. Miller (1958) for example, argues that lower class juveniles who become delinquents do so because of the lower class value system. He claims that lower class values and beliefs important to lower class youth include trouble, toughness, smartness, excitement, fate and autonomy. Miller believes that the more marked pressure of these values in the lower class than in other classes makes it inevitable that many lower class children run afoul of the law, which does not incorporate these values. Miller fails to realize society as the source of delinquency.

Other theories examine the social class-linked motivation for delinquency in a slightly different way. Cohn (1955), Cloward and Ohlin (1960) agree that theirs is a middle class based society, but they do not believe that it is a lower class value system or culture that leads one to delinquency. Rather, they feel that the basic problem arises out of the lower class individual's attempt to move into the middle class.

It is Cohn's view that most who try to make it will not. Anticipating failure, their reaction is to invert the middle class system; that is opposite of what middle class people say is correct. The result is malicious, non-utilitarian, frequently criminal behavior.
Cloward and Ohlin believe that the lower class individual still wants to make it and when he sees he cannot succeed legally, he decides to try it through illegal means. He becomes involved, therefore, in utilitarian property, crime which allows him to collect the good things, the symbols of status associated with middle class culture. Whether or not the theorists agree on particulars, the important factor in all these theories is that they are based on the concept of social class. The social group to which a person belongs apparently provides him with a characteristic view of the world that does much to determine his behavior and thought patterns.
B. Hypotheses to be tested:

The present study investigates the interrelationships among the four variables employed in this study. Social class is the independent variable. The dependent variables are the identification of delinquents and the acceptance-rejection of delinquents. The control variable is liberalism-conservatism.

Delinquency, as a relative concept varies from culture to culture. Also, the norms which define delinquent behavior are not necessarily the same in various subcultures within a given culture.

Certain behaviors such as prostitution or drunkenness may be regarded by some members of a social class in a given culture as delinquent behavior, while other members of the same social class or of other social classes might not regard those same behaviors as being delinquent behavior.

With regard to such different interpretations of a particular kind of behavior as delinquent or non-delinquent, I investigated the following questions:

1. Do members of different social classes identify different sets of people as being delinquent?
2. Do members of different social classes differ in their attitudes toward acceptance or rejection of various kinds of delinquents?
3. Do patterns of attitudes toward acceptance-rejection of delinquents change if "liberalism-conservatism" is used as a control variable?

My assumption is that attitudes are not uniform throughout the population but do vary along subcultural and, particularly, along social class lines. What is "delinquent" in one class is not necessarily "delinquent" in another class. There are also class differences in those situations in which behavior is in a disapproved direction and of sufficient degree to exceed the tolerance limit of an individual so that it is considered delinquent behavior.

I do not know the direction of such differences. I have chosen to treat the problem by presenting my hypotheses in a null form.

B. Hypotheses to be tested.

\( H_{01} = \) There is no relationship between social class and the identification of kinds of delinquents and acts of delinquency. (See Appendix B for kinds of delinquents and acts of delinquency.)

\( H_{02} = \) There is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of delinquents.

\( H_{03} = \) There is no relationship between social class and the
degree of acceptance or rejection of delinquents when liberalism-conservatism is used as a control variable.

**Variables**

The four major variables in this study are defined in the following pages.

1. **Independent Variable - Social Class**

   Social class was selected as an independent variable for this study. A number of factors determine what social class an individual will belong to. Among those factors ordinarily considered are education, occupation, income level and place or type of residence. The factor which has been emphasized in the present study is education.

   Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) in their study of social class and mental illness divided their sample into five social class categories and they presented the following social class percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   While their analysis is somewhat outdated, it provides a commonly accepted description of the various classes. They
found that the Upper Class, Class I, is composed of the wealthy business and professional leaders of the community. They are the most highly educated class, and are predominantly Protestant; their wealth often is inherited.

Class II, the Upper Middle Class, is composed of managers and lower ranking professionals who have had some college education. The members of this class are upwardly mobile and sensitive to class differences. They are members of a large variety of organizations and clubs.

Class III, the Lower Middle Class, is composed primarily of employees such as clerks, bookkeepers, section heads in government or business offices, or semi-professionals. One-fourth of this group own small businesses. The majority of the adults in this class are high school graduates and have no college education. Usually most of their children attend state colleges. Forty-seven percent of the families in this group are Roman Catholic, 14 percent are Jewish, while 39 percent are Protestant. Members of this class are optimistic about their future and their chances of achieving an acceptable standard of living.

Class IV members are either semi-skilled employees, such as assembly line workers, or skilled manual employees. They have low income compared to the higher classes. The number of years of education is 9.4 years for husbands and 10.5 years for wives. Their children have no intention of going to college. Religiously, the majority of this class are Catholic. Their
wives are members of neighborhood women's groups, while husbands characteristically belong to an occupational union.

Class V members are mainly either on relief or employed in semi-skilled factory jobs or in unskilled jobs. Members of this class have the lowest income level, savings, educational achievement, level of occupational skill. They have "bitter" attitudes towards those in authority or those in higher classes. Forty-seven percent of the children under seventeen years of age whose parents are members of this class live in a broken home. Family ties are considered to be fragile, and their membership in other groups or organizations is limited. Members of this class struggle to survive on their daily living.

Since Hollingshead and Redlich conducted this study, some characteristics of these social classes have changed. For example, some individuals employed in the skilled trades, such as plumbers and carpenters who would in most cases be members of Class IV, have as much income as some members of "higher" classes. Nonetheless, their study indicates that a number of conditions, life styles, and attitudes are common to members of the same social class, and vary from one social class to another. The question for the present research study is whether attitudes relating to delinquent behavior vary from one social class to another.

2. Dependent Variables:

a) Identification of delinquents and what constitutes delinquency
This variable refers to the attitudes toward labeling the delinquents. The variable was chosen to provide indications of social class attitudes towards delinquents.

The variable provides a comparison to Simon's (1965) study in which he asked a sample of individuals to name the kinds of persons and behavioral acts that they considered to be deviant. The use of this variable will give one indication of attitudes of sample respondents towards delinquents in this study. The assumption being made is that people will identify those groups which are salient to them. The groups they do not identify as deviant are probably not as important to them or are not seen as a threat to the society. These assumptions need partial testing by comparing results from this question with the responses of acceptance and rejection of delinquents.

b) Acceptance - Rejection of delinquents:

This variable refers to the degree of social distance that members of a social class feel toward various kinds of people regarded as delinquents. On one end of the continuum, the individual might be willing to become a close friend or a speaking acquaintance with a particular category of delinquents, for example, prostitutes, drug addicts, hippies or alcoholics. At the other extreme he might prefer that the delinquents be isolated from the community or from his immediate neighborhood.

3. Control Variable: Liberalism-Conservatism

The variable "liberalism-conservatism" refers to the degree which a member of a social class is willing to accept
any changes in terms of politics, the economy or other social factors in an effort to eliminate deviancy or in order to control delinquency. The assumption being made is that "liberals" will be more willing than "conservatives" to accept changes such as enactment of civil rights legislation and equal rights for minorities and women.

c) Operationalization of variables:

1. It was intended that social class as an independent variable would be measured by using the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (See Hollingshead 1957). The two factors which this index uses are education and occupation. The index was initially chosen because education and occupation are considered as the most important determinants of position in the status structure. Also, the procedure is quickly and easily used for survey-type social research.

The "occupation" data, however, were not complete enough for this use. The decision was made to use only education as a measure of social class.

Education is classified into one of the seven categories:

1. Graduate degree
2. College graduate
3. Partial college
4. High school graduate
5. Partial high school
6. Junior high school
7. Less than seven years of school
It might be more accurate to say that Hollingshead's procedure measures "social status" rather than "social class." Gerth and Mills' (1946) translation of Weber's article, "Class, Status and Party" distinguished three separate but interesting stratification systems. "Social Class," in Weber's view, is determined primarily by economic and property considerations. "Social status" is determined by the prestige or respect which individuals enjoy in the community. "Party" refers to collective differences in power. It would be more accurate in Weber's terms, then, to say that Hollingshead's scale measures social status rather than social class because his scale uses two factors which seem to reflect prestige more than income. But "class" is used in a number of different ways.

Hollingshead (1959:2) indicates that the Index of Social Position measures positions in the status structure of society. Also Hollingshead (1959:10-15) later combines the range of computed scores into five class-status categories.

In an effort to provide some continuity with results obtained by Hollingshead, his Two Factor Index was referred to throughout this research. Keeping this in mind, when referring to social class rankings in the present study it is implied that differences in prestige were a determinant of the obtained rankings.

The five classes outlined by Hollingshead are combined for this study into three social class groups for statistical analysis. Class I remained I - Upper Class; Class II became
Class II - Middle Class; Classes III, IV and V became Class III.

2. Identification of delinquents.

This variable was measured by the following closed-ended question.

"Sometimes certain individuals (7-18 years of age) engage in acts of behavior which do not conform to what we consider to be appropriate behavior. We usually call such persons 'delinquents.' I would like for you to put a mark in the box for those types of people, especially under 18 years of age, whom you regard as being delinquents."

The percentage responding for each delinquent type will be computed for the sample as a whole and for various social categories, particularly social classes.

Then respondents were shown the following:
"Certain individuals (7-18 years of age) engage in acts of behavior which do not conform to what we consider to be appropriate behavior. We call such persons delinquents. I would like for you to identify for me, among the list below, those ..."
types of persons with such kinds of behavior which you would regard as being delinquents.

"Place an [X] in the corresponding box.

malicious mischief
manslaughter
burglary
prostitution
juvenile promiscuity
alcoholism
excessive drinking
dropping out of school
school vandalism
premarital sex

homosexuality
marijuana smoking
heroin addiction
mental illness
feeble mindedness
running away from home
trespassing
cheating"

3. Acceptance - Rejection of delinquents:

This variable refers to the degree of social distance that an individual feels towards various kinds of people he regards as delinquents. All aspects of acceptance-rejection of delinquents and the social distance from various kinds of delinquents will be measured by using a modification of the Bogardus (1933) social distance scale. (For detailed discussion of the validity and reliability of this technique see Goode and Hatt, 1952, 243-48).

The Bogardus social distance scale contains seven statements. The first statement indicates a willingness to be on very close terms with a member of some group or subculture, and the seventh statement indicates strong feelings of social distance and rejection of members of that particular group or subculture.

If a respondent is willing to have members of a group as speaking acquaintances, there is an assumption that he would not have some members of that group isolated from his neighbor-
hood or his community. Bogardus scored the responses to his scale by assigning a score corresponding to the lowest-numbered statement to which the respondent agreed. If the responses are made to several groups, such as various racial categories, these individual scores are added and an overall social distance score for those groups assigned to each respondent.

The social distance scale has been widely used to measure attitudes towards various ethnic and racial groups, (see, for example, Bogardus 1928, 1933). The seven-statements of the Bogardus scale have been revised for this study into four statements. Measurements of social distance will be computed for ten types of delinquents.

When the questionnaire was administered to the respondents, an introductory statement was made, as follows: "Here is a list of several types of persons who engage in various kinds of behavior and are regarded as delinquents. I would like for you to indicate the kind of reactions which you might have to such persons. Place an \( \checkmark \) in the corresponding box of your identification (sic).

1. I would accept members of this group as my next door neighbor.

\*murderers
\*thieves
prostitutes
alcoholics
truants

\*sex offenders
drug addicts
mentally ill individuals
habitual minor offenders
runaways
2. I would prefer members of this group to live in a treatment center away from my neighborhood.

*murderers  | sex offenders
*thieves    | drug addicts
prostitutes | mentally ill individuals
alcoholics  | habitual minor offenders
truants     | runaways

3. I would permit members of this group to live in my neighborhood but not next door.

*murderers  | sex offenders
*thieves    | drug addicts
prostitutes | mentally ill individuals
alcoholics  | habitual minor offenders
truants     | runaways

4. I would like members of this group to live out of my city.

*murderers  | sex offenders
*thieves    | drug addicts
prostitutes | mentally ill individuals
alcoholics  | habitual minor offenders
truants     | runaways

*Assume that prison sentence has been served.

The respondents were carefully instructed on how to fill out the questionnaire. The explanation was, for example, as follows:

"Regarding convicted murderers who have served their prison sentences, would you have members of this group live away from your neighborhood? That is, would you prefer that these murderers be removed from your immediate community?

"How about people who are thieves? What are your reactions towards prostitutes, alcoholics, murderers, etc.?"
There are two main variations between the Bogardus procedures of measuring social distance and procedures used in the present study.

The first variation is that three of his seven statements are not used for this study. One statement indicates a willingness to see a member of one's family marry a member of a group. Another states the respondent's willingness to work beside a member of this group. The next is that the respondent would wish a member of this group to live outside the Country. I don't feel that these statements are necessary for the present study. I did not consider it necessary to know if the respondent would be willing to have a member of his family marry a thief or a homosexual for instance, or hang around with a murderer. Nor did I consider it necessary to ask if a respondent would want a juvenile who is a runaway or a prostitute to be expelled from the Country. Rather, I was interested in knowing if the respondent was generally favorable or disapproving of various kinds of delinquent behavior.

The second variation from the Bogardus method is in the "scoring" of responses. In the present study the maximum obtainable score is 4. Of the four statements used, Items 1 and 3 indicate some degree of acceptance of members of a particular group, and these statements are assigned the low scores of 1 and 2. Items 2 and 4 are worded in such a way as to indicate some degree of rejection of members of a group, and they are assigned the high scores of 3 and 4.
I feel that this procedure is better for this study than is the procedure used by Bogardus (see Bogardus, 1933).

Using the social distance scale, the following measurements were made regarding the acceptance-rejection of delinquents.

1. Social distance to individual types of delinquents.

Using the scoring procedure already outlined, social distance to each of the ten individual types or delinquents was measured. Averages or percentages for each of these types of delinquents, within the range of 0-4, were computed for the sample as a whole and for each social class category, based on education and occupation.

2. Acceptance-rejection of types of delinquents.

Each person in the sample was categorized as either an acceptor or rejector of delinquents. This was accomplished by computing a midpoint on the scores measuring social distance to delinquents, and determining whether each sample member was above or below that midpoint. The midpoint for this variable, on a scale of 0-40, was 20.

3. Acceptance-rejection of "aggregate types" of delinquents.

Sample members have also been categorized as either acceptors or rejectors of each of the three "aggregate types" of delinquents, cultural delinquents, sexual delinquents and criminal delinquents.

a) Cultural delinquents:

The six "cultural" types of delinquents are
alcoholics, drug addicts, the mentally ill, habitual minor offenders, runaways and truants. These delinquents are combined into one aggregate because they violate the norms of society dealing with demeanor and other day-to-day activities. (0-24)

b) Sexual delinquents:

This aggregate includes prostitutes and sex offenders. (0-8)

c) Criminal delinquents:

This aggregate includes "murderers" and "thieves." (0-8)

1. Social distance to cultural delinquents:

This was measured by adding scores of social distance to the two significant individual types of delinquents, habitual minor offenders, and drug addicts. The range of possible scores is 0-8.

2. Social distance to sexual delinquents:

This is measured by adding scores of social distance to prostitutes and other sex offenders. The range for this is 0-8.

3. Social distance to criminal delinquents:

This is the total score of social distance to murderers and thieves. The range for this variable is 0-8.

By clarifying sample members as acceptors or rejectors of delinquents, we will then determine the likelihood, using the chi-square statistics, that members of different social classes were favorable or unfavorable towards delinquents and
what constitutes delinquency.

Liberalism-Conservatism:

Liberalism-conservatism refers to the degree to which an individual of the social class is willing to accept any changes in terms of politics, the economy, or other social factors as an aspect of eliminating factors contributing to deviancy or in order to control delinquency. This variable will be tested and measured, using a scale developed by F. M. Kerlinger (in Shaw and Wright 1967:322-24), which consists of twenty-six modified Likert items. The author estimated the split-half reliability of this scale to be 78 for liberalism and 79 for conservatism, based on his sample of 168 subjects.

Kerlinger administered his scale with liberalism and conservatism items to his sample, who responded to each item in one of these six ways. The respondent could agree very strongly (scored as plus-3), agree strongly (plus-2), or disagree very strongly (minus-3). "Liberally" worded items were scored by assigning these weights to the corresponding responses. "Conservatively" worded items were scored by assigning reverse weights to the corresponding responses. The respondent's final score was the sum of these weights for all twenty-six items. His higher scores indicate liberal attitudes.

For the present study, I have decided not to use all the Kerlinger's twenty-six items, but to select ten items that
will measure attitudes on a dimension of liberalism-conservatism. The elimination process is shown under the heading "pretest" in Chapter Four.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented the three hypotheses designed to be tested by this study. It has also presented the four variables contained in those hypotheses, and the operational definitions of the four variables.

The variables included in these hypotheses are "social class" and "acceptance-rejection of delinquents" as the dependent variables, and "liberalism-conservatism" as the control variable.

The next chapter gives the analysis of the study design in terms of sampling and the collection of data for this study.
CHAPTER FOUR

Methods

A. Population and Sample:

This study was done in the city of Omaha, Nebraska, a community of approximately 400,000 residents, located in the Midwestern section of the United States.

The major consideration for sampling in this research was to provide a variation in social class. To insure social class variation, census information was obtained concerning the median income level and median education level for each of the seventy census tracts within the city of Omaha. The sample was composed of adult individuals of both sexes. My research design includes a "control" on race—only the social attitudes, opinions and beliefs of white residents of Omaha were sampled regarding those persons they might conceive of as delinquents.

I have chosen church members as the base for this study, and the sample for this study was randomly selected in such a way as to represent social class from different sections of the city.

B. Research Method and Procedures:

The data for this study were collected by the questionnaire survey method. The questionnaires were group-administered, with oral instructions. The final structure and level of questionnaire for this study was based on the
results of a pretest.

PRETEST

Since I did not want to use all of Kerlinger's twenty-six liberalism-conservatism items of social attitudes, in an effort to determine which of the twenty-six items would efficiently predict liberalism and conservatism, I presented the original twenty-six items to a pretest sample of twenty people selected from different social class levels in the city of Omaha. For practical reasons, I wished to limit the number of items to ten. To select the items from the longer list, I added up the scores for each of the twenty sample members. To differentiate a group of "liberals" and a group of "conservatives," I selected the eight highest scores received as representing "liberalism" and the twelve lowest scoring members as my conservative pretest sample. Then for each of the twenty-six items I computed a mean for "liberals" and a mean for "conservatives." The greater the difference between the two means, the better the predictability of that item. I then selected the five liberal items and the five conservative items which had the greatest difference between means. These ten items served as the liberalism-conservatism scale for this study. Examples of the selected liberalism items follow:

1. Society should be quicker to throw out old ideas and traditions and adopt new thinking and customs.

2. To ensure adequate care of the sick we need
to change radically the present system of privately controlled medical care.

Examples of the selected conservatism items:

1. A first consideration in any society is the protection of property rights.

2. Individuals who are against churches and religion should not be allowed to teach in colleges.

For scoring purposes, I used a five-degree scoring system for the pretest, strongly agree (SA), agree (A), undecided (U), disagree (d) and strongly disagree (SD). I found that SA and SD were paid little or no attention. Because very little attention was given to these two degrees of scoring SA and SD, I eliminated them from the study.

Since I am mostly interested in the general attitudes of liberals and conservatives, it was preferable to assign only a three-degree scoring system for this study, agree (A), undecided (U), and disagree (D). For scoring, agreement with the liberally worded item carried a weight of 2, disagree a 1, and undecided, 0. For the conservatively worded items, the scoring was reversed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal item</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another point of the questionnaire pretesting was a consideration of open-ended and closed-ended questions. Two types of questions were presented to the twenty persons selected. The respondents had great difficulty in listing
types of delinquents (truants, drug addicts, hippies) in response to the open-ended question, so that some of the respondents left this question unanswered. On the other hand, it was easier for those who had the close-ended question to identify from the provided list of delinquents (murderers, thieves, runaways, etc.). Even though the categories of delinquency provided were presumed to relate to those regarded as delinquents, the respondents seemed to identify only those delinquents that were salient to them. Those they did not identify were probably of no concern to them. I decided, based upon the pretest, to use a closed-ended question for the measurement of the variable.

My choosing churches as the base for my study was a "good" choice, as confirmed by my experiences in the pretest. Because of being a foreign national, I had anticipated that gaining acceptance for door-to-door interviews might present some difficulty. I rejected the possibility of telephone interviews as I decided that some people might not be willing to "strain their ears" to understand my "accent," and this might affect the percentage of responses. Although it is easier to mail questionnaires than to administer their use, the percentage of returns is uncertain. This method of using churches was a way of gaining responses to this study, as I had been turned down many times in my pretest.

Some respondents were suspicious and asked me how I happened to get their names. I told them that their names
were selected at random from a list of all the residents in
the city of Omaha, and I told them that I wanted to get
people from all walks of life, and by chance their names were
those selected.

One lady argued that she was too busy, and suggested
that I should talk to her neighbor, that she likes to talk
to people. I was very polite and told her that I knew I was
taking some of her time, and that I was trying to get the
opinions of all kinds of people, and that if I just got the
people who like to talk but left out the people who are doing
things or who are a little busy, then I wouldn't have a very
good sample. I added that I needed her opinions because they
are important for the study. Irrespective of all these
explanations, she concluded that she was sorry that she never
gives her opinions to people because her opinions were her s
and were her own business. I became so frustrated and concluded
that an institutional approach of using churches would better
serve my purpose than individual contacts.

C. Sampling Procedures

I used the following procedures to select my sample
for the study. There were five census tracts selected out of
the possible seventy tracts within the city of Omaha. First
of all, I ranked the seventy tracts into five groups of
fourteen tracts each, by education and income.

Next, I selected one tract from each group of fourteen
tracts. I wrote the fourteen tracts on separate pieces of
paper and placed them in a container and drew one tract. I repeated this until the required five tracts were selected. Thus Census Tracts 2, 25, 47, 58, and 67 were randomly selected and became the base for my sampling.

The selected census tracts were then numbered by rank for study purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Ranking Group Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census Tract 47 represents group 1, number 67 represents group 2, number 58 represents group 3, Census Tract 2 represents group 4, and number 25 represents group 5.

For the purposes of sampling among the churches of Omaha, I first of all compiled a list of names of churches from the telephone directory. I then grouped those churches which are located within the five census tracts selected for the study. After grouping these churches into five clusters, four churches were randomly selected from each cluster. The object of this procedure was to select a sample of twenty churches as the base for this study.

To accomplish this, four church names for each census tract were chosen from a container at random.

As totals of approximately three hundred respondents
were desired for this study, sixty respondents were "allocated" to each census tract, allowing for fifteen respondents from each church. Figure 4 illustrates the survey design for the study.

Figure 4:
Survey Design

CT - Census tracts (2, 25, 47, 58, 67) represent the geographical locations of the selected tracts for the study.

O - represents ranking of the selected tracts based on education and income level of the residents.
1 - 47, 2 - 67, 3 - 58, 4 - 2, 5 - 25.

XA - 'X' represents a church; 'A' represents a minimum of 150 adult members required in each church for sampling.
$Y_{10}$ represents fifteen respondents from each church and '10' represents the sampling interval.

The formula used for obtaining three hundred respondents for this study is as follows:

\[
CT_2 \text{ or } X_4 = \frac{X_1}{Y_{10}} + \frac{X_1}{Y_{10}} + \frac{X_1}{Y_{10}} + \frac{X_1}{Y_{10}} = \frac{X_4}{Y_4} = \frac{4}{40} = \frac{1}{10}
\]

\[
= \frac{150}{10} + \frac{150}{10} + \frac{150}{10} + \frac{150}{10} = 15 + 15 + 15 + 15 = 60
\]

$CT_2$ or $X_4 = 60$ respondents

Then $CT_2 + CT_{25} + CT_{47} + CT_{58} + CT_{67} = X_{20}$

\[
X_{20} = \frac{X_{20}}{X_4} \times \frac{60}{1}
\]

\[
= \frac{20}{4} \times \frac{60}{1} = 300
\]

$X_{20}$ or 20 churches give 300 people

After the sample of churches was selected, arrangements were made with the pastors of the churches concerned to obtain the church directories. After obtaining the lists of church members, a sampling interval for each church was computed on the basis of number of adult members and the number desired (15) from each church. Since the list of all members was provided, it was necessary to sort out the adults (19 years and older) to compile the sample.

D. Sampling Strategy:

I arranged and held formal meetings with the ministers and directors of Christian Education in each of the twenty churches selected for this study. I explained to them my sampling technique and how it could be carried out. Using
the church directory from each of the twenty churches selected, and having sorted out the adults 19 years and older, a sample interval at ten was computed to give fifteen respondents from each church. (Each church had over 150 adult members.)

After the formal sampling of participants from the churches' directories had been completed, the ministers and directors of Christian Education were instructed on how the sampling technique of assigning numbers 1, 2, and 3 to the members could be done. After giving the ministers and directors of Christian Education the training on this research sampling technique, some copies of questionnaires were left with them, for the respondents, in a few of the churches, when appointment conflicted with other appointments.

In selecting the respondents from each church to participate in the study, I assigned numbers (1, 2, and 3) to the adult members as they came into the church to worship. Numbers 1 and 2 were assigned to the members not included in the sample, and number 3 was given to those who were randomly sampled from the directories. It was well arranged that I was able to recognize the sample members, and the number "3" was given to them.

During the church announcements the ministers requested that those who had number 3 should wait after service for about ten minutes. A brief explanation of the questionnaire was made. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaires.

In a few of the twenty churches selected for this
study, a very small percent of the people included in sample was not present, and I left copies of the questionnaire for them to fill out during special meetings and prayer gatherings during the week.

Some of the respondents selected to fill out the questionnaires chose to take their copies home after the explanation was given and to return them to the ministers. The result was that not all the questionnaires taken home by the respondents were returned.

A total of two hundred questionnaires were completed at the end of the survey, either 66.6 percent rate of return, instead of the anticipated three hundred.

Next it was necessary to know the rates of participation in each census tract. Two hundred respondents or 66.6 percent of the total three hundred people sampled for the study actually participated. Table I outlines the participation and the non-participation rates for each of the census tracts.

Table I.
Sample Participation in the Study by Census Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Sample Base</th>
<th>Non-Participation</th>
<th>Sample Contribution</th>
<th>% of 300 Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>66.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census Tract 25 has low contribution and it represents group 5, the lower income census tract group. The low rates
of contribution are because one of the churches selected for the study in that census tract refused to return any of their questionnaires. Also, one of the churches selected in Census Tract 2 refused to return any of their questionnaires. Although a smaller percentage of the selected churches refused to return their questionnaires, the total returns show that all the three classes were represented well. Table II indicates this:

Table II
Social Class Characteristics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Number Participation</th>
<th>% of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I = I</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II = II</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV } III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social class percentages in Table II are compared with the social class percentages obtained by Hollingshead and Redlich (1958). Of the Hollingshead and Redlich sample, 12.4 percent were placed in the upper two classes (I and II), compared to 61.00 percent of the two upper classes (I and II) in this study; 66.2 percent of their sample were members of the lower classes (IV and V) compared to 39.00 percent of lower classes (III, IV and V) of this sample.

A comparison of income for the sample groups in this study with the income level of the residents of the city of
Omaha provides the distribution of family income among social classes. Table III illustrates the figures on family income for this sample, as well as the median income levels for all families in the city of Omaha, as determined by the 1970 census.

Table III

Family Income for Sample and for the City of Omaha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
<th>Omaha %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Under $6,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $6,000-$8,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $9,000-$11,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $12,000-$14,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $15,000-$24,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. $25,000 and Over</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Undeclared Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was high participation rates for all the social classes in this study. The results obtained show that lower classes were more in number than anticipated.

Table IV shows the social characteristics for this study.
### Table IV

Social Characteristics of Sample for this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Characteristics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N. Participation</th>
<th>% Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>1. less than seven years of school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Junior High School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Partial High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. High School Graduate</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Partial College</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. College Graduate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Graduate Professional</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td>1. Unskilled workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Machine operator and semiskilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Skilled manual workers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Clerical and sales</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Administrative personnel</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Business manager and lesser</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Executive professionals</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Undeclared values</td>
<td>62</td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>1. 19-29 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 30-39 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 40-49 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 50-59 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 60 and over</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Undeclared values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td>1. Single</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Married</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Separated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Widowed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Divorced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>1. Male</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was of importance to determine whether each of the ten social distance scales was valid. Therefore, for each of the ten scales, two coefficients were computed. The first is the coefficient of reproducibility. The second is the coefficient of scalability. These coefficients are then listed below for all the ten scales in Table V.

Table V
Guttman Scale Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Coefficient of Reproducibility</th>
<th>Coefficient of Scalability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murderers</td>
<td>.9899</td>
<td>.7666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>.9709</td>
<td>.6444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes</td>
<td>.9506</td>
<td>.6555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholics</td>
<td>.9222</td>
<td>.6444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truants</td>
<td>.9005</td>
<td>.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenders</td>
<td>.9665</td>
<td>.6555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways</td>
<td>.9056</td>
<td>.6111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addicts</td>
<td>.9709</td>
<td>.6888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
<td>.9005</td>
<td>.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Minor Offenders</td>
<td><strong>.9709</strong></td>
<td><strong>.6666</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{X} = .94485 \quad \bar{X} = .65319 \]

The coefficient of reproducibility is an indication of the extent to which a respondent's score is a predictor of his response pattern. A coefficient higher than .9 is considered to indicate a valid scale. The coefficient of scalability indicates whether a scale is unidimensional and cumulative.
This coefficient should be at least .6 (for explanation of the computation of these coefficients, see Nie, 1975) (SPSS). This table then provides strong statistical support for the use of these scales to measure the social distance and acceptance-rejection variables discussed above.

For each of the aggregates in the findings of this study, only those delinquents which were statistically significant at the .05 or less level were measured and compared for the total sample which were significant and for each social class category which was significant at .05 or less.

The study began in May, 1976, and was completed in August, 1977.

The total one hundred non-participants listed in Table I are the individuals who refused to participate as well as those who said they would but never completed the questionnaire.

After the data were collected and coding was done, the data were submitted to the computer center at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

A programmer at this center assisted me in analyzing the data using programs in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The data and the analyses which resulted are presented in Chapter Five.
Chapter Five

Findings

Introduction:

This study was done to investigate the attitudes of a sample of individuals, by social class, toward various kinds of delinquents and delinquent behaviors. Simons' (1965) study is the primary source from which the present study was developed. The findings showed that there are some differences between the results of this research study and the results obtained by Simons. Table VI illustrates these differences. First of all, Simons did his study on deviance-in-general while this study was done specifically on juvenile delinquency as deviant behavior. Second, Simons employed an open-ended form of questionnaire in which his respondents listed for him those various acts or persons they might regard as being "delinquents." Simons used 180 subjects for the collection of his data while the present study used two hundred subjects.

The percentage results of Simons' study and the percentage results of the present study were compared (see Table VI).
Table VI

Identification of Delinquents for this Study and for Simons' Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquent Type</th>
<th>Simons' Study (%)</th>
<th>The Present Study (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truants</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Minor Offenders</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenders</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Extremists</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatniks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perverts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheists</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murderers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addicts</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most noteworthy fact about these two sets of data is that their rates of responses are not similar. Table VI shows the comparison, and indicates that they are not similar (for comparable items). The differences might be due to sample
differences, differences in percentages of response, or differences in approach. For example, there was a subgroup difference based upon the sex of respondents. Those Simons found in his study were as follows: (Simons, 1965:224)

36 percent of females as opposed to 18 percent of males mentioned prostitutes; 54 percent of those with some college as opposed to 34 percent of those who had finished high school or less, mentioned drug addicts; 19 percent of those over forty years old as opposed to those under forty, said beatniks were deviants. But all other subgroup variations were too slight to be reliable.

The subgroup differences found in this study are as follows:

73.2 percent of males as opposed to 90.7 percent of females identified thieves as being delinquents; 80.4 percent of males as opposed to 68.6 percent mentioned alcoholics; 78.1 percent of males as opposed to 82.2 percent of females identified drug addicts; 15.2 percent of those with college degree as opposed to 54.3 percent of those with high school education or less, identified murderers as delinquents; 77.8 percent of those between forty and forty-nine years old as opposed to 6 percent of those between fifty and fifty-nine years old identified mentally ill individuals as delinquents.

The procedure of using both education and occupation as factors for determining what social class an individual respondent belongs to had to be modified (see Chapter Three about education). Only "education" was used. "Occupation" was eliminated. The reason for eliminating occupation is that, while complete information about the educational levels of respondents was obtained, I obtained occupational information on only 69 percent of the respondents.

Also, the procedure of collapsing Hollingshead and Redlich's (1965) five social classes adopted for this study (see Chapter
Three) has been rearranged on the basis of education. The rearrangement is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hollingshead and Redlich</th>
<th>This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I = Upper Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>II = Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>III = Lower Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV = Lower Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arrangement of social classes by educational status:

I } I = Upper Class - Graduate professionals and college graduates
II } II = Middle Class - Partial college
III-V } III = Lower Class - High school graduates, partial high school or less.

The original five social class categories used by Hollingshead and Redlich (1965) in their study of social class and mental illness were compressed into three categories, basing the "class" categories on education. This arrangement was made to show the differences in the use of class between Simons' study and this study. Class I remained I - Upper Class. It was composed of Graduate Professionals and those with College degrees; Class II, which became Class II - Middle Class, was composed of those with Partial College educations. And Classes III, IV, and V became Class III - Lower Class, was composed of high school graduates, and some who had partial high school or less than seven years of school.

Another reason of collapsing Hollingshead and Redlich's
five classes into three classes for this study, is that since Hollingshead and Redlich conducted their studies, most of the things have changed. Particularly this study combined Classes III, IV and V of their social class categories into one category (III) including high school graduates in the lower class. Hollingshead and Redlich Class III was the lower middle class and the majority of the adults in this class were high school graduates. In American society today, high school education is no longer valued as highly, and most of the high school graduates have difficulty obtaining a job. The rest of the analysis of these data will be identified by using Classes I, II, and III.

Test of Hypotheses

\[ H_0: \text{There is no relationship between social class and identification of delinquents.} \]

There were differences in social class attitudes in terms of which groups of individuals or persons they identified as delinquents. Table VII presents the percentage data for each of the three social class categories, for the ten identified delinquent groups.

Table VII

"Murderers" were identified with malicious mischief and manslaughter.

"Thieves" were identified with burglary.

"Prostitutes" were identified with prostitution and juvenile delinquency.

"Alcoholics" were identified with alcoholism and excessive drinking.
"Truants" were identified with dropping out of school.

"Sex offenders" were identified with premarital sex and homosexuality.

"Runaways" were identified with running away from home.

"Drug addicts" were identified with marijuana smoking and heroin addiction.

"Mentally ill" were identified with mental illness and schizophrenia.

"Habitual minor offenders" were identified with cheating and trespassing.

The table illustrates the differences in social class attitudes toward delinquents and what constitutes delinquency. These differences in attitudes are shown in the differences between rates of responses by social class for each of the ten types of delinquents.
Table VII
Identification of Delinquents by Social Class
Kinds of Delinquents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Murderers N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Thieves N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Prostitutes N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Alcoholics N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Truants N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sex Offenders N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Runaways N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Drug Addicts N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mentally Ill Individuals N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Habitual Minor Offenders N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I N=64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90.62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73.43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II N=58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>86.20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81.03</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82.75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82.75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III N=78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79.48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74.35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75.64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table VII indicates, all social classes were likely to identify as "delinquents" murderers, thieves, prostitutes, alcoholics and drug addicts.

Of two hundred respondents, 64 were in Class I, 58 were in Class II, while Class III was composed of 78 respondents. Out of 64 respondents in Class I 93.75 percent (60) identified murderers as delinquents, 90.62 percent identified thieves, 87.50 percent identified prostitutes, 85.93 percent identified drug addicts, while 73.43 percent mentioned alcoholics as delinquents. There were 6.25 percent who identified mentally ill individuals as delinquents, 35.93 percent of them mentioned runaways as delinquents. They were less likely to identify mentally ill individuals as delinquents.

Out of 58 respondents in Class II, 86.20 percent identified murderers, 81.03 percent identified thieves, 82.75 percent identified prostitutes, 82.75 percent identified alcoholics, and 81.03% mentioned drug addicts as delinquents, while 5.17 percent said that mentally ill individuals were delinquents. They were more likely to identify as "delinquents," murderers, thieves, prostitutes, alcoholics and drug addicts, while they were less likely to identify mentally ill individuals as delinquents.

Out of 78 respondents in Class III 91.02 percent identified murderers as delinquents, 79.48 percent identified thieves, 74.35 percent identified prostitutes, 75.64 percent identified drug addicts, while 66.66 percent identified alcoholics as being
delinquents. Members of Class III were more likely to identify as "delinquents" members of these five groups (murderers, thieves, prostitutes, drug addicts and alcoholics). Of them, 6.4 percent said that mentally ill individuals were delinquents. They were less likely to identify mentally ill individuals as delinquents.

The table shows, then, that all the social classes had different response rates for each of the ten types of delinquent groups, and they were more likely to identify as delinquents murderers, thieves, prostitutes, alcoholics and drug addicts, and less likely to identify mentally ill individuals. There were very small differences in rates of response among the three social classes I, II, and III. On the other hand, that means that the percentage differences between upper and lower classes were not large.

To determine whether these differences were statistically significant, or whether they occurred by chance, Chi-square computations were made for each of the ten delinquency categories, using social class (as operationalized) as an independent variable.

As the table for each "kind of delinquent" is discussed, a statement is made about the null hypothesis as it relates to that particular kind of delinquency.

Table VIII discusses social class and the identification of criminals as delinquents.
Table VIII
Identification of Murders, by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Identified as delinquent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 2.05
df = 2
P = NS

Of two hundred respondents, 64 came from Class I, 58 from Class II, and 78 from Class III.

In Class I, 93.75 percent identified murderers as delinquents while 6.25 percent gave no response; 82.21 percent of respondents in Class II identified murderers as delinquents while 13.79 percent gave no response; 91.03 percent of Class III mentioned murderers as delinquents while 8.97 percent had no response. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between social class and identification of murderers as delinquents.

The first null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and identification of delinquents has not been rejected as applied to the category of murderers who were being identified as delinquents. For this delin-
quent category, the null hypothesis is not rejected because the probability value is greater than .05.

Table IX discusses social class and the identification of sexual delinquents.

Table IX
Identification of Prostitutes, by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Identified as delinquent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 4.12\]
\[\text{df} = 2\]
\[P = \text{NS}\]

Of two hundred respondents, 64 came from Class I, 58 from Class II, and 78 from Class III. In Class I, 87.50 percent identified prostitutes as delinquents, while 12.50 percent gave no response; 82.76 percent in Class II identified prostitutes as delinquents while 17.24 percent gave no response; 74.36 percent in Class III identified prostitutes as delinquents while 25.64 percent had no response. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between social class and identification of prostitutes as delinquents.

The first null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and identification of delinquents has not been rejected, as applied to the category of
prostitutes who were being identified as delinquent. For this delinquent category, the null hypothesis is not rejected because the probability value is greater than .05.

Chi-square computation was also made to determine if there were relationships between social class and the identification of cultural delinquents. Table X illustrates the relationship between social class and the identification of the "drug addicts" category of cultural delinquents.

Table X

Identification of drug addicts, by social class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Identified as delinquent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.39 \]
\[ df = 2 \]
\[ P = NS \]

Of two hundred respondents, 64 came from Class I, 58 were members of Class II, and 78 came from Class III. In Class I, 85.94 percent identified drug addicts as delinquents while 14.06 percent made no response; in Class II 81.03 percent identified drug addicts as delinquents while 18.97 percent gave no response; in Class III 75.64 percent identified members of this group as delinquents, while 24.36 percent had no response.
The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between social class and identification of drug addicts as delinquents.

The first null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and identification of delinquents has not been rejected, as applied to the category of drug addicts as delinquents. For this delinquent category, the null hypothesis is not rejected because the probability value is greater than .05.

It might be interesting to see a reverse social attitude by social class toward another category of cultural delinquent. Table XI illustrates the relationship between social class and the identification of the "mentally ill" category of cultural delinquents.

Table XI

Identification of Mentally Ill, by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Identified as delinquent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.1 \]
\[ df = 2 \]
\[ p = NS \]

Of two hundred respondents, 64 were members of Class I, 58 came from Class II, and 78 from Class III. Table XI indi-
cates that, only 6.25 percent in Class I identified mentally ill individuals as delinquents, while 93.75 percent had no response; in Class II, 5.17 percent identified mentally ill individuals as delinquents while 94.83 percent made no response; and 6.41 percent of members in Class III identified members of this group as delinquents, while 93.59 percent made no response.

The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between social class and identification of mentally ill individuals, as delinquents.

The first null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and identification of delinquents, has not been rejected, as applied to the category of mentally ill, as delinquent.

For this delinquent category, the null hypothesis is not rejected because the probability value is greater than .05. Although this chi-square test is not statistically significant for mentally ill category of delinquency, it is interesting to see that a greater percentage from each social class did not respond to this particular delinquent category. Probably because mental illness does not fit into their definition of delinquent behavior.

Although the first null hypothesis was not statistically significant and was not rejected, however, it was significant when liberalism-conservatism was controlled for.

$H_{02} =$ There is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of delinquents.
Table IX shows social distance scores toward the ten delinquent categories. It has four columns, A, B, C, and D. Column A indicates respondents' willingness to accept members of delinquent groups as next-door neighbors. Column B indicates that respondents would like members of the delinquent groups to live away from their neighborhood. Column C indicates the respondents' willingness to accept delinquent groups in their neighborhood but not next door. Column D states that respondents would want the delinquents to live outside their city.

Table XII illustrates social distance scores "expressed" by respondents toward various delinquent groups. Individual scores from each column were added to yield the total social distance scores in the last column. The total figures simplify the process of comparing social distance responses toward the ten delinquent categories. In this table the higher the social distance score, the greater the social distance toward that delinquent group. This is because the columns have different scoring points. For example, murderers scored (4.88). This means that the respondents had the greatest social distance to murderers, as compared to Truants whose scores (2.42) were the lowest.

Table XII indicates that the least amount of social distance was expressed toward truants, runaways and mentally ill individuals, and the greatest social distance was expressed toward murderers. Sex offenders were disapproved of more strongly than drug addicts. The respondents expressed only a slight dif-
Table XII

Social Distance to Individual Types of Delinquents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Delinquents</th>
<th>Social Distance Score</th>
<th>Social Distance Score</th>
<th>Social Distance Score</th>
<th>Social Distance Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murderers</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholics</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truants</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenders</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addicts</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Minor Offenders</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ference between thieves than prostitutes.

These ten types of delinquents listed in Table XII were then combined into three aggregate types of delinquents. The three types are:

a) Cultural delinquents - includes drug addicts, mentally ill, alcoholics, truants, runaways and habitual minor offenders

b) Sexual delinquents - includes sex offenders and prostitutes

c) Criminal delinquents - includes murderers and thieves.

Social distance to each of these three aggregate types of delinquents were then obtained by having the sum of a combined social distance score for each of the corresponding individual types of delinquents.

Table XIII illustrates the social distance to aggregate types of delinquents.

Table XIII
Social Distance to Aggregate Types of Delinquents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Aggregate</th>
<th>Social Distance</th>
<th>% of Possible Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Delinquents (20-point scale)</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>46.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Delinquents (20-point scale)</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>47.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Delinquents (60-point scale)</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>32.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest social distance was expressed toward criminal delinquents and the least social distance toward cultural delinquents. The percentage column (in Table XIII) was developed
because one scale (for cultural delinquents) had more points possible than did the others.

To determine the differences among the social classes in terms of their reactions to the ten individual types of delinquents, social distance scores were computed for each of the three social class groups. Table XIV illustrates the computed results. There were differences in the percentages of responses among social classes on their attitudes and opinions toward delinquent groups. It is easier to compare social distance scores in the three social class categories by comparing the scores listed in the last column of Table XIV.
## Table XIV

Social Distance to Individual Types of Delinquents by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance</td>
<td>Score (1-point Scale)</td>
<td>Score (2-point Scale)</td>
<td>Score (3-point Scale)</td>
<td>Score (4-point Scale)</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murderers N=64</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thieves N=78</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes N=58</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholics N=78</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truants N=58</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenders N=57</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways N=58</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addicts N=58</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill N=62</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Minor Offenders N=62</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table indicates, all social classes were less favorable toward murderers, thieves, prostitutes, sex offenders and drug addicts, while alcoholics were mostly frowned upon by members of Class II. All the social classes had scores of between 4.15 and 5.42 toward members of these delinquent groups.

They were more willing to isolate members of these groups and indicated that they would want them to live away from their neighborhood and/or would want them to live outside their city. Columns B and D show the greatest distance toward murderers, thieves, prostitutes, alcoholics, sex offenders and drug addicts. For example, Class I, with a social distance score of 1.83, would want murderers to live away from their neighborhood as compared to .17 or .28 indicative of acceptance of murderers (who had "served their time") as next-door neighbors or to live in the neighborhood. The 2.25 social distance score in Column D shows that members of Class I would even want murderers to live outside their city. The table also shows that there were very slight differences between classes in terms of their attitudes toward members of these delinquent groups.

On the other hand, the respondents were more favorable toward the mentally ill, truants, runaways, and habitual minor offenders. They had the least social distance to members of these groups. The differences in their degree of acceptance and rejection of members of this group were small. Except that, habitual minor offenders and mentally ill individuals had some degrees of rejection in the neighborhood but Class I and Class III would not want them to live outside the city, but Class II members
would even want them to live outside their city. The favorable attitudes toward members of these delinquent groups are shown in Cells A and C of Table XIV.

Social Class and Acceptance-Rejection of Delinquents:

In examining this variable, the respondents were asked if they would permit members of delinquent groups to live next door. Table XV illustrates the relationship between social class and the acceptance or rejection of one category of criminal delinquents (thieves).

Table XV

Acceptance-Rejection of Thieves, by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Acceptors</th>
<th>Rejectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.80 \]
\[ df = 2 \]
\[ P = NS \]

Of two hundred respondents, 64 came from Class I, 58 from Class II, and 78 from Class III. In Class I, 21.87 percent accepted thieves as their next-door neighbors, while 78.13 percent rejected thieves and would not want them as their next-door neighbors; in Class II 27.59 percent accepted thieves as their next-door neighbors, while 72.41 percent rejected them; in Class III, 11.54 percent indicated they would like thieves to live next door, while 88.46 percent rejected members of this delinquent group.
The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of thieves as delinquent.

The second null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of delinquents has not been rejected, as applied to the category of thieves being accepted or rejected as delinquent.

Table XVI illustrates the relationship between social class and acceptance-rejection of sexual delinquents (sex offenders). The respondents were asked if they would like sex offenders to live next-door. Results are illustrated in Table XVI.

Table XVI
Acceptance-Rejection of Sex Offenders, by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Acceptors</th>
<th>Rejectors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 0.91 \]
\[ \text{df} = 2 \]
\[ P = \text{NS} \]

Of two hundred respondents, 64 came from Class I, 58 from Class II, and 78 from Class III. In Class I, 12.50 percent would want sex offenders to live next-door, while 87.50 percent rejected them; 10.34 percent in Class II accepted sex offenders as next-door neighbors, while 89.66 percent rejected them; 7.70 percent
of members of Class III accepted sex offenders as next-door neighbors, while 92.30 percent rejected them.

The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of sex offenders as delinquent.

The second null hypothesis, which states that there is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of delinquents has not been rejected, as applied to the category of sex offenders being accepted or rejected as delinquent.

To further examine the social distance variable, the discussion of data shows that the respondents were asked if they would like those people they regarded as delinquents to live away from their neighborhood. Table XVII illustrates the response showing the relationship between social class and the acceptance-rejection of certain cultural delinquents, in this case, truants.

Table XVII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Acceptors</th>
<th>Rejectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.42 \]

\[ df = 2 \]

\[ P = NS \]
Of two hundred respondents, 64 came from Class I, 58 from Class II, and 78 from Class III. In Class I, 23.44 percent accepted truants and would like them to live in their neighborhood, while 76.56 percent rejected truants and would like for them to live away from their neighborhood; 74.14 percent in Class II would like truants to live away from their neighborhood while 25.86 percent would accept truants in their neighborhood; out of 78 respondents in Class III, 71.79 percent liked truants to live away from their neighborhood, while 28.21 percent of them would accept truants in their neighborhood.

The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of truants as delinquents.

The second null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of delinquents has not been rejected, as applied to the category of truants being accepted or rejected as delinquent.

To further examine the social distance variable, the respondents were asked if they would like those people they regarded as delinquents to live outside their city. Chi-square computation was also made to determine if there were relationships between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of certain criminal delinquents; in this case, murderers. Table XVIII illustrates the relationships between social class and the acceptance-rejection of criminal delinquents (murderers).
Table XVIII

Acceptance-Rejection of Murderers, by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Acceptors</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 1.25$

$df = 2$

$P = NS$

Of two hundred respondents, 64 came from Class I, 58 from Class II, and 78 from Class III. Out of 64 respondents in Class I, 56.25 percent rejected murderers and would want them to live outside their city, while 43.75 percent accepted murderers in their city; out of 58 respondents in Class II, 62.07 percent would want murderers to live outside their city, while 37.93 percent accepted members of this group; out of 78 respondents in Class III, 65.38 percent would like murderers to live outside their city, while 34.62 percent accepted murderers in their city.

The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of murderers as delinquents.

It is noteworthy that, even though murderers were regarded as delinquents, not a greater percent of respondents would want them to live outside their city.

The second null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance
or rejection of delinquents has not been rejected, as applied to the category of murderers being accepted or rejected as delinquents.

Table XIX illustrates the summary findings between the relationships of social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of delinquent groups.

Table XIX

Summary Responses of Social Distance Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquent Type</th>
<th>Condition of Relationship</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Levels of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>Live next door</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenders</td>
<td>Live next door</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truants</td>
<td>Live away from neighborhood</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murderers</td>
<td>Live away from city</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square test results obtained indicate that no significant relationships existed between social class and their degree of acceptance or rejection of criminal delinquents (murderers and thieves), sexual delinquents (sex offenders), and cultural delinquents (truants).

The null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of delinquents has not been rejected, as applied to the categories of murderers, thieves, sex offenders, and truants, as being accepted or rejected as delinquent.

This hypothesis has not been rejected as applied to the
categories of murderers, thieves, sex offenders and truants, as being accepted or rejected as delinquents, in terms of living next-door, living away from the neighborhood and living away from the city.
There is no relationship between social class and the acceptance-rejection of delinquents when liberalism-conservatism is chosen as a control variable.

Sample members were divided into liberal and conservative categories. There were some significant differences with regard to acceptance-rejection of delinquent groups. There also proved to be social class differences in terms of their likelihood of being classified as acceptors or rejectors. There were differences between liberals and conservatives with regard to acceptance-rejection of cultural delinquents. Table XX illustrates this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Liberals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rejectors</td>
<td>Acceptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = 9.95\] \hspace{1cm} \[x^2 = 10.62\]

\[df = 4\] \hspace{1cm} \[df = 4\]

\[P = .04\] \hspace{1cm} \[P = .03\]

The chi-square test indicates that both of these tables were statistically significant at the \(P < .05\) level. Table XX shows that, among the liberals, Class I members were more likely to be classified as acceptors of cultural delinquents than Class II and III. Among conservatives, Class I strongly rejected cul-
tural delinquents.

The third hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between social class and the acceptance-rejection of delinquents when liberalism-conservatism is chosen as a control variable has been rejected because the probability value is less than .05.

Conclusion

This is the summary of the results that were obtained for this study. The primary question with which this research has been conceived is the relationship between social class and what kinds of persons they regard as delinquents.

Generally, the findings provide partial support for the theory that there is no delinquency or delinquent behavior until someone labels it so.

In examining this theory through hypothesis-testing, it was found that when asked what groups of persons the respondents considered to be delinquent, the most frequently mentioned type was "criminals" which was mentioned by 90.5 percent of the sample.

There were some differences in terms of the frequency with which different types of persons were identified as delinquent. The largest differences were for the response to "murderers" and "mentally ill individuals." The differences in these percentages was not large enough to be statistically significant. The first null hypothesis cannot be rejected for the responses of "murderers" and "mentally ill individuals."

The sample as a whole expressed the least amount of social
distance to the cultural delinquents, particularly mentally ill individuals, runaways and truants. They were less favorable toward criminal delinquents "murderers," "thieves," sexual delinquents "sex offenders," "prostitutes," and the "drug addicts" category of cultural delinquents.

There were social class differences in terms of social distance to delinquents and acceptance or rejection. The differences were not large enough to be statistically significant. The second null hypothesis cannot be rejected because the differences which occurred with the reactions to criminals "murderers," "thieves," sexual delinquents--"sex offenders," "prostitutes," and "alcoholics," "drug addicts," "runaways," "habitual minor offenders," "mentally ill," "truants" categories of cultural delinquents, was at the probability value greater than .05.

When liberalism-conservatism was introduced as a control variable, social class differences were large enough to be statistically significant at the P < .05. The respondents were divided into categories of liberals and conservatives. Examining the social class and the variable liberalism-conservatism, there were class differences in terms of acceptors and rejectors of social, political and economic changes in the society.

The results in Table XX shows that members of Class I liberals were more likely to be acceptors, while Class I conservatives were more likely to be rejectors.

The third hypothesis has been rejected because the response differences were large enough to be statistically significant at the P < .05 level.
CHAPTER SIX
Discussion and Conclusions

The previous chapter disclosed a number of statistically significant differences among the social classes relating to attitudes, beliefs and opinions toward delinquents and what constitutes delinquency. The present study had made some contributions and has offered some insights regarding existing theory and research pertaining to social classes and their attitudes toward those they regarded as delinquents and certain behavior they disapproved of as being delinquent behavior.

First of all, this study has expanded Simons' study and has tested his assumptions. Second, clarification of the concept of "societal reaction" provides input to the "labeling" model of delinquent behavior. Third, the data of this study suggested a number of observations about possible variations of reactions to delinquent activity, and conditions under which those reactions occur.

The original study of J. L. Simons was conducted with the intention of filling a major gap in the area of research into attitudes toward deviants. Chapter One of this thesis explained some strong points and shortcomings of Simons' pilot study. His study stated that some deviant acts are given greater attention by society than others. The results of his studies suggested that subgroups within society or social classes differ in terms of the amount of attention which they devote to various deviant
actions. There are questions raised in Chapter One regarding whether social class attitudes or definitions are correlated with disapproval. That is, does defining and identifying of delinquent groups mean that the identified groups are delinquents? The present study has been conducted to develop an instrument which builds on Simons' design and to make it possible to answer this question. The tools include two measures of attitudes toward deviants, Simons' concept of social distance to deviants. The social distance scale provides a broader indication of attitudes and opinions toward delinquent groups than the simple identification of delinquents.

Using the social distance scale, sample members were able to indicate their placement on an attitudinal continuum, from social rejection to social acceptance, for a number of delinquent types. This research study presents a design which can easily be adopted by any social researcher to measure variations in social reactions toward any type of delinquent.

This study has introduced the concept "know thy place," which derives its structure from the instrument of social distance. Chapter Five provided a conclusive answer to the question of the correlation between identification of delinquents and social distance regarding delinquents. The most frequently mentioned type of delinquents (murderers) had the greatest percentage (90.5%) of sample members who identified members of this group as delinquents. The social distance scale as applied to murderers, amounted to 4.88. A small percentage (6%) of sample
members identified mental illness as delinquent behavior. This may have indicated that the sample members viewed mental illness as behavior which is beyond the control of individuals concerned. This relates to the concept of social change in terms of social, political and economic changes so as to eliminate the factors—such as low income, prejudice, discrimination, political pressure, unequal opportunity—which, in turn, might help to eliminate social factors that affect individuals who are in these groups.

The concepts of social distance and identification of delinquents had some similarities. In Chapter Four the sample members were asked, using closed-ended questions, what kinds of people or groups they regarded as being delinquents. They were then asked to give their reactions to various types of delinquents using a social distance scale.

There were some similarities between the identification of delinquents and social distance to delinquents. In regarding acts as delinquent behavior, the sample members disapproved of some acts and regarded them as delinquent behavior. They also did not identify certain acts as delinquent behavior. The most frequently mentioned delinquent acts, listed in order of frequency of responses, were murder, thefts, drug addiction, prostitution, sex offences and mental illness.

By comparison, individual social distance scores which were obtained on all the ten delinquent groups indicated strong disapproval of murderers, thieves, drug addicts, prostitutes, and sex offenders. The least amount of disapproval was expressed
on the social distance scale towards mentally ill individuals. Also in aggregate categories, "criminals" (murderers and thieves) were given the strongest rejection.

Another point of comparison was the attitudes of the social classes toward criminal delinquents. All the three social classes were much more likely to identify criminals (murderers, thieves) as delinquents. All the social classes expressed greater social distance to criminals, and were more likely to be classified as rejectors of criminals.

The data in this study, then, strongly indicate a direct relationship between the frequency with which a sample identifies a group as delinquent and the degree of disapproval they feel toward members of that group. This statement provides clarification of Simons' concept of identification of deviants. It also lends impact to Simons' results. Simons mentioned that 49 percent of his sample identified homosexuals as deviant. The frequent mentioning of homosexuals meant that his sample disapproved of homosexuals more strongly than any other deviant activity. Also that his female sample members mentioned prostitution more frequently than did males is evidence that they disapproved of this activity more than did men.

Even though the two variables yielded some similarities, they seem not to measure the same concept. Rather, the concepts of identification of deviants and social distance to deviants may be viewed as complementary variables (the former is an open-ended measure and the latter is a "forced-choice" measure). The
behavior is that delinquent behavior is identified and reacted to more strongly, and it subsequently earns a delinquent label for the actor who engages in such activity.

The results obtained from this study shed some light on this labeling process. The results show which acts are most likely to be given strong disapproval if they become noticed, and also suggest what relative degrees of disapproval (social distance) will be expressed. Murderers, thieves, drug addicts, prostitutes have been shown previously to lead to strong disapproval. Mentally ill individuals, truants, runaways were seen as less disturbing but still a threat to the society.

The results of this study also show that reaction to delinquent behavior has strong societal implications. Some forms of delinquent behavior received stronger disapproval than others. Two sets of data, Simons' and the present study, demonstrated variations of social class reaction. For example, Simons found that female sample members disapproved of prostitution more strongly than male sample members. In the present study, females, though some of the responses by women were not statistically significant, disapproved of thieves (criminal delinquents) more strongly than men. All the social classes disapproved of criminals and criminal behavior. All the social classes were more favorable and lenient toward mental illness. This then shows that not all types of delinquent behavior is viewed by the dominant social strata as undesirable or more menacing than ordinary rule-breaking. Some forms of delinquency are tolerated while those that seem to pose a serious threat to
important norms or established institutions may be sharply controlled.

The present study clarifies to some degree the concept of the delinquent label. Though the results of this study have not supported the first null hypothesis, theoretically, the nature of the label is strongly influenced by the degree of disapproval with which the society of the dominant social group levies upon such behavior. Becker talks about the "label" of being caught and labeled as rule-breakers. The label which Becker describes is not a uniform "emblem" which everyone wears who has been caught breaking some societal norm or rule. Rather, it is a complex variable that ranges from strong disapproval to little or no disapproval or acceptance or rejection.

In Becker's four stages of a deviant career, his model states:

Step One: Committing of deviant act. The actor may be caught and punished for his behavior.

Step Two: Individual may find that he is treated differently by people he comes in contact with. He may be denied employment. He may be constantly suspicious by the police and other officials.

Step Three: Self-fulfilling prophecy: a deviant individual may be forced to pursue a deviant career because conventional options are denied to him.

Step Four: Individual accepts deviant label and eventually joins deviant subculture.

(Becker: Outsiders, 1963)

The Becker model describes the progression of a deviant career from the deviant act, to the subsequent label, to the
social reaction which follows the imputation of the model, and finally the act of entering a deviant group. The results of this study have some implications for Becker's model. In Step Three, the social interacting syndrome takes place between social class individuals and the delinquents. This interaction involved identification of a particular behavior as delinquent behavior. It further leads to rejection and isolation of delinquents concerned. This interaction is influenced by a kind of label that society confers. The results of this study shows that the members of society would be much more concerned about limiting their social interaction with criminals (murderers and thieves) and drug addicts than with the mentally ill individuals, and the truants. This indicates that individuals who served prison terms for murder or theft will be more disapproved of than those who have been patients in a mental hospital. It implies that society regards a subculture made up of murderers or drug addicts much more harshly than one made up of mentally ill individuals.

The results of this study also show that the degree of disapproval with which society views each type of delinquent behavior determines the nature and intensity of the label which is conferred on the delinquent actor. For example, criminal delinquents (murderers and thieves) have the greatest social distance, and members of these groups have the highest degree of disapproval. Rejection and isolation follow at the highest degree of labeling of these delinquents.

These greatest social distances and highest degrees of
disapproval influence the degree of social interaction with which members of social classes or the society will be willing to have with those kinds of delinquents.

The major contribution of this research study has been in generating data which suggest some conditions under which disapproval of delinquent action takes place.

Beginning with the concept of identification and social class attitudes toward delinquents, this research study has shown consistent findings of varying social class reactions to criminal delinquents (murderers and thieves). Table VII indicates that Classes I, II, and III identified criminals as delinquents much more frequently than did other delinquent groups, and maintained greater social distance from (aggregate) "criminals." All the classes were more likely to be classified as rejectors of criminal delinquents.

An important point to note is that when the sample members responded that they regarded murderers and thieves as delinquents, they based their attitudes on two different definitions of the nature of members of these groups. The first identified members with malicious mischief and manslaughter, while thieves were equated with burglary. The second definition was revealed when the questionnaire indicated that members of these groups had served prison terms. In any case, when the sample expressed their social distance to this aggregate criminals (murderers and thieves) they chose to be rejectors of members of these groups.
The respondents' attitudes and opinions toward criminal delinquents show that there are no social class differences or subcultural differences in terms of their attitudes toward murderers or thieves.

Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) found that the lower classes experienced more interest in mental illness and were more inclined to label it as undesirable. Table XIV shows almost identical class attitudes toward mentally ill individuals. Class I and II scores on social distance to this group were almost identical to that of Class III. This is a point of conflict between the Hollingshead and Redlich findings and the findings of this study.

This analysis suggests that all classes disapproved of criminal behavior (as well as being more favorable toward mental illness). However, all classes expressed more social distance to delinquents (in the aggregate) because everyone is concerned about one's life and property. Some have thought that the upper classes believe more strongly in the values prohibiting violence and disrespect for the property of others; the results of this study show that lower classes also subscribe to these values.

The variety of responses reaffirms Simons' suggestion that almost everyone is deviant from the standpoint of at least some persons. A further postulate of these results is that everyone in a particular societal setting has an internalized normative perspective from which they evaluate the behavior of others.
In the questionnaire, the respondents were not asked to make comments. However, the following quote may be representative of what they felt about the mentally ill: "I would not want to burden anyone by pushing them off on somebody; also, they belong in institutions." Of the ten types of delinquents to which the respondents expressed reactions, the sample members probably felt that the mentally ill individual had no choice of his action. An argument can be made that if an individual feels that "delinquent" behavior was caused by forces outside the control of the actor, then society maintains the least societal distance to such individual.

With my three years of work experience with adolescents in the mental health hospital, I found that most children were committed into the mental ward by their parents. The diagnostic impression for most of these adolescents was schizophrenic; some were adjudged hereditary. Some adolescents were brought in as delinquents because of family problems such as broken homes, death of the parents, or family violence--factors which those adolescents could not control.

Considering this with reference to the respondents' attitudes toward mentally ill individuals in this study, it can be concluded that the sample members were more likely to express a small degree of disapproval toward members of this group because it was beyond their own control.

The individuals sampled were also willing to have a closer relationship with the runaways and the truants, but the degree of differences of the respondents were not large enough to be sta-
As stated earlier, the individuals sampled were willing to differentiate criminal delinquents from sexual delinquents; the sample disapproved of thieves much more than of prostitutes. The sample may have felt that the thieves intervene with other people's property, while prostitutes are down-grading themselves by using their bodies wrongly against tradition and norms of the society without threatening property.

The strong disapproval of sexual delinquents, prostitutes and sex offenders shows that the sample does not agree with Schur (1967) that these acts are "crimes without victims." The sample does perceive that these crimes have victims, because the sexual mores of American society are so critical and central to the American way of life. Those who engage in this behavior are "moral" victims of their own crimes.

Another observation was that when liberalism-conservatism was used as a control variable, there were more significant results of social class attitudes toward cultural delinquents (alcoholics and mentally ill) in terms of economic, social and political changes. Alcoholics, drug addicts and habitual minor offenders were more strongly disapproved of than are runaways. If we think of a runaway as being a young person who leaves home because of violence in the home, because of lack of freedom in the home, because of a poor relationship with parents, or problems of malnutrition, then some conclusions could be reached concerning the social reaction to this delinquent category. Although the smaller percentage of respondents may dis-
approve of this behavior to some degree, the disapproval would not be strong. The sample was also willing to interact with members of this category as long as the runaways do not do anything to hurt themselves or others.

The conclusions of this study strongly suggest a theory of social reaction to delinquents. The theory postulates the following conditions under which the disapproval of various types of delinquency may occur.

a) Irrespective of how a person acts, another person may consider the behavior delinquent according to their values and respond accordingly.

b) Delinquent behavior which is perceived as being brought about by certain factors beyond the control of the individual delinquent actor receives relatively small amounts of disapproval.

c) Delinquent behavior receives strong disapproval by members of society when it involves other people's property, or results in some victim's being hurt, either physically, financially, or morally.

d) The lower class members disapprove strongly along with other social class members of behavior which violates greatly norms which are a part of the dominant American culture.

These postulates suggest some ideas which could serve as the basis for future research study.
Implications and Recommendations

Some of the conclusions in this study could be tested by a further research project designed to investigate social class attitudes toward delinquents. This could be done by using closed-ended questions which might include a list of criminal, sexual and cultural delinquents. From this list the respondents could be asked to choose the one they might consider worst to be labeled delinquent. They might further be asked open-ended questions to tap the respondents' opinions and feelings about these delinquent groups (prostitutes, thieves, murderers). This research could also attempt to determine what social class differences resulted from such questions. How did social classes differ in terms of their reactions and responses to these questions?

A total of 66.6 percent of the population sampled responded. Thinking of the 34 percent of the population that did not respond, it is felt that their attitudes toward delinquents were similar to the attitudes of those who did respond. It may be, for example, that their refusal was that they did not want to get involved in the decision-making or value judgment. A total of 66 percent of the population that responded was a reasonable percentage of return.

The high participation rate may be due to religious influence, which could create biases in attitudes toward delinquents. All the sample members were categorized as either
acceptors or rejectors of delinquents, as well as liberals or conservatives by acceptors or rejectors of social change.

There were some problems concerning the liberalism-conservatism scale which was selected for this study. First of all, it was hard to believe that responses to ten statements would yield an accurate picture of an individual's social attitudes, particularly an attitude as complex as liberalism-conservatism. The wordings of some of the statements in this scale were sometimes confusing, and they needed detailed explanation. For example, one statement said that we need to change radically the present system of privately controlled medical care. It was unfortunate that the term "radical" was included. Some respondents commented that changes were necessary but it was necessary that it has to be a radical change.

To the statement, "unemployment insurance is an inalienable right of the working man," some respondents commented, quote, "unemployment insurance may be a privilege but not a right, and could be if he contributes to it." Agreement with the above statements is supposed to indicate a liberal ideology.

Agreement with the following statements is supposed to indicate a conservative ideology. "Individuals with the ability and foresight to earn and accumulate wealth should have the right to enjoy that wealth without government interference and regulations." But is not taxation an example of government interference and regulation? And no one felt that these persons should not pay taxes.
The result of these and other complaints about this scale shows that the classification of liberal or conservative was not clearly understood, but the results were statistically significant despite the possible ambiguity of some concepts.

This research was started in May, 1976, and was completed in August, 1977. The questionnaires used in the study were completed between May, 1977 and August, 1977.

Conclusive Summary

In Chapter One the hope was expressed that this research would serve both "research" and "theoretical" functions. Based upon the three contributions which this chapter has discussed, each of those functions has been served.

The first contribution has been to build upon the research design developed by J. L. Simons. His method was simply to ask a sample to name the kinds of persons they considered deviant.

The present research design added the concept of acceptance-rejection of delinquents, using the social distance scale. This scale then made it possible to verify the assumption that those groups that are named as delinquent will also be the ones strongly disapproved of.

The second contribution of this study has been to clarify some concepts and statements central to the labeling theory and career model of deviant behavior. The study also found that the degree of disapproval with which a form of delinquent behav-
ior is regarded will have a strong influence on the reaction of society toward members of these groups, the kinds of labels given, and the amount of interaction which they will permit between the individuals and the other members of society.

The final contribution has been to generate data which suggest some of the dynamics of the social reaction to delinquents. One conclusion was that all social classes, including lower class members, disapproved more of "criminal" delinquents (murderers and thieves) because they subscribe to the basic values of the American culture. Other, more tentative, conclusions were also suggested by this study, the fact that almost everyone is delinquent from someone's point of view; that disapproval of delinquent behavior is based upon the amount of variation of behavior but rather on the perception that that behavior results in some victim's being hurt; and that disapproval will be slight if the respondent feels that this behavior was caused by forces beyond the control of the delinquent actor. The overall results of this research suggest that further research and a theory of societal reaction to delinquency could be generated.
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Appendix E
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Certain individuals, (7-18 year of age) engage in acts of behavior which do not conform to what we consider to be appropriate behavior. We call such persons delinquents. I would like for you to identify for me, among the list below, those types of persons with such kinds of behavior which you would regard as being delinquents. Place an "X" in the corresponding box.

- malicious mischief
- manslaughter
- burglary
- prostitution
- juvenile promiscuity
- alcoholism
- excessive drinking
- cheating
- dropping out of school
- premarital sex
- homosexuality
- marijuana smoking
- heroin addiction
- mental illness
- running away from home
- trespassing

2. Those persons (7-18 years of age) who engage in these kinds of behavior are regarded as delinquents. I would like for you to indicate the kinds of reactions which you might have to such persons. Place an "X" in the corresponding box of your identification.

A. I would accept members of this group as my next-door neighbor.

*Murderers
*Thieves
Prostitutes

- Alcoholics
- Truants
- Sex Offenders
- Runaways

- Drug Addicts
- Mentally Ill Individuals
- Habitual Minor Offenders

B. I would prefer members of this group to live in a treatment center away from my neighborhood.

*Murderers
*Thieves
Prostitutes

- Alcoholics
- Truants
- Sex Offenders
- Runaways

- Drug Addicts
- Mentally Ill Individuals
- Habitual Minor Offenders
C. I would permit members of this group to live in my neighborhood, but not next door.

*Murderers Alcohols Drug Addicts
Thieves Truants Mentally Ill Individuals
Prostitutes Sex Offenders Habitual Minor Offenders
Runaways

D. I would like members of this group to live out of my city.

*Murderers Alcohols Drug Addicts
Thieves Truants Mentally Ill Individuals
Prostitutes Sex Offenders Habitual Minor Offenders
Runaways

*Assume that prison sentence has been served.

3. I have listed below various statements on some of the social problems about which we all have individual beliefs and opinions. This scale is to let you express your attitudes and opinions. Please respond to each of these items in the following manner:

Agree - A, Undecided - U, Disagree - D. Put a circle (A) around a letter of your choice.

A. Society should be quicker to throw out old ideas and traditions and to adopt new thinking and customs.

A U D

B. A first consideration in any society is the protection of property rights.

A U D

C. To assure adequate care of the sick, we need to change radically the present system of privately controlled medical care.

A U D

D. Individuals who are against churches and religions should not be allowed to teach in colleges.

A U D
E. Both public and private universities and colleges should get generous aid from both state and federal governments.

F. Individuals with the ability and foresight to earn and accumulate wealth should have the right to enjoy that wealth without government interference and regulations.

G. Public enterprises like railroads should not make profits. They are entitled to fares sufficient to enable them to pay a fair interest on the actual cash capital they have invested.

H. Government laws and regulations should be such as to ensure the prosperity of business since the prosperity of all depends on the prosperity of business.

I. Unemployment insurance is an inalienable right of the working man.

J. The well-being of a nation depends mainly on its industry and business.

4. Please indicate below your last completed year in school.

_____ a) Graduate Professional (with degree)

_____ b) College Graduate (16)

_____ c) Partial College (13-16 years, no degree)

_____ d) High School Graduate (12)

_____ e) Partial High School (10-11)

_____ f) Junior High (7-9)

_____ g) Less than 7 years of school
5. What is your occupation? Be specific, please.

6. What is your marital status?
   ____ a) Single
   ____ b) Married
   ____ c) Separated
   ____ d) Widowed
   ____ e) Divorced

7. What is your average annual income?
   ____ a) Under $6,000
   ____ b) $6,000 - $8,000
   ____ c) $9,000 - $11,000
   ____ d) $12,000 - $14,000
   ____ e) $15,000 - $24,000
   ____ f) $25,000 or over

8. Your Age ________.

9. Sex: Male ________ Female ________
### Appendix F

**Groups Identified as Delinquent by Social Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquent Group</th>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murderers</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholics</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truants</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenders</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addicts</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Minor Offenders</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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