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ABSTRACT

This study tests several tenets of the theory of differential oppression. The theory of differential oppression suggests that the social order is created by adults for adults. Children are forced to conform to this order, despite their possible reluctance, because they lack the power to create meaningful social change. The extended use of power by adults leads to the oppression of children. The theory of differential oppression maintains that delinquency is one possible reaction to oppression.

This study also attempts to expand the theory of differential oppression by addressing the role of alienation in the development of delinquency. It suggests that oppression plays an important role in the development of alienation, but not in the onset of delinquency. It is argued that alienation is a stronger predictor of delinquency than alienation.

Stephen Lyng's analysis of edgework activity is used to analyze the formation of delinquent conduct. Edgework activities are defined as risky, life-threatening recreational pursuits (e.g., skydiving, rock climbing, etc.) that people use to escape social constraint and alienation. In this case, delinquency is examined as one possible form of edgework. It provides adolescents with an opportunity to escape their alienation through risky, self-directed delinquent behaviors. This results in a sense of excitement, autonomy and achievement rarely found in the adult world.
A self-report delinquency instrument was administered to a sample of UNLV and Community College of Southern Nevada students (N=226). The data suggests that alienation is an intervening variable in the relationship between oppression and delinquency. The data also suggests that, for highly alienated adolescents, delinquency may serve as a form of edgework.
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My younger brother and I grew up together during the 1970's and early 1980's in a small, industrial Midwestern city. We were raised by our parents in a two bedroom home on the lower west side of the city. Both of us attended public schools.

Our neighborhood was old and well established. The neighbors were very friendly and there were always lots of children around. But like most homes in the city, lot sizes were exceptionally small and grass was scarce. None of the yards in the neighborhood were large enough to accommodate our daily baseball and football games. So from the time I was about ten years old, until well into my teenage years, I spent a lot of my spare time playing at a park located only a few blocks from my house.

It was at the park that I met an elderly gentleman named Joe. Joe and four of his friends (Roy, Augie, Frank and Al) had been regulars at the park for over 25 years. They spent most of their evenings there relaxing. They pitched horseshoes, played cards, ate watermelon and did a lot of story telling. I affectionately referred to Joe and his friends as the "boys."

Over time, Joe took a personal interest in me. He spent a lot of time talking to me and teaching me how to pitch horseshoes. Eventually, we developed a close friendship. Visiting the "boys" at the park was one of my favorite childhood activities.

My fondest memories of Joe and his friends were our conversations. We regularly
sat around a picnic table and talked. Actually, they did most of the talking and I did a lot of the listening. They talked about everything from the war to politics. But perhaps their favorite topic of conversation was children. Joe and his friends frequently expressed their displeasure with my generation. Joe often remarked that when he was a child things were very different. He said that in his day children understood the meaning of hard work, sacrifice and respect. He once told me that "Kids today are a waste. It is frightening to think that this country has to depend on today's children to be tomorrow's leaders."

Joe was always careful to point out that I was an exception. He said that I wasn't like most of "today's" kids. He told me that I had my head screwed on straight and that he expected big things from me. But despite his efforts, his negative view of my generation had a lasting impression on me.

This was made worse by the fact that Joe and his friends were not the only people who felt that way. It seemed like most of the adults I knew had similar feelings (e.g., parents, school teachers, the church pastor, politicians, etc.). I distinctly remember one of my high school English teachers, who was also our senior class advisor, telling us that we were the worst graduating class she had ever seen in more than twenty years of teaching. By the time I was eighteen years old, I had come to believe that I was born into the most unruly, hopeless generation in American history.

It wasn't until I graduated from college and got married that my opinion began to change. I found my friends and I saying the same things about the children of the late 1980's that was once said about the children of the 1970's.

I came to realize that adults are always concerned about the conduct of
adolescents. In fact, concern about the unruliness of adolescents can be traced back to the
times of Aristotle who once remarked that the "young are... ready to carry desire into
action, ... [and are] apt to be carried away by their impulses... [and] carry everything too
far" (as cited in Hall, 1905: 523).

Perhaps my generation was the worst in American history. We'll probably never
know for sure. But there is one thing that I do know, if Joe and the boys were still here,
they would be saying the same things about today's children that they once said about my
generation.

Growing up in an industrial city, playing at the park and meeting Joe had a
tremendous impact on me. These childhood experiences, combined with my formal
education, led me to the study of juvenile delinquency.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As we move into the twenty-first century, crime and delinquency looms as one of America's most important social problems. Police departments across the country complain about a shortage of officers; newspapers and television programs focus on America's crime epidemic; and, every politician vows to be tough on crime. The government and the public are concerned about crime because there doesn't seem to be an effective way to control this phenomenon. Leon Radzinowicz and Marvin Wolfgang once wrote:

There can be no doubt that optimism has gone, platitudes have proven empty. We are living through a time when, more than ever before, there can be no consensus on how to tackle crime (as cited in Weis et al. 1996: xviii).

Little has changed in the twenty-five years since that statement was written. University researchers remain compelled to study crime, delinquency and the criminal justice system. There has been an explosion of criminological literature since 1945. A number of theoretically divergent positions have developed regarding the definitions, causes and solutions of crime and delinquency. One of the most recent contributions is the theory of differential oppression which maintains that delinquency is one of several possible adaptations to oppressive social conditions. This study seeks to contribute to the
criminology literature by utilizing a self-report delinquency survey to test, as well as critically examine, major tenets of the theory of differential oppression.

Robert Regoli and John Hewitt (1994) introduced the theory of differential oppression in 1991. It was revised in 1994. To date, Regoli and Hewitt have authored the only writings on the theory. This study represents one of the first known attempts to empirically test the theory of differential oppression.

The theory assumes that children are raised in an oppressive social environment. This oppression results from the assumptions that adults make about the inferiority and vulnerability of children. The social order, including standards of worth and achievement, is created by adults for the benefit of adults. Children are forced to conform to these standards, despite their reluctance, because they lack the power to create meaningful social change. Adults rarely treat children as subjects. Instead, they treat them as objects to be controlled and manipulated. The extended use of power and authority by adults creates an oppressive social order to which children are expected to conform.

According to Regoli and Hewitt (1994), children do not always accept their role in the social order. Instead, they adapt to their oppression in one of four ways: passive acceptance, exercise of illegitimate coercive power, manipulation of one's peers, or retaliation (p.211). The latter three involve some form of delinquent behavior while the former represents conformity. Further, Regoli and Hewitt point out that it is not the mere existence of oppressive relations with children that create delinquency. Instead, it is their differential oppression that is responsible for the onset of delinquency (p.211). Those children who experience the most severe and frequent forms of oppression (e.g., physical...
abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, etc.) are most likely to respond to their oppression in a way that is officially defined as delinquent.

Regoli and Hewitt maintain that delinquency cannot be located within a given child. It is not biological or psychological in nature. Delinquency is the product of a particular social arrangement. Therefore, the solution is not to treat individual offenders. Rather, the solution rests in creating a social structure that views children as "equally valuable, autonomous, and independent human beings" (Regoli and Hewitt 1994: 211).

The theory of differential oppression is an important contribution to the field because it pays careful attention to the social position of juveniles and the affect that position has on the development of delinquency. However, Regoli and Hewitt's analysis of social status is somewhat narrow. It focuses exclusively on two dimensions of adolescent status: oppression and powerlessness. More than being oppressed and powerless, adolescents are "marginal" members of American society. A marginal status exists when a person is not completely integrated into either of two competing cultures (Park 1928; Stonequist 1937). Adolescents are not totally committed to being children, nor are they completely accepted as adults. Marginality is a unique dimension of adolescent status that receives consideration in this study.

It is important to recognize that although adolescent status is essential to any analysis of delinquency, there are other variables that must be considered (e.g., alienation and risk taking). This study seeks to expand the theory of differential oppression by examining the extent to which the marginal status of juveniles, combined with oppression as detailed by Regoli and Hewitt, serves to foster a sense of alienation among adolescents.
This is a departure from the theory of differential oppression. Regoli and Hewitt never explicitly address or recognize the role of alienation in the formation of delinquency.

This study asserts that all adolescents are alienated to some extent because of the marginal, powerless social position they occupy. Modern American society views children as followers, not leaders. They are rarely given the opportunity for meaningful, responsible participation in society (e.g., they can't vote, work full-time, get married, etc.). The assignment of children to peripheral social roles can increase feelings of isolation and powerlessness among adolescents. Children who do not feel that they are contributing members of society have little reason to feel bound by its rules. Those who are not committed to responsibility and involvement in conventional society are more likely to take an actively rebellious stance toward society (Hawkins et al., 1987).

It is also important to recognize that not all juveniles experience the same degree of alienation. Adolescents exist on a continuum ranging from alienated to extremely alienated. This is also a slight variation on the theory of differential oppression which suggests that children exist on a continuum of oppression. In both cases, it is hypothesized that the more intense the feelings of alienation (or oppression), the greater the risk for delinquency.

Regoli and Hewitt (1994) argue that the "sense of powerlessness and impotency" combined with oppressive acts, lead to various forms (adaptations) of delinquency. However, they never explain why children adapt to their oppression through delinquency instead of through some other form of behavior (e.g., writing, art, sports, etc.). Why is delinquency particularly appealing to adolescents?
This study attempts to answer this question by examining the role of risk taking in the formation of delinquent conduct. Lyng (1990) asserts that constraining social structures motivate people to participate in spontaneous edgework activities. Edgework activities are defined as life-threatening pursuits (e.g., skydiving, rock climbing, etc).

People who experience excessive constraint and alienation often believe that they have little or no control over their lives. Many of these people often choose to participate in life-threatening activities that provide them with an opportunity to control their destiny. Maintaining control and successfully negotiating the edge is the purpose of taking part in a given "edgework" activity. Edgework activity provides participants with the opportunity for self-directing, autonomous activity that is rarely available in their daily lives. This study explores the parallel between edgework and delinquency. In other words, it asks the following two questions: Is delinquency an adolescent form of edgework that allows adolescents a rare opportunity to escape oppressive, alienating social structures? Does delinquency provide children with a sense of power, freedom and responsibility that is not available to them within the traditional social structure?

The role of social bonds as an insulator against alienation, and delinquency, is also examined. Notions of commitment, attachment, belief and involvement are used as measures of social integration (Hirschi 1969). It is assumed that a high degree of social integration serves to insulate adolescents from intense feelings of alienation.

This study attempts to establish oppression and alienation as key concepts in the explanation of juvenile delinquency. Delinquency is examined as a risk taking behavior that allows adolescents to momentarily escape their alienation and capture a sense of
personal autonomy, power and excitement.

Over the last twenty years the public has shown a growing concern over the increase of delinquency and violent crime among our youth. Traditional criminological models used to explain and control delinquency have proven ineffective. This study examines and analyzes a new model of delinquency which will hopefully provide useful insights into the onset, development and control of juvenile delinquency.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews and critically examines the theory of differential oppression. It also reviews the research literature that is used to expand the theory of differential oppression (e.g., marginal status, alienation, edgework).

The Principles of Differential Oppression

The theory of differential oppression is organized around the following four principles (Regoli and Hewitt 1994: 209-211):

1. Adults emphasize order in the home and at school.
2. Adults' perceptions of children establish them as inferior, subordinate, and troublemakers.
3. The imposition of adult conceptions of order on children often becomes extreme to the point of oppression.
4. Oppression leads to adaptive reactions by children:
   a. *Passive acceptance* - Obedience to adult standards and authority based upon fear. This often leads to hatred which is repressed. Such repressed hatred often takes the form of alcoholism, drug addiction or low self-esteem later in life.
   b. *Exercise of illegitimate coercive power* - Delinquent behavior serves as an effort to demonstrate power over adults. Delinquency provides children with a sense of autonomy and control.
   c. *Manipulation of one's peers* - Through such activities children experience a sense of control and empowerment rarely felt.
   d. *Retaliation* - Directly striking out at adults (e.g., vandalism, or at its extreme, the killing of one's parents.).

Regoli and Hewitt (1994) maintain that juvenile delinquency is symptomatic of
oppressive social relations. The form of an adolescent's adaptive behavior is linked to the nature of the oppression they have experienced (e.g., violence, ridicule, intimidation, humiliation, etc.). The next several sections are designed to discuss the propositions listed above.

The Status of Children

Regoli and Hewitt (1994: 7) are gravely concerned about the status of American children. Consider the following:

- Every 32 seconds a baby is born into poverty.
- Every 14 minutes an infant dies in the first year of life.
- Every 13 hours a child under 5 is murdered.
- Every night 100,000 children go to sleep without homes.
- Every week over 9400 babies are born to teenage mothers.
- Every month at least 56,000 children are abused or neglected.
- Every year at least 400,000 youths drop out of school.

There is little reason to believe that these conditions will improve anytime soon.

The social health of American children has declined to its worst level since 1970 (Miringoff 1989). These miserable conditions do not exist without consequences. Juvenile delinquency is not something that just happens. It "represents the culmination of a process that begins at birth and evolves through adolescence" (Regoli and Hewitt 1994: 7). Delinquency is the symptom of a much larger problem that relates to the status children hold in society.

The issue of delinquency cannot be addressed without addressing the status of children. Status is important because it frames human interactions. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) argue that status based on age has important consequences because it relegates the
largest number of people to a subordinate position.

Children occupy one of society's lowest statuses. There are approximately 65 million children in America and none of them have the right to vote, nor do they enjoy the same Constitutional protections as their adult counterparts. As a result of their powerless social position many children are forced to endure serious oppression (e.g., physical punishment, humiliation, unequal opportunity and physical or sexual abuse). Regoli and Hewitt (1994: 9) note that some countries have recognized the potential for such discrimination and have taken steps to address the problem. For example, in the early 1980's Sweden outlawed the humiliation and physical punishment of children. In 1991, Finland attempted to lower the official voting age from 18 years old to five years old. And in 1992, Germany's parliament introduced legislation that prevented spanking and the intentional withholding of affection.

Regoli and Hewitt (1994) maintain that Christianity has played an important role in creating the status of children. A 1990 survey of 113,000 people in the United States found that 86.5% them identified with some branch of Christianity (Goldman 1991). The Judeo-Christian ideology has significantly shaped the values and beliefs of American society. Many of the Bible's teachings establish children as inferior and subordinate. Regoli and Hewitt cite the following passages as support for their position:

Correct thy son, and he shall give thee rest; yea, he shall give delight unto they should (Proverbs 29: 17).

He that spareth his rod hateth his son; but he that loveth him chateneth him betimes. . .Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive him betimes (Proverbs 13: 24).
If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, with not hearken unto them: Then shall his father and his mother . . . bring him out unto . . . the gate of his place; And they shall say unto the elder of his city, this our son is stubborn and rebellious. . . . And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he die. . . . (Deuteronomy 21: 18-21).

The point here is not that the Bible has caused the abuse of children. Rather, the lessons of the Bible have been influential in justifying the swift, harsh and virtuous punishment of children. The Bible clearly establishes children as inferior to adults, and thereby are subject to their control.

Religion is not the only vehicle used to establish children as inferior. The law has also played a crucial role in this regard. For example, the United States Constitution does not extend the concept of "rights" to children. In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1, 17 (1967) states:

If his parents default in effectively performing their custodial function - that is, if the child is "delinquent" - the state may intervene. In doing so, it does not deprive the child of any rights, because he has none.

The Oppression of Children

Regoli and Hewitt (1994) maintain that it is not teaching children right from wrong that is the problem. It is the methods that adults often rely on to teach children that are problematic (e.g., threats, intimidation and physical abuse). Oppression exists when:

... one, or more, identifiable segments of the population in a social system systematically . . . act over . . . time to prevent another identifiable segment of the population from attaining access to the scarce and valued resources of the system (Turner, Singleton and Musick as cited in Regoli and Hewitt 1994: 12).

Adults oppress children because of their need to isolate and control them.
Children are forced to live in a social order that is created by adults. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) point out that the family is a microcosm of society. It is also the most common site of oppression. Children who don't conform to the social order are labeled as deviants or trouble makers who must be punished.

Regoli and Hewitt (1994) side with psychologist Alice Miller who believes that adults have been taught a dangerous set of beliefs about child rearing. The following beliefs mold relationships between parents and children (Miller as cited in Regoli and Hewitt 1994: 14):

1. Adults are the masters of the dependent child, and determine what is right and wrong.
2. The child is held responsible for the anger of adults.
3. What children feel poses a threat to autocratic adults.
4. The child's will must be “broken” as soon as possible.

Miller believes that these beliefs lead adults to teach children the following lessons about childhood:

1. Parents deserve respect because they are parents, and, children are undeserving of respect because they are children.
2. Obedience makes a child strong.
3. People who love you also hurt you.
4. The way you behave is more important than the way you really are.
5. Parents are free of drives and guilt.
6. Parents are always right.

She concludes that the most important thing children learn from this is that they should not be aware of what their parent’s are doing to them. Children believe that they must be passive and respectful. Their feelings and ideas are not important.

Regoli and Hewitt (1994) suggest that all adults oppress children, but some more directly than others. They detail three major forms of oppression: individual, collective
and institutional. Individual oppression refers to acts committed by adults designed to
directly and personally oppress children. Such acts would include, but are not limited to,
abuse, neglect and tough love.

Collective oppression occurs when adults, as a group, endorse policies that are not
designed to impact a specific child, but rather, are intended to affect all children.
Examples would include: a community's failure to support school bond issues; protests
about the high cost of child health care programs; the prohibition of children from public
areas like restaurants or apartment complexes; and, objecting to the construction of
children's shelters (Regoli and Hewitt 1994).

Finally, Regoli and Hewitt (1994: 16) maintain that no matter what social
institution is examined - health care, the economy, religion, school and the family -
children are the victims of oppression. And although this may be true, this study is
particularly concerned with the role of the family and the school in the oppression of
children. Particular attention is given to these two institutions because it is at home and in
school that young children spend the most time during their formative years. These
institutions play vital roles in the socialization and supervision of children.

Oppression and the Family

The family is responsible for the control, discipline and development of children. It
is their role in creating and maintaining order that is of particular interest here.

The relationship between parenting and delinquency has received considerable
attention in the literature. The major debate surrounds two types of parenting control:
direct and indirect. Direct controls refer to a parent's use of monitoring, supervision and
punishment. Indirect controls are the affective bonds (e.g., attachment and commitment)
that exist between parents and children (Burton 1995).

Both Nye (1958) and Hirschi (1969) maintain that direct controls are limited in
their ability to prevent delinquency. They believed that adolescents spend too much time
away from their parents for monitoring and supervision to be effective. While discussing
the utility of direct parental controls, Nye (1958: 7) writes:

It is effective only when the child can expect to be detected in the
delinquent act, is actually within the physical limits of the house, or is
otherwise under the surveillance of adults. Since there are many times
when the child is outside the sphere of direct control, it cannot be effective
by itself.

Hirschi maintains that direct controls add little to the results achieved by the use of
indirect controls. He wrote (1969: 88):

Since most delinquent acts require little time, and since most adolescents
are frequently exposed to situations potentially definable as opportunities
for delinquency, the amount of time spent with parents would probably be
only a minor factor in delinquency prevention. So-called "direct control" is
not, except as a limiting case, of much substantive or theoretical
importance.

There is a substantial research tradition that underscores the importance of indirect
parental controls (Hirschi 1969; Wells and Rankin 1988; Akers 1994; Rankin and Kern
1994). However, there is also a substantial number of recent studies that have found a
significant relationship between direct parental controls and delinquency (Hagan et al.
1985; Smith and Paternoster 1987; Cernkovich and Giordano 1987; Wells and Rankin
1988; and, Rankin and Kern 1994).
Indirect and direct parental controls represent two dichotomous parenting philosophies. But, there are a number of specific child-rearing strategies that might help us to assess the impact of parenting on the formation of delinquent conduct.

Strong and DeVault (1986: 375-377) discuss three common styles of child-rearing relevant to the discussion of family order. These styles are: authoritarian, authoritative and permissive. Authoritarian parents tend to be strict and rigid. They typically require absolute obedience. These parents commonly say things like "do so because I said so," or they use physical force to ensure obedience. Maintaining control of their children is the primary goal. Working-class families tend to be more authoritarian than middle-class families (Kohn as cited in Strong and DeVault 1986: 375).

The authoritative approach differs significantly from the authoritarian approach. Authoritative parents rely on positive reinforcement and an infrequent use of punishment. They try to encourage the development of their children's autonomy within reasonable limits. Open lines of communication play an important role in authoritative child-rearing strategies. Children raised by authoritative parents tend to approach stressful situations with curiosity and show high levels of self-reliance, self-control and friendliness (Baumrind as cited in Strong and DeVault 1986: 375).

The permissive approach is most common in middle-class families. Permissive parent's generally value the autonomy of their children. But, they often rely on manipulation and justification when dealing with children. For example, when Susan says she wants to go to a water slide park for her birthday, her father may say, "Well, that sounds fine, but perhaps you would rather go to an amusement park. After all, it is getting
cooler in the evenings now and we could not stay very long at the water slide park. Not only that, there have been a lot of accidents there lately. If we went to an amusement park we could spend the whole day and maybe stay over night. I really think maybe it would be better to go to the amusement park, don't you? . . I'm glad you agree." The freedom that children experience with the permissive approach may not be real. The child is supposedly free because s/he conforms willingly, but such freedom is not authentic since the child is ultimately influenced by an authority figure. Permissive child-rearing styles send this message: "Do what we tell you to do because you want to do it" (Strong and DeVault 1986: 376).

Diana Baumrind also acknowledges the existence of authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles, but adds a third, indulgent parents; and a fourth, indifferent parents (as cited in Regoli and Hewitt 1994: 239-240). Indulgent parents maximize the freedom of their children and place few demands on them. These parents don't want to actively control their children's lives. Instead, they wish to serve as a resource that their children may or may not choose to use. Indifferent parents put very little energy into parenting and have very little interest in their children's lives. They tend to be more concerned about their own lives than the lives of their children.

Each of the parenting styles discussed produces different types of children who are more or less likely to exhibit certain behavioral characteristics. Children of authoritarian parents tend to be less happy, moody, passively hostile, vulnerable to stress and have low self-esteem (Belsky 1984). There is also some evidence that suggests they are vulnerable to delinquency (Conger and Conger 1994). Children raised by authoritative parents tend
to be well adjusted and socially competent (Maccoby and Martin 1983; Fletcher et al. 1995). Indulgent parents are more likely to produce irresponsible children that shy away from leadership roles (Regoli and Hewitt 1994: 240). According to Pulkkinen (1982), children raised by indifferent parents are most likely to participate in delinquency.

All child-rearing styles are oppressive to the extent that they use varying degrees of coercive power to create and maintain order. Child-rearing styles could be placed on a continuum with authoritarian being the most oppressive and indifferent being the least oppressive. But ultimately, no matter which parenting style is used, children are subject to the authority of their parents, and they lack the social power to change their social position, even if such a change is in their best interest.

Parenting styles represent only one form of oppression that takes place within the family. And although most people view the family as a place where love and affection are freely shared, Gelles and Pedrick-Cornell (1990: 27) point out that "the history of Western society is one in which children have been subjected to unspeakable cruelties." Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980: 13) have argued that the family is probably the most violent institution that a person will encounter; they concluded that "violence between family members is probably as common as love."

Straus and Gelles (1986) found that more than 10 out of every 1000 children under age eighteen are seriously abused or neglected every year (See Straus 1991 for an examination of violence in the American family). This study also showed that over 200,000 children are seriously assaulted each year; 100,000 are seriously injured, some with permanent impairment, each year. More than 1,000 children are killed each year as a
result of abuse and neglect.

Sexual abuse and neglect are also serious problems. Neglect can include any of the following: inadequate medical care; emotional cruelty; improper supervision; financial exploitation; and, keeping children out of school or exposing a child to immoral or criminal conduct (Meier 1964). One study of over 540,000 child abuse cases from 19 states revealed that 59 percent of these cases were neglect; 28 percent physical abuse; and, 13 percent sexual abuse (U.S. Congress 1989). The combination of restrictive child-rearing practices, and the physical/sexual abuse of children contributes substantially to the oppression of children.

**Oppression and the School**

Other than the family, the school probably plays the most important role in the socialization of children. This study is particularly interested in the social structure and normative order that is created and maintained by schools.

At home, most children are exposed to a social order that ranges from authoritarian to indifferent. Children's experiences with discipline and social order at home vary widely. But at most mainstream American schools, children are faced with an authoritarian social order.

At school, children are confronted with a social order that they have had no say in creating. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) maintain that the school is a serious source of oppression for children. Relying on the work of Paulo Freire (1990: 59), they maintain that school oppression mirrors the oppression they experience in the larger society.
According to Freire:

1. The teacher teaches and the students are taught;
2. the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing;
3. the teacher thinks and the students are taught about it;
4. the teacher talks and the students listen-mekky;
5. the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined;
6. the teacher chooses and enforces his/her choice, the students comply;
7. the teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the teacher;
8. the teacher chooses the program content, and the students (who were not consulted) adopt it;
9. the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with her/his professional authority, which s/he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students;
10. the teacher is "subject" of the learning process, while the pupils are mere "objects."

Students are forced to obey a set of rules created by a group of adults who have been given "official" authority. Students are susceptible to censorship (e.g., language, newspaper content, etc.), random locker searches, and suspensions/expulsions based on the subjective opinion of a given principal (See Regoli and Hewitt: 249-251 for a detailed discussion).

The school has an enormous amount of power that it uses to create standards of achievement, worth and normality. Children who do not fit these arbitrary standards are considered outsiders (e.g., abnormal, deviant, slow, etc.). Harry Gracey (1977) believes that from the very first day of school, children are arbitrarily judged by authoritarian adults. It is on the basis of such judgements that children are labeled "good" or "bad." Further, Gracey (1977) maintains that primary purpose of kindergarten is not academic preparation. Instead, it is designed to teach children how to "fit in" to a bureaucratic
school system. According to Gracey (1977: 217):

The unique job of the kindergarten in the education division of labor seems rather to be teaching children the student role. The student role is the repertoire of the behavior and attitudes regarded by educators as appropriate to children in school.

Children must be taught the importance of following rules and submitting to authority. In other words, children must be taught to do what they are told without every questioning why (Gracey 1977: 225). The more obedient a child is, the more likely it is that they will be labeled a "good kid." Students who question or disobey authority are more likely to be labeled "bad students." They are also more likely to be unsuccessful in school (Kelly 1982).

Those students who are successfully labeled will be most seriously affected. Once negative labels are initiated at school, they tend to be reinforced at home by parents and neighbors. Such labels can significantly affect a child's self-concept. Students who are labeled "dumb," "bad" or "slow" often realize that they are powerless to resist or change such labels. Once adults in authority apply a label, little can be done to change it. Many of these children fall victim to a self-fulfilling prophecy. They begin to act the way that people expect them to act, in this case, delinquent. The opposite may be true for those students who receive positive labels such as "bright" or "well behaved."

Labeling is not the only way that the school impacts the opportunities of its students. Schools frequently use their power and discretion to structure the opportunities of students. Tracking and subject channeling are two practices that have the potential to limit certain students' opportunities.
Mainstream American schools tend to be extremely authoritarian institutions that drastically limit the freedom, creativity and autonomy of children. Such limitations can intensify adolescents' feelings of alienation.

The school acts to separate the "good children" from the "bad children." Labels attached in school have a tremendous impact on the future opportunities of children.

**Differential Oppression: Evaluation and Critique**

The theory of differential oppression is a dynamic and innovative approach to juvenile delinquency. It is an important contribution to the delinquency literature because of its thorough and provocative analysis of the status of children, and the affect of that status on the formation of delinquent conduct. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) do a good job demonstrating the social nature of delinquency.

Despite its contributions, the theory of differential oppression is vulnerable to at least six major criticisms. First, Regoli and Hewitt (1994) rely on rather vague, and at times, contradictory notions of oppression. For example, Regoli and Hewitt (1994) maintain all of the following:

Oppression is the unjust use of authority. This misuse of authority often results from attempts by one group to impose its conception of order on another group. Oppression socially, emotionally, or physically restrains, restricts, and prevents people from living the way they would in the absence of oppressive force (p. 206).

Do children desire order? We believe they do, but whose order do they desire? One imposed by adults or one that they help create (p. 213).

Oppression describes a situation . . . where identifiable segments of the population . . . prevent another identifiable segment . . . from attaining valuable resources (Turner as cited in Regoli and Hewitt 1994: 12).
Juvenile delinquency or its prevention does not result from parents teaching right from wrong, but from how they teach (p. 12).

Clearly there are occasions when adults exercise their power over children out of sincere concern for a child's welfare (p. 208).

The above quotes appear to endorse competing positions. On one hand, Regoli and Hewitt (1994) place a high premium on the freedom and autonomy of children. They believe that children should be considered "equally valuable, autonomous and independent human beings" (p. 211). But at the same time they appear to recognize the need for parents to teach children "right" from "wrong." The recognition of basic "rights" and "wrongs" seems to imply their belief in a preferred social order, one with a particular sense of virtue. Further, they seem to accept the idea that parents can legitimately use their power if it is out of sincere concern for the child.

In many ways, these are incommensurable positions. How can children be free and autonomous, but still subject to the legitimate use of power by their parents? How is legitimate parental power/authority distinguished from illegitimate parental power/authority? At what point does restraint and restriction become oppression? Regoli and Hewitt's (1994) failure to address these questions make their concept of oppression difficult to operationalize.

A second criticism concerns Regoli and Hewitt's (1994) gender neutral approach to parenting. Parenting is a complex and dynamic process. For example, parents may not be authoritarian or indulgent, they may be both. Perhaps some parents are authoritarian about some things (e.g., homework and dating), but indulgent about others (e.g., curfew). It is also possible that a child's mother and father may have different parenting styles. For
example, the father may be indulgent while the mother is authoritarian. Relying on parenting styles to make generalizations about levels of oppression can be problematic.

A gender neutral approach also leaves the theory of differential oppression implicitly vulnerable to charges of misogyny by some feminists. Dougherty (1995: 7) points out that "by talking about the negative consequences of parental behavior... it does not take a giant leap in thinking to infer that what is really being explored are the negative consequences of maternal, not parental, abuse since mothers (both single and married) are still the ones who carry the heaviest burden of child care in our society."

Third, the theory of differential oppression tries to cover too much ground. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) try to explain too many different types of delinquency. The four adaptations they offer attempt to explain practically every form of delinquency from vandalism, to drug use, to murder and practically everything in between. But they fail to explain why some adolescents choose one form of delinquency while others choose another form.

Fourth, the theory of differential oppression appears overly deterministic. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) implicitly suggest that seriously abused and neglected children are destined to become delinquent because of the crushing weight of their oppression. Regoli and Hewitt (1994: 213) do try to avoid charges of determinism by suggesting that: "Not all seriously oppressed children become delinquent. Because children are differently situated in society, they have different options for working out their responses to oppression." Unfortunately there is little discussion of what these options are or why some children successfully utilize them while others become delinquent.
A fifth criticism concerns the empirical evidence that links serious oppression to delinquency. Regoli and Hewitt (1994: 211) rely on an extensive research tradition (McCord 1983; Geller and Ford-Somma 1984; Welsh 1985; Burgess et al. 1987; Fagan and Wexler 1987; Cavaiola and Schiff 1988; Gray 1988; Sandberg 1989) to argue that the link between serious oppression and delinquency is exceptionally strong. However, it is important to note that this body of research has been heavily criticized on methodological grounds (Widom 1989; Howing et al. 1990; Schwartz et al. 1994).

Zingraff et al. (1993: 175-176) identifies five central problems with this research tradition: (1) the use of convenience samples; (2) the failure to confirm self-reported accounts of abuse through official records; (3) the failure to use comparison samples of children as a baseline against which to compare the delinquency of abused and neglected children; (4) the heavy reliance on retrospective research designs which sample only delinquent children; and, (5) the frequent failure to control for other factors that may influence the abuse - delinquency relationship (e.g., social class, family environment, etc.). Doerner (1987) concluded that the research in this area is so seriously flawed that it could never provide an empirical link between the maltreatment of children and delinquency.

Some studies have attempted to overcome these methodological limitations. The results have been mixed. Alfaro (1981) and Eckenrode (1993) found that children are surprisingly resilient and tend not to be adversely affected by their maltreatment. Brown (1984) found no correlation between physical abuse and delinquency, but did find a relationship between delinquency and emotional abuse and neglect. And Zingraff et al. (1993) concluded that any significant relationship between delinquency and maltreatment
disappears when one controls for status offenses. They maintain that the relationship between maltreatment and delinquency has been exaggerated.

When carefully examined, the evidence linking oppression to delinquency is not as overwhelming as suggested by Regoli and Hewitt (1994). Most of the methodologically improved studies are inconclusive or, at best, suggest a weak connection between maltreatment and delinquency (See Schwartz et al. 1994).

The final criticism addresses Regoli and Hewitt's (1994) unrealistic solution to delinquency. They suggest that we address the delinquency problem by "empowering children with the same rights and privileges available to adults; consider them equal to adults, as women are to men" (p. 214). In an ideal world this may be possible, but in the real world there are power differentials that prohibit such equality. Blau (1964) points out that people always behave in ways that increase the likelihood of them getting what they want. The kind of equality that Regoli and Hewitt speak of cannot exist in a capitalist society which is built on power differentials and competition.

**Beyond Differential Oppression: The Marginal Status of Adolescents**

Although socialization is a life long process, it can be broken down into three major stages: childhood, adolescence and adulthood. Most of the time the socialization process runs smoothly. However, the transitions from one stage to the next can be problematic. This is particularly true of the transition from adolescence to adulthood.

Some preindustrial societies use a "rite of passage" ceremony to designate a child's transition into adulthood. Such ceremonies assure young people that their status has
officially changed. From that point forward they will be treated not as children, but as respected members of the community who enjoy all the responsibilities and privileges of adulthood.

Modern industrial societies, like America, offer no such assurance. Adolescence is a confusing and uncertain time in a child's life. Adolescents believe that they are mentally and physically prepared for marriage and work, but they are denied both. Teenagers are told to act like young adults, not children, yet they don't receive the respect and status of adults. Children are left to create an identity distinct from both childhood and adulthood. This identity frequently manifests itself in teenage clothing, hairstyles, music, language, etc. (McAlexander and Schouten 1989). For most children this is a very difficult task. Simmons, Rosenberg and Rosenberg (1973) found that early adolescence was the most difficult and confusing time for children. Young adolescents were found to have lower self-esteem, less confidence and were more self-conscious than younger children.

It has also been suggested that males and females react differently to adolescence. Boys tend to withdraw, lose sleep and become irritable (Baron and Joly 1988). Girls often feel inadequate or unintelligent (Tavris 1992: 32); and frequently they turn their frustration inward by becoming fixated on their physical appearance (Baron and Joly 1988). The roots of many eating disorders can be found in childhood (See Chernin 1981).

Park (1928) and Stonequist (1937) developed the phrase "marginal man" to describe a situation encountered by first generation children of immigrants. These children were exposed to competing cultures; one at home and one at school. At home, children were exposed to the language, values and traditions of their parent's homeland. But at
school, these children were exposed to the language, values and traditions of America.

The word marginal is used to describe a person who is not integrated into either of two competing cultures. American teenagers are marginal to the extent that they neither children, nor adults. Perhaps their position is best described by the concept of liminality.

According to Turner (1969: 95), liminality:

> ... describes a condition where people slip through the network of commonly accepted and understood classifications that normally locate states and positions of status in cultural states. ... Liminal entities are neither here nor there; they are betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention and ceremony.

American society has no culturally accepted way of making the transition from adolescence to adulthood. Davison and Davison (1979) have described adolescence in America as a "big waiting room."

Marginal statuses are difficult to accept (see Polk 1984 for a discussion of the school's role in creating marginal youth). Cohen (1955) expanded on Merton's theory of anomie by suggesting that a large amount of delinquency behavior results from "status frustration." Cohen argued that lower class boys yearned for the same status as their middle class counterparts. Unfortunately structural barriers existed that denied lower class boys an equal opportunity to be successful through conventional means. As a result, many of them attempted to achieve monetary success and status through delinquent activities.

Cohen's use of the term "status frustration" is useful, but perhaps too narrowly defined. His analysis is limited that of lower class boys. It is my contention that all adolescents, by nature of their marginal status, experience some degree of status frustration. In other words, young people actively seek the power, privilege and
autonomy that they associate with adulthood. Since such things aren't available to them through conventional channels, delinquency serves as an effective substitute.

Marginality is a state of non-interaction. People are not integrated into either of two or more competing groups or cultures. An inability to effectively integrate into a social structure leaves one very vulnerable to feelings of alienation. Adolescents are no different. Their inability to be neither "children" nor "adults" leaves them particularly vulnerable to alienation.

### Alienation and Juvenile Delinquency

Regoli and Hewitt (1994) did an excellent job demonstrating how adults use power, authority and other oppressive means (e.g., abuse, neglect, etc.) to create a social order that views children as subordinate. However, they were much less effective in showing a relationship between the maltreatment of children (oppression) and delinquency. In other words, Regoli and Hewitt (1994) have shown that oppression is an important issue related to the issue of delinquency, but they have not shown exactly how oppression creates delinquency.

Such a relationship may be difficult to demonstrate because of the subjective nature of alienation which makes it difficult to operationalize. What one person believes is oppressive, another may find beneficial. Take for example two friends of mine, Joe and Rich. While I went away to college, they both joined the same branch of the military. After several months, Joe quit. He wrote me a letter and said that the military was overly authoritarian. He found his experience to be self-destructive and humiliating. He had
nothing but contempt for his superiors. Rich, on the other hand was proud to be in the military. He said that it was tough, but it was a beneficial experience that taught him a lot about discipline and self-reliance. Rich had nothing but respect for his superiors. Joe and Rich experienced the military in very different ways. One found it oppressive, while the other found it liberating.

This is one of the problems with the concept of oppression. It is very difficult to define. Alienation on the other hand is a much easier concept to operationalize. It refers to feelings of detachment and powerlessness. Although different things may cause alienation in different people, the experience of alienation is much easier to operationalize, and therefore measure.

In this study, I will suggest that oppression does not cause delinquency. Instead, oppression forces children to occupy a marginal status in society. As marginal members of society, adolescents become alienated. They never develop the sense that they are valued, respected, autonomous, contributing members of society. In this sense, they have no personal investment in society or its rules. To this degree, alienation, not oppression, should be examined as a key variable in the explanation of delinquency.

It would be difficult to begin any theoretical discussion of alienation without discussing the work of Karl Marx. In his early writings, Marx details four types of alienation (see Marx's essay on Alienated Labor in McLellan 1977: 81-83): (1) alienation of the worker from the product; (2) alienation of the worker from the act of production; (3) alienation of the worker from their species being; and, (4) alienation of human beings from human beings. But before specifically addressing types of alienation, it would be
beneficial to understand Marx's conception of human labor. For Marx (1963: 127), "labor, productive life. . . is man's species-life. A person's very nature is determined by their work. It is through labor that people express and ultimately realize themselves. Marx (1964: 113) draws a sharp distinction between human work and animal work with the following quote:

Man makes his life activity itself the object of his will and of his consciousness. His conscious life activity distinguishes man immediately from animal life activity. It is just because of this that he is a species being. Or rather, it is only because he is a species being that he is a conscious being, i.e., that his own life is an object for him. Only because of that is his activity free activity.

Marx maintained that humans don't labor out of physical need like animals. Their motivation is nothing other than the need to creatively express themselves. Closely related to this, and essential to Marx's theory of alienation, is the notion of species-being. Human beings are seen as self-conscious members of a universal species. People are united by a human nature, or essence, which is shared by all people. He argues that humans' basic nature is in conflict with the social and economic conditions created under capitalism. According to Marx, capitalism causes people to become alien from their essential nature (i.e., free, creative labor).

With these principles in mind, it is now possible to examine Marx's theory of alienation. First, there is alienation from the product. In an ideal society, objectification is a beneficial process whereby a person expresses themselves through creative labor. According to Marx, the individual "reproduces himself. . . actively and in a real sense, and he sees his own reflection in a world which he has constructed" (Marx 1963: 128).
Capitalistic society perverts this process. Products that are produced no longer represent individual freedom, creativity and personality. Instead, they represent the interests of capitalists. The worker cannot choose how, where, when or even how much of a product to produce. Instead s/he is directed to do so by others.

School represents the work of children. Their school work is a reflection of them and their creativity. When adults and institutions use authority to control and manipulate school children (e.g., tracking, subject channeling, etc.) it results in alienation. In the Marxist sense, children become alienated from their product.

Alienation from the process of production is a second form of alienation relevant to our discussion of children. Capitalism carefully controls production. As such, Marx (1963: 125) claims that a worker "does not fulfill himself in his work, but denies himself, has a feeling of misery rather than well-being, does not develop freely his spiritual and physical power, but is physically exhausted and spiritually debased".

For Marx (1963: 71), labor can be one's own only when it is free and self-guided. Capitalism does not permit such labor. Work becomes analogous to "slave labor." Children find themselves in a similar situation since all of their actions are carefully controlled and scrutinized by adults. Children must limit their activity (e.g., thoughts, actions, etc.) to those things that are found acceptable by adults. Children are precluded from doing anything that challenges the established adult order. Since children are not free, they are alienated from the process of production. But in the case of children, it is not just production of material goods, but production of the social order (e.g., home, school, etc.).
Marx (1964: 11) also discusses the alienation of the worker from their species-being. According to him, labor is the "objectification of man's species life." Labor is how human activity becomes objective. In this way, it becomes the foundation of social life. A person's labor is aimed at creating objects that have meaning and can be used by all humankind. So when one becomes alienated from their product (personal objectifications) and from the act of production (the means by which people relate), it follows that people are alienated from their species-being (Dickens and Lacy 1977). Adults do their best to control what children produce and how they produce it. Children rarely have the freedom to produce exactly what they want, in the way they want to produce it. As a result, children are alienated from their species being.

Briefly summarizing Marx's ideas on alienation, one common theme can be identified. He placed a premium on the notion of free, creative labor. He believed that it was through such labor that human beings expressed themselves. Capitalist efforts to control labor served to suppress the expression of self, and as such, resulted in alienation from one's products, the productive process, from one's species being and ultimately from society itself.

In Marxist terms, the workers, or proletariat, were alienated by a capitalist system run by the bourgeoisie. Marx maintained that capitalist control over production alienated human beings from their basic nature which is rooted in the freedom of expression. These ideas are directly applicable to the life experience of American children. But in America it is the adults who represent the bourgeoisie and the children the proletariat. Adults carefully control the movement and expression of children. Children are not permitted to
express themselves freely. Instead, they are forced to conform to an adult social order. According to Marx, these experiences can only result in alienation.

Most critical to a Marxist analysis of the status of juveniles is powerlessness. For Marx, the inability to freely create and produce is the greatest cause of alienation. Several additional measures of social power are used in this study to determine the extent to which adolescents actively and freely control their lives at home and in school.

Colvin and Pauly (1983) draw on Marx's ideas to develop what has been termed an integrated structural theory of crime. They maintain that crime can in large part be explained by family socialization. More particularly, they suggest that working class people who hold low status jobs are most likely to experience coercive control patterns at work (e.g., with employees and supervisors) which frequently lead to strain and alienation. These control patterns are reproduced at home and often result in inconsistent, overly harsh discipline. These same control patterns that alienate parents from their workplace serve to alienate children from their parents and their homes.

Children experience the same kind of authoritarian, coercive controls at school that they do at home. The children's resentment of such authority patterns can lead to adjustment problems at school. Colvin and Pauly (1983) also note that children of working class parents are likely to face a series of institutional challenges at school. For example, they are more likely to attend economically deprived schools, score poorly on standardized tests and be placed on slower learning tracks. Such institutional barriers result in increased strain and alienation.

Colvin and Pauly (1983) argue that childrens' feelings of alienation at home and in
school is reinforced by their associations with similarly alienated peers. Patterns of delinquency are likely to emerge from these peer groups (Krueger et al. 1994). Research by Messner and Krohn (1990) supported the major tenets of integrated structural theory.

Marxist theories describe alienation on the objective level. Alienation is a denial of control over the decisions affecting one's life (Wolfstetter-Kausch and Gaier 1981). Marx referred to this as the separateness of the worker from his work. But alienation also exists on the psychological subjective level. Gold (1969) discusses three feelings of alienation: (1) powerlessness; (2) feelings of meaninglessness and social isolation; and, (3) self-estrangement. Self-estrangement was also an important dimension of Marx's theory of alienation. This study utilizes Srole's (1956) Anomia Scale to obtain measures of powerlessness, isolation and self-estrangement.

Beyond the theoretical, there are a number of empirical studies that link alienation with various forms of delinquent behavior. Wynn (1976: 23) claims that "America has witnessed a steady growth of alienation among adolescents and youth... the means through which this alienation has been expressed have varied: attitude changes, drugs, suicide, and overt antisocial conduct."

In a study of attempted suicide, Wenz (1979) sampled two hundred phone calls from a crisis intervention center in the northern United States. Wenz (1979: 19) concluded:

... adolescence by itself seems to be a good predictor of whether or not a person will attempt suicide strongly suggests that there is something about the condition of adolescence which underlies this type of behavior. One possibility is that biological maturation is itself the crucial variable. Alternatively, the argument which follows concentrates on a major
sociological aspect of adolescence - the adolescent's relative alienation from institutionalized social life. Alienation may be endemic to the period of adolescence.

Schaffer and Deblasiie (1984) found a relationship between juvenile prostitution and alienation. More particularly, they note that "when children experience failure in the traditional setting, they find reinforcement on the streets and among peers. Childhood experiences such as parental neglect and abuse, academic failure, and alienation are the foundation upon which the young build their lives" (p.695).

Raymond Calabrese has conducted a number of studies that examine the link between alienation and delinquency. In one study on academic dishonesty, he sampled a number of high school students, some from a private high school and some from a public high school. He found that those who exhibited higher levels of alienation were most likely to cheat (Calabrese and Cochran 1990). In another study, Calabrese and Adams (1990) investigated differences in alienation between incarcerated and nonincarcerated youth. They found that incarcerated youth had significantly higher levels of total alienation, isolation and powerlessness than their nonincarcerated counterparts. Calabrese and Adams recognize that incarceration may serve as an alienating factor, therefore these results must be viewed very tentatively.

But perhaps the most significant study to date was conducted by Krueger and his colleagues (1994: 328). They examined a birth cohort of 862 male and female 18 year olds and found that "youths involved in extensive delinquency were uniquely characterized by feelings of alienation, lack of social closeness and risk taking."

Countless studies have associated adolescent alienation with delinquency. Hirschi
(1969) indirectly addresses adolescent alienation by focusing his research on the importance of social bonds. His version of social control theory argues that the stronger a child's bond to society (i.e., the less alienation they experience), the less likely that child is to become delinquent. Social bonds are characterized by four major elements: (1) attachment to friends, family and school; (2) commitment to education, a career and a successful future; (3) belief in honesty, thoughtfulness and fairness; and, (4) involvement in school and community activities. According to Hirschi (1969), strong social bonds are most effective in insulating children from alienation and delinquency.

In an effort to test his social bond theory, Hirshi (1969) administered a self-report survey to approximately 4,000 junior and senior high school students in California. He found the following: children with a strong attachment to their parents were less likely to break the law; commitment to conventional values was related to conventional behavior; and, children involved in conventional activities were less likely to engage in delinquent behavior.

Hirschi's social bond theory has been one of the most influential, and most tested, of all criminological theories. A number of other research efforts have validated Hirschi's original findings (Hindelange 1973; Calabrese and Schumer 1986; Cochran and Akers 1989; Junger and Polder 1992; also see Akers (1994) for a review of studies that support social bond theory.). Others studies have not supported Hirschi's theory (Krohn and Massey 1980; Warr 1993; also see Curran and Renzetti 1994 for a review of studies that do not support social bond theory.). Overall, social bond theory appears to be best suited for explaining non-serious delinquency.
It should be clear that any discussion of juvenile delinquency must include a discussion of adolescent alienation (see also Calabrese 1987). The literature establishes a strong connection between alienation and delinquency.

**The Relationship Between Alienation and Risk Taking**

Although it appears clear that there is some kind of relationship between alienation and delinquency, one has to ask the question why? What is it about feelings of alienation that draw many children into delinquent activity?

Stephen Lyng's (1990) analysis of risk taking provides a unique theoretical model that can be applied to juvenile delinquency. Edgework refers to voluntary risk taking (e.g., hang gliding, skydiving and rock climbing, etc.). Lyng was drawn to the study of edgework because of what he thought was an interesting paradox. On one hand, most Americans agree about the importance of reducing threats to personal well-being. On the other hand, there are people who actively seek out activities that have a potential for serious injury or death. Why?

Lyng (1990) begins to answer this question by examining the nature of life, and work, in America. He argues that American life is increasingly mechanical, bureaucratic, rigid and impersonal. In general, he concludes that the modern American life, particularly work, has enormous potential for creating alienation.

Lyng (1990) maintains that people, particularly workers, have increasingly less control over their lives (i.e., as a result of technology, etc.). It is important to understand that in modern American society it is not just the factory worker who is estranged from.
his/her work. According to Lyng (1990: 876):

The general tendency toward a "deskilling" of work in economies dominated by mass-production industries and bureaucratic decision making and authority structures means that workers at many different levels, ranging from service workers to certain types of professionals, may be forced to work under alienating conditions.

It is alienation and the lack of control over one's daily work (life) that leads people to edgework activities.

Edgework presents people with an opportunity for creative, skillful, self-determining action (Lyng 1990: 877). Edgeworkers are not thrill seekers or gamblers. Instead, they believe in their ability to confront and overcome danger. Edgeworkers want an opportunity to exercise their skill in overcoming a serious challenge.

According to Lyng (1990), edgeworkers are not interested in activities where they are not in complete control of the situation (e.g., roller coaster rides). Edgework activities are accompanied by at least four distinct sensations: (1) self-determination; (2) fear of failure; (3) excitement; and (4) hyperreality (i.e., edgework experiences feel more real than their daily life experiences (Lyng 1990: 860-861)). Lyng (1990: 855) maintains that the concept of edgework "allows us to view high-risk behavior as involving, most fundamentally, the problem of negotiating the boundary between chaos and order.

Lyng's analysis of edgework can be easily applied to the phenomena of juvenile delinquency. In other words, delinquency can be examined as voluntary risk taking.

Children, perhaps more than any other single group, occupy a marginal social position. They rarely, if ever, have the opportunity for genuinely free, creative, self-directed behavior. For the most part, their lives are carefully controlled and ordered.
According to Lyng's model (1990), one would expect children to search for autonomous, creative, self-directing activities. Delinquency may serve as one such activity. All edgework activities involve a threat to one's physical or mental well-being or one's sense of order (Lyng 1990: p.857). And as mentioned earlier, such activities are accompanied by sensations of self-determinism, fear, excitement and hyperreality. Delinquent behavior has the potential to fall within such parameters (See Katz 1988 for a discussion of the seductions of crime. Notions of excitement and hyperreality receive particular attention).

Not only do we know that adolescents are alienated, but we also know that they are risk takers. Three quarters of "adolescent deaths are caused by accidents, homicides and suicide, all of which indicate a lethal propensity for risk taking" (Goleman 1987: C1).

Delinquent activities can provide children with a sense of personal autonomy and excitement that allows them to momentarily escape their otherwise routine, alienated existence. This study seeks to examine juvenile delinquency as an edgework activity.

**Concluding Remarks and Research Questions**

A review of the literature has shown the importance of a number of concepts in the study of juvenile delinquency. The theoretical perspective used in this study suggests that an oppressive social structure serves to foster feelings of alienation in adolescents. Due to their marginal social position, children don't have the social power to effectively alter their social environment. Feelings of alienation and helplessness lead children to take part in delinquent activities because they provide them with a sense of personal autonomy and excitement rarely found in their daily lives.
The following hypotheses were born out of the previously discussed literature on juvenile delinquency. These research hypotheses will be tested and the results discussed in Chapter V.

1) The more severely oppressed an adolescent, the lower his/her self-esteem.

2) The more severely oppressed an adolescent, the higher his/her level of delinquency.

3) The more oppression adolescents experience, the greater their sense of alienation.

4) The higher an adolescent's level of alienation, the higher his/her level of delinquency.

5) Alienation will be more strongly associated with delinquency than oppression.

6) The stronger an adolescent's social bonds (e.g., commitment, belief and involvement), the lower his/her level of delinquency.

7) The more alienation adolescents experience, the lower their self-esteem.

8) The less social power adolescents have, the higher their level of delinquency.

The less social power adolescents have, the higher their level of alienation.

9) The more alienation an adolescents experience, the more likely they are to identify with edgework sensations.

10) The more adolescents value edgework sensations, the higher their level of delinquency.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Method

This study utilized a self-report delinquency survey. Although it is most common for self-administered questionnaires to be implemented through the mail, this survey relied on group administration.

After an extensive review of the relevant literature and numerous substantive discussions with knowledgeable colleagues, a preliminary draft of the questionnaire was developed. After five drafts, the survey questionnaire was pre-tested in introductory level sociology classrooms. Minor revisions were made based on respondent feedback.

The final version of the questionnaire was approved, and permission to conduct the study was granted, by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Human Subjects Committee. The questionnaire contained approximately 140 closed-ended questions designed to illicit information on the following: (1) demographics; (2) delinquent behavior patterns; (3) physical and mental abuse; (4) authority structures at home and in school; (5) alienation; (6) self-concept; (7) social bonds; and (8) motivation for delinquent behavior (e.g., risk taking). The questionnaire took between fifteen and twenty-five minutes to complete on average.
Sampling and Administration

Initially, I planned to conduct a random sample of Clark County high school classrooms. During the summer of 1995 a research proposal was sent to the Clark County School District, Committee to Review Cooperative Research Requests. This committee denied the request because they were uncomfortable with the nature of the survey questions (e.g., information on illegal activity, gambling, etc.).

An alternative sampling strategy was developed after being denied access to the ideal sample population. There was no other cost-effective, efficient way to obtain a random sample of juveniles available. As a result, this study relies on a convenience sample of students enrolled in introductory level sociology courses at: (1) the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV); and (2) the Community College of Southern Nevada (CCSN). Although students in these classes are not adolescents, the majority of them range in age from eighteen to twenty, and therefore are not far removed from their adolescent experiences.

Since sociology courses fill a general social science requirement for students, a wide range of students with diverse backgrounds enroll in these courses. For this reason introductory level courses in other disciplines were not sampled. Students from both institutions were sampled in order to ensure that the study captures the widest range of demographic diversity (e.g., social class, geographical residential patterns, etc.).

The survey went into the field the second week of February. The final set of questionnaires was administered on March 11, 1996. During each administration a scripted set of instructions was used to introduce the questionnaire, and to provide a
complete set of instructions to the potential respondents. Questionnaires were passed out to every member of the class. Only those students who read and signed the provided consent form were permitted to participate in the study (See Appendix A).

After sampling from two large classes at UNLV and three smaller classes at the community college, it became apparent that females were significantly over represented (3-1) in the sample. This distribution would not allow one to test for significant differences between gender. This problem was corrected by sampling from an additional UNLV class. Only males were invited to participate in this administration.

Once all the questionnaires were completed, respondents who did not fall between the ages of 17 and 20 were screened out. The total N = 226 (98 males and 128 females).

Operationalization of Key Concepts

Juvenile Delinquency

A version of Short and Nye's (1958) classic self-report scale was used as the primary measure of delinquent behavior (See Appendix B - questions #25a-#25o). Some minor changes were made in an effort to modernize the instrument. Two important questions were added. One asked about domestic violence; the other one asked about the use of a gun or knife at school. Despite the fact that Short and Nye's scale is almost forty years old, researchers have made not made sufficient attempts to update its content.

Oppression

Regoli and Hewitt (1994) suggest that there are at least two important indicators
of oppression: (1) acts of oppression (e.g., abuse); and (2) low self-esteem (See Chapter II for a discussion of these indicators of oppression). A series of self-report questions are used to measure physical, sexual and emotional abuse (See Appendix B - questions #52c, d, e, i and l). These responses were nominally measured. An interval measure of self-esteem was achieved with the Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale (See Appendix B - questions #22a-j). The scale was originally designed to be used with high school students.

**Alienation**

Alienation was operationalized in two ways. First, an interval level measure of alienation was obtained by Srole's (1956) Anomia scale (See Appendix B - questions #23a-e). This is a commonly accepted measure of alienation. Anomia has traditionally been viewed as a person's generalized sense of malintegration or alienation. The Anomia scale measures the five major dimensions of alienation: (1) powerlessness; (2) meaninglessness; (3) normlessness; (4) isolation; and (5) self-estrangement.

Social bonds are considered as a measure of social integration. It is assumed that the more integrated a person is, the less alienated they are. According to Hirschi (1969), weak social bonds (e.g., commitment, attachment, belief and involvement) leave people vulnerable to alienation, and ultimately lead to a life of criminal activity.

**Social Power**

A series of Likert scale questions were designed to illicit information about the amount of power and autonomy subjects felt they had, at home and in school, with respect to the norms, communication, supervision and discipline. An attempt was made to
measure the extent to which adolescents feel controlled by adults; and the extent to which they feel like legitimate creators of the social order under which they must live (See Appendix B - questions #37c, #38, #53, #54 and #55). A substantial number of the questions in this area were drawn from Hirschi (1969) and Cernkovich and Giordano (1987).

**Motivations**

The extent to which a need for autonomy, risk taking and excitement motivate delinquent behavior is measured by a series of Likert scale questions that were specifically developed for this study (See Appendix B - question #26b, d, f, g, h, and j).

**Reliability and Validity**

The reliability and validity of delinquency, alienation and authority structure measures included in this survey instrument are supported by previous research. The wording, ordering or content of these measures has not been significantly changed. Although the measures of oppression and motivation were not drawn from the existing literature, they are simple, self-report questions that appear to have face validity.

**Data Analysis**

The data for this study was analyzed with the help of the statistical software package known as SPSSx. Independent and dependent variables were measures at the nominal, ordinal and interval levels.

Since all of the research hypotheses for this study were based on association,
appropriate tests of correlation were utilized. Gamma was used when both the variables were ordinal. Lambda was used for tables larger than two by two when both variables were nominal. And finally, Pearson correlation coefficient was used when both variables were interval level.

Research Design: Advantages and Limitations

Advantages

Group administration of respondent-completed questionnaires offers a number of advantages. First, it is a reasonably inexpensive way to quickly and efficiently reach a large number of respondents. A second advantage is control. The researcher can choose the venue for administration, answer questions when needed, as well as monitor the completion of the surveys. Such control allows the researcher to make each administration as similar as possible thus exposing each respondent to reasonably similar environmental conditions. A final advantage concerns the nature of the questions asked. Methodological studies tend to show that self-administered surveys are more effective at obtaining truthful answers to sensitive questions (e.g., crime, delinquency, sexual habits, etc.) than other types of surveys (Bourque and Fielder 1995).

Limitations

Unfortunately, despite its advantages, self-administered surveys are not without their problems. The length and complexity of self-administered questionnaires is limited. Short, simple, closed-ended questions are most likely to be answered. People often don't
feel motivated to answer long, complex questionnaires that rely substantially on open-ended questions (Bourque and Fielder 1995). Also, self-administered survey designs must pay attention to the literacy level of potential respondents. Substantial variation in the reading ability of potential respondents makes it necessary to use simple, easy to read questions. Concerns over the reading level of potential respondents was largely mitigated in this study since sampled respondents were drawn from college classrooms. None the less, as a result of these concerns, this study relies exclusively on closed-ended questions. Unfortunately, this limits the depth of the information obtained.

A second limitation of this survey design is that it asks respondents to recall events and feelings that they experienced several years ago. This approach has been subject to criticism (Doerner 1987; Widom 1989). This study attempts to mitigate this problem by asking respondents questions about very salient, memorable events (e.g., delinquency). Additionally, respondents are not asked to remember specific details about the event, nor are they asked exactly how many time they did something. Instead, their responses are typically recorded with general categories like "very often," "sometimes," "rarely" or "never."

Finally, this research is limited by its use of a convenience sample. Reliance on a non-probability sample means that the results of this study cannot be generalized to a larger population. Although this is unfortunate, this study does provide important preliminary findings that can be used in the future to design a more complex research project that relies on a random sample of high school students.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter will present and discuss the data gathered from the questionnaire (See Appendix A). It will include a description of demographic characteristics, as well as a discussion of the interrelationships between major variables, and a discussion of the statistical tests used to test each of the research hypotheses.

Demographic Characteristics

The presentation of demographic data allows us to examine the various backgrounds and social positions of the respondents. Such information can be important when attempting to explain or understand a given finding. An analysis of the demographics also allows us to determine the extent to which the sample population is representative of the UNLV student population. Demographic characteristics are also important because they are commonly used as controls when conducting multivariate analysis.

Gender

Table 4.0a compares the gender distribution in this study with the gender distribution at UNLV. Women comprise 56.6 percent of the sample; men constitute 43.4
percent of the sample. According to the 1994 edition of "Selected Institutional Characteristics" published by the UNLV Office of Institutional Analysis and Planning, women constitute approximately 52.5 percent of the student population. Men comprise about 47.5 percent of the student body. The sample for this study under represented men by 4.1 percent; it over represented women by 4.1 percent. Despite this, the sample was large enough for gender to serve as a control variable throughout most of the substantive analysis.

Table 4.0a

Sample Comparison By Gender (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Survey Sample</th>
<th>UNLV Student Body</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>+4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Race_

Table 4.0b shows that 67.3 percent of the sample identified themselves as Caucasian; 9.3 percent Asian; 7.5 percent African American; 6.6 percent Hispanic; 1.3 percent Native American; and, 8.0 percent indicated "other" as their racial background. This is relatively comparable to the racial composition of the UNLV student body. According to the 1994 edition of "Selected Institutional Characteristics," 69.8 percent of the university student body is white (Non-Hispanic); 6.0 percent was Hispanic; 5.8 percent
was African American; 5.5 percent is Asian; and, 0.7 percent is Native American.

Table 4.0b
Sample Comparison By Race
(in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Survey Sample</th>
<th>UNLV Students</th>
<th>Sample Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>+3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey sample under represents Caucasians by 2.5 percent. Hispanics, African Americans and Native Americans are slightly over represented (between 0.6 and 1.7 percent). Asians were over represented by 3.8 percent. According to the 1994 edition of UNLV's "Selected Institutional Characteristics," 12.2 percent of the student body was not identified as belonging to one of the five major racial categories listed in table 4.0a. Those students were included under the category "other."

Social Class

This study relied on two basic measures of social class - parents' education and
Table 4.0c
Parents' Educational Attainment
(in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Education</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a High School Diploma</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned High School Diploma</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed College</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad./Professional School After College</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than 8.0 percent of mothers and fathers failed to earn at least a high school diploma. 30.5 percent of the mothers earned their high school diploma compared with only 23.5 percent of the fathers. Approximately 26.0 percent of both mothers and fathers report having earned some college credits. 23.5 percent of the fathers earned a college degree compared with 22.6 percent of the mothers. Graduate or professional school was attended by 17.3 percent of the fathers. Only 12.8 percent of the mothers attended graduate school.

It is important to note that approximately 64.0 percent of the mothers and 56.0 percent of the fathers have not earned a college degree. In fact, 38.0 percent of the
mothers and 30.0 percent of the fathers have no college education at all. This suggests that at least one third of the students in this sample are first generation college students.

Occupation was used as a second measure of social class. Alba M. Edward's Social-Economic Groupings of Occupations index (1960) was utilized. This index has well established reliability and validity. The United States Census has grouped workers with this scale since the 1930's.

Occupations are divided into six major groups. Each of these groups should have a distinct standard of economic life, and particular intellectual and social similarities. Income and education are the two major dimensions used to rank order the six occupational categories.

Table 4.0d provides a summary of the parents' occupation. More than 35.0 percent of fathers and 27.0 percent of mothers occupy professional positions. This category reflects a high social class. Parents in this category generally have more education and earn more money than parents in the other five categories. On the other hand, a high percentage of parents also occupy low paying, low status jobs. For example, 15.5 percent of mothers and 16.8 percent of fathers labor as unskilled service or domestic workers. The majority of parents work either as professionals or unskilled laborers. These categories represent "high status" and "low status" respectively on the occupational groupings index. But these on not the only groups represented. As seen in Table 4.0d, parents also occupy a number of jobs that fall in the middle of this scale. These include business managers, clerical and sales workers, craftsman and foreman, and operatives.
Table 4.0d

Summary of Parents' Occupation
(in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Grouping</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical and kindred workers</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business managers, officials, and proprietors</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales workers</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives and kindred workers</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled service and domestic workers</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4.0d only 82.6 percent of mothers and 78.3 percent of fathers were reported as working. This is because 1.3 percent of the fathers did not work; 7.9 percent of the respondents indicated that they did not know or this question did not apply to their family; 10.6 percent of these cases were missing. With respect to mothers, 8.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they did not know or that this question did not apply to their family; 14.6 percent of mothers did not work outside the home; and, 9.3 percent of these cases were missing. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas does not provide comparable data on parents' education and occupation.

**Demographic Characteristics: A Summary**

The above section has provided a demographic description of the sample used in
this study. Where possible, the characteristics of this sample were compared with those of
the UNLV student population.

This study did not take special steps to draw a scientifically representative sample. However, this sample does capture a great deal of demographic diversity. And although the results of this study can not be generalized beyond this sample, it is important to note that these research results rely on a sample with sufficient variability.

The analysis that follows will report any significant gender differences with respect to major variables such as oppression, alienation and juvenile delinquency. Unfortunately, due to a relatively small sample size (n=226), there were not enough cases within race and social class categories to effectively use these variables as a control.

**Oppression, Self-Esteem and Juvenile Delinquency**

As discussed in Chapter II, the theory of differential oppression suggests that oppressed children respond to their oppression in one of four ways (i.e., passive acceptance, exercise of illegitimate coercive power, manipulation of one's peers and/or retaliation). This study is primarily concerned with two of those adaptations - passive acceptance and the exercise of illegitimate coercive power. The exercise of illegitimate coercive power takes the form of delinquency.

According to the theory of differential oppression, passive acceptance is conformity to adults standards based in large part on fear. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) maintain that such compliance often leads to low self-esteem. Secondly, the theory of differential oppression maintains that oppression can lead to delinquency. This leads to
the following two hypotheses: (1) The more severely oppressed an adolescent, the lower their self-esteem is likely to be; and (2) The more severely oppressed an adolescent, the more likely it is that a child will take part in delinquent activities.

**Hypothesis One**

_The more severely oppressed the adolescent, the lower his/her self-esteem._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPRESSION</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-ESTEEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 (previous page) illustrates a crosstabulation that depicts the bivariate relationship between oppression and self-esteem. A Gamma value of -.252 identified a
negative correlation with a significance of .001. As predicted, the more oppression adolescents had experienced, the lower their self-esteem.

A significant negative relationship exists for both males and females. A Gamma value of -.256 was found significant at .037 for males; and a Gamma value of -.249 was found significant at .022 for females.

In addition to the ordinal level measures tested above, interval level measures of oppression and self-esteem were also tested. A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated. The correlation between oppression and self-esteem was statistically significant, $r (218) = -.298, p < .001$. Oppression accounts for approximately 9.0 percent of the variance in self-esteem. Both Gamma and the Pearson correlation coefficient establish a significant, negative relationship between oppression and self-esteem.

**Hypothesis Two**

*The more severely oppressed an adolescent, the higher his/her level of delinquency.*

Table 4.2 depicts the bivariate relationship between oppression and delinquency. A Gamma value of -.019 identified an extremely small negative association between oppression and delinquency. This association was not significant (.814). No significant relationships were identified between oppression and delinquency, even when controlling for gender.
### Table 4.2

Oppression by Delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELINQUENCY</th>
<th>OPPRESSION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gamma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for interval level measures of oppression and delinquency. The correlation was not statistically significant, $r (222) = .078$, $p > .05$. Both Gamma and Pearson suggest that there is no significant association between oppression and delinquency.

**Oppression, Alienation and Delinquency**

After reviewing the relevant research on oppression (the maltreatment of children) and alienation, it was suggested that oppression is an important factor to consider when...
explaining delinquency. But it may not be a causal factor. For example, it may be possible that alienation is more strongly associated with delinquency, while oppression is associated with alienation. In other words, alienation may serve as an intervening variable in the relationship between oppression and delinquency. The following three hypotheses help to explore this possibility.

**Hypothesis Three**

_The more oppression an adolescent experiences, the greater his/her sense of alienation._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3</th>
<th>Oppression by Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPPRESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIENATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The crosstabulation presented in Table 4.3 (previous page) depicts the bivariate relationship between oppression and alienation. A Gamma value of .239 identified a positive, significant association (.007). As predicted, the more oppression adolescents experienced, the higher their level of alienation.

When controlling for gender, mixed results were achieved. For males, a Gamma value of .258 was not significant (.078). However, a Gamma value of .229 was significant for females (.043). This suggests that the relationship between oppression and alienation is stronger for females than for males.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for interval level measures of oppression and alienation. The correlation was statistically significant, r (220) = .217, p < .001. Oppression accounted for approximately 4.7 percent of the variation in alienation.

**Hypothesis Four**

*The higher an adolescent's level of alienation, the higher his/her level of delinquency.*

Table 4.4 depicts the bivariate relationship between alienation and delinquency. A Gamma of .227 identified a positive correlation with a significance of .004. As predicted, the higher an adolescent's level of alienation, the more likely he/she was to participate in delinquent behavior.

For males, a Gamma value of .160 was not significant (.219), but a Gamma value of .280 was significant for females (.008). Similar to the relationship between oppression and alienation, the relationship between alienation and delinquency appears to be stronger...
for females than for males.

Table 4.4
Alienation by Delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELINQUENCY</th>
<th>ALIENATION</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the ordinal measures tested above, interval level measures of
alienation and delinquency were also tested. A Pearson correlation coefficient found that
the association between alienation and delinquency was statistically significant, r (221) =
.232, p < .001. Alienation accounted for approximately 5.3 percent of the variance in
delinquency.
Both Gamma and the Pearson correlation coefficient suggest that a significant positive association exists between alienation and delinquency. Alienation accounts for approximately 5.4 percent of the variance in delinquency. This suggests that there is a positive relationship between alienation and delinquency. However, it is important to note that this relationship appears to be stronger for females than for males.

**Hypothesis Five**

*Alienation will be more strongly associated with delinquency than oppression.*

Table 4.5 summarizes the results of those tests used to evaluate the strength of the relationship between oppression and delinquency, as well as the relationship between alienation and delinquency. The data shown in Table 4.5 shows that both Gamma and the Pearson correlation coefficient identify a significant, positive correlation between alienation and oppression. No significant relationship between oppression and delinquency was found. This suggests that alienation is more strongly associated with delinquency than oppression. However, this relationship is significantly stronger for...
females than for males.

Social bonds are used as a measure of social integration. Hirschi (1969) maintained that strong social bonds increased a person's social integration. It is implied that the higher one's social integration, the lower one's alienation. According to Hirschi, strong social bonds serve to insulate people from delinquent activity. This suggestion leads to the sixth research hypothesis.

**Hypothesis Six**

_The stronger an adolescent's social bonds (e.g., commitment, attachment, belief and involvement), the lower his/her rate of delinquency._

This study relied on several measures of commitment drawn in large part from Hirschi (1969). These questions were designed to illicit information about the importance of obtaining good grades, the amount of time an adolescent spent thinking about his/her future plans, and the amount of time an adolescent spent doing home work (See Appendix B - questions #28, #31, #32, #33 and #34) during his/her high school years.

Crosstabulations were constructed to depict the bivariate relationship between each of these measures of commitment and delinquency. Table 4.6a summarizes the Gamma correlations for each measure of commitment. Only one measure was significant. A Gamma value of -.311 identified a significant (.000), negative association between the number of hours adolescents spent on their homework and delinquency. The less time adolescents spent on their homework, the higher their level of delinquency. This relationship was significant for both males and females.
The amount of time adolescents spent thinking about what they would do after school, their life after high school, whether or not they completed their homework assignments and/or how important it was to earn good grades were not found to be significantly associated with delinquency.

In addition to measures of commitment, multiple measures of attachment were also taken. These questions were designed to illicit information about the students' feelings toward their friends, teachers and parents (See Appendix B - questions #29, #46, #48,
Crosstabulations were constructed to depict the bivariate relationship between each of these measures of attachment and delinquency. Table 4.6b summarizes the Gamma correlations for each measure of attachment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Attachment</th>
<th>Gamma Value</th>
<th>Significance of Gamma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you care what your teachers thought about you?</td>
<td>-.343</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For you, how important was it to develop close friendships?</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How influential were your friends in deciding what you did?</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one measure of attachment was significant. A Gamma of -.343 with a significance of .000 identified a negative association between the extent to which adolescents cared about their teachers' opinions of them and delinquency. When controlling for gender, the strength of this association gets stronger for males (Gamma -.396/.001). It is not significant for females.

Three other measures of attachment were achieved at the nominal level.

A summary of the Lambda values and their significance is listed in Table 4.6c.
### Table 4.6c

Summary of Associations Between Attachment and Delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Attachment</th>
<th>Lambda Value</th>
<th>Significance of Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing is worth leaving your parents?</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting my parents down would be the worst things that could happen to me?</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was closer to my parents than most kids my age?</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Lambda value of .139 with a significance of .009 identified a significant association between attachment to one's parents and delinquency. Those adolescents who agreed that there was no reason good enough to leave their parents had lower levels of delinquency than those adolescents who expressed a willingness to leave their parents. Concern over pleasing one's parent's and the degree of closeness a child felt toward their parents (relative to other parents) were not significantly related to delinquency. No significant gender differences were found.

Thus far, the analysis has centered on two dimensions of social bonds: commitment and attachment. All measures of commitment and attachment were taken at the nominal and ordinal levels.

The remainder of this section will focus on the third and forth dimensions of the social bond: belief and involvement. Belief in the legal system was measured by an index comprised of seven questions (See Appendix B - questions #51a - #51g). A Pearson correlation coefficient identified a negative relationship between belief in the legal system
and delinquency. This relationship was statistically significant, $r (222) = -.370$, $p < .001$. This suggests that the stronger the adolescent's belief in the legal system, the less likely he/she is to take part in delinquency. This explains approximately 13.7 percent of the variance in delinquency.

Involvement represents the final dimension of the social bond. This study relied on several different measures of involvement. These questions were designed to illicit information about work and religion (See Appendix B - questions #42, #44, #63 and #64). Crosstabulations were constructed to depict the bivariate relationship between each of these measures of involvement and delinquency. Table 4.6d summarized the Gamma correlations calculated for each measure of involvement.

A Gamma value of -.199 with a significance of .014 identified a negative correlation between attendance at religious services and delinquency. This suggests that the more often adolescents attended church, the less likely they were to become involved in delinquent behavior. However, this relationship does not hold if one controls for gender.

Table 4.6d also indicates that there is no significant relationship between the number of hours an adolescent worked during school and his/her involvement in delinquent behavior. However, a Gamma value of -.223 with a significance of .028 identified a negative correlation between the number of hours females work and their degree of involvement in delinquent behavior. The more hours that females worked, the less likely they were to take part in delinquent behavior. This significant relationship did not exist for males.
Table 4.6d

Summary of Associations Between Involvement and Delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Involvement</th>
<th>Gamma Value</th>
<th>Significance of Gamma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many hours per week did you work during school?</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How time did you spend doing house work?</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did you attend religious services?</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you attend programs for children at your church and if so how often?</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final measure of involvement was created with an index that calculated an adolescent's level of involvement in school activities (See Appendix B - questions #35a - #351). A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated. The correlation between involvement in school activities and delinquency was statistically significant, $r(211) = - .182$, $p < .001$. In other words, the more involved a student was in school activities, the less likely he/she was to be involved in delinquent behavior. Involvement accounts for approximately 5.3 percent of the variance in delinquency.

**Alienation and Self-Esteem**

Hypothesis one tested the relationship between oppression and self-esteem.

Hypothesis three tested the relationship between oppression and alienation. Hypothesis seven seeks to identify any relationship that exists between alienation and self-esteem.
**Hypothesis Seven**

*The more alienation adolescents experience, the lower their self-esteem.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alienation by Self-Esteem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIENATION</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gamma*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The gamma value listed has been changed from a positive to a negative so that it reflects an accurate interpretation of the table. This change was necessary because of my choice to label the table based on ease of interpretation and not on the direction of the variables.

Table 4.7 (previous page) illustrates a crosstabulation depicting the bivariate relationship between alienation and self-esteem. A Gamma value of -.305 identified a positive correlation with a significance of .000. As predicted, the more alienation adolescents
experienced, the lower their self-esteem.

When controlling for gender, a significant correlation remains for both males and females. A Gamma of \(-.258\) was found significant at \(0.032\) for males; and a Gamma of \(-.358\) was found significant at \(0.000\) for females.

In addition to the ordinal level measures tested above, interval level measures of alienation and self-esteem were also tested. A Pearson correlation coefficient identified a negative relationship between alienation and self-esteem that was statistically significant, \(r(215) = -.205, p < .001\). Alienation accounts for approximately 4.2 percent of the variance in self-esteem. Both Gamma and the Pearson correlation coefficient establish a significant, negative relationship between alienation and self-esteem.

**Social Power and Delinquency**

One of the important contributions of the theory of differential oppression to any analysis of juvenile delinquency is the detailed attention it pays to the status of juveniles. Chapter II presented a detailed discussion of the status of juveniles. It was argued that adolescents have little if any social power. They are forced to live by the rules adults create. Adolescents rarely are provided the opportunity to make meaningful contributions to the social order, or to change the social order in ways they might find beneficial. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) suggest that juveniles often adapt to their powerlessness by exercising illegitimate coercive power. In other words, delinquency often serves as an effort by adolescents to demonstrate their power over adults. It provides children with a sense of autonomy and self-control.
Hypothesis Eight

The less social power adolescents have, the higher their rate of delinquency.

Five nominal/ordinal measures of social power were taken. These questions were designed to illicit information about the amount of power adolescents felt they had in making decisions at home and in school (See Appendix B - questions #37C, #38, # 52F, #52G and #53).

Crosstabulations were constructed depicting the bivariate relationship between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Control</th>
<th>Gamma Value</th>
<th>Significance of Gamma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much influence did the student's have on how the school was run?</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much influence did you have on how the school was run?</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much influence did you have in making family decisions?</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Control</th>
<th>Lambda Value</th>
<th>Significance of Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My parents told me to &quot;do so because they said so.&quot;</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents wanted me to do things their way.</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each of these measures of social power and delinquency. Table 4.8a (previous page) summarizes the correlations for each of these measures. As seen in Table 4.8a, there does not appear to be any significant relationship between power and delinquency. The relationship between power and delinquency remains insignificant even when controlling for gender. One explanation for this may be that alienation serves as an intervening variable in the relationship between power and delinquency. In other words, a lack of power may increase one's level of alienation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Control</th>
<th>Gamma Value</th>
<th>Significance of Gamma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much influence did the student's have on how the school was run?</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much influence did you have on how the school was run?</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much influence did you have in making family decisions?</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Control</th>
<th>Lambda Value</th>
<th>Significance of Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My parents told me to &quot;do so because they said so.&quot;</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents always tried to get me to do things their way.</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8b (previous page) compares the same measures of power listed in Table 4.8a with levels of alienation. Through this comparison it will be possible to determine if levels of power are related to alienation. Table 4.8b suggests that a lack of power at school is negatively correlated with alienation. Interestingly, a Gamma value of -.460 identified a negative relationship with a significance of .000 for females when testing the relationship between the amount of control the student as an individual has at school and alienation. This was not a significant relationship for males.

Conversely, a Lambda value of .104 identified a relationship with as significance of .028 for males when testing the relationship between "my parent's told me to do so because they said so" and alienation. This was not a significant relationship for females.

When examining the results summarized in Tables 4.8a and 4.8b it would appear that the students' level of power is not related to their level of delinquency. On the other hand, one's level of power is modestly related to one's level of alienation. It also appears that one's level of power at school is more significantly related to the formation of alienation than one's level of power at home. These relationships hold true across gender with the two exceptions mentioned above.

**Delinquency As Edgework**

Chapter two examines the concept of edgework and discusses its potential applicability to the study of juvenile delinquency. This section seeks to determine if delinquent juveniles identify with those sensations most commonly associated with edgework activities.
According to Lyng (1990), edgework is accompanied by at least four sensations:

1. Self-determination, self-control or autonomy;
2. Fear of failure (e.g., risk);
3. Excitement; and,
4. Sensations of a hyperreality (e.g., an incredible natural high).

This hypothesis was tested by constructing an index based on these dimensions (See Appendix B - questions #26d, f, g, h, and j).

**Hypothesis Nine**

*The more alienation adolescents experience, the more likely they are to identify with edgework sensations.*

Table 4.9 depicts the bivariate relationship between alienation edgework sensations (possible motivations for delinquency). A Gamma value of .310 identified a positive relationship with a significance of .000 between alienation and edgework sensations. The more alienated the adolescents the more likely they were to identify delinquency as a risky, exciting, self-directed endeavor. This relationship remained significant for females (.356/.001), but not for males.

A Pearson correlation coefficient identified a positive, significant relationship between adolescents' level of alienation and their motivations for committing delinquency \((r (218) = .264, p < .001)\). Alienation explains approximately 6.9 percent of the variance in motivation.
Table 4.9
Alienation by Edgework Sensations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATIONS</th>
<th>ALIENATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma Value: .310
Significance: .000

Hypothesis Ten

Those adolescents who value edgework sensations will have higher levels of delinquency than those adolescents who do not value edgework sensations.

Table 4.10 shows the crosstabulation depicting the bivariate relationship between edgework sensations and delinquency. A Gamma value of .510 with a significance of .000 identified a positive correlation between edgework sensations and delinquency.

Those adolescents who found delinquency risky, exciting and an opportunity for autonomy had higher levels of delinquency. This significant relationship held for both males (.394/.000) and for females (.580/.000).
A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to test the relationship between delinquency and edgework sensations. The correlation between delinquency and edgework sensations was statistically significant, $r(221) = .437, p < .001$. This identifies a moderately strong positive correlation between edgework sensations and delinquency. This correlation accounts for more than 19.0 percent of the variance in delinquency.

| DELINQUENCY | MOTIVATIONS | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|             | Low | Medium | High | %  |
| Low         | 30  | 14     | 9   | 53 | 23.8 |
| Medium Low  | 35  | 20     | 9   | 64 | 28.7 |
| Medium High | 12  | 19     | 19  | 50 | 22.4 |
| High        | 5   | 20     | 31  | 56 | 25.1 |
| Column Total| 82  | 73     | 68  | 223| 100.00 |

Table 4.10
Edgework Sensations by Delinquency

Gamma

Value | .510
Significance | .000
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CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study represents one of the first attempts to empirically test the theory of differential oppression. Two major tenets of the theory were tested: (1) Oppression leads to low self-esteem; and (2) Oppression is positively associated with juvenile delinquency.

Analysis identified a negative relationship between oppression and self-esteem (See Table 4.1). A negative relationship between oppression and self-esteem was present for both males and females. Pearson correlation coefficient identified a significant, negative association between oppression and self-esteem. Oppression accounts for approximately 9.0 percent of the variance. Alienation is also positively correlated with self-esteem. But it only accounts for 4.2 percent of the variance in self-esteem.

This supports the contention of Regoli and Hewitt (1994) who suggest that as oppression increases, self-esteem decreases. But this was only one part of the theory of differential oppression. The most significant claim made by the theory is that oppression is positively associated with delinquency. This hypothesis was not supported (See Table 4.2).

Both ordinal and interval measures of oppression failed to establish a significant relationship between oppression and delinquency. Although this does not support the position of Regoli and Hewitt (1994), it is consistent with a significant research tradition.
discussed in Chapter II which maintains that the relationship between the oppression (maltreatment) of children (adolescents) and juvenile delinquency is overstated.

But despite the fact that oppression is not significantly associated with delinquency, oppression does play a role in the explanation of delinquency. The analysis in Chapter IV focussed on a number of key variables: oppression, self-esteem, alienation, social bonds, delinquency, autonomy (or personal control) and edgework sensations. A correlational analysis of these variables suggests the following model of juvenile delinquency illustrated in Figure 1:

**Figure 1.0**

**A Correlational Model of Juvenile Delinquency**

```
Oppression  ➔  Alienation  ➔  Juvenile Delinquency

Edgework Sensations
```

**Oppression and Delinquency**

Although oppression was not significantly related to juvenile delinquency, it was significantly related to alienation. Table 4.3 illustrates the positive relationship between oppression and alienation. The more oppression a child experienced, the higher their level
of delinquency. This was a significant relationship for females, but not for males.

Pearson's correlation coefficient estimates that oppression accounts for slightly less than 5.0 percent of the variation in alienation. This suggests that a number of other factors are involved in creating alienation.

Chapter IV spent some time exploring the relationship between social power and alienation (See Table 4.8b). It was assumed that a negative relationship would exist between social power and alienation. In other words, the less social power an adolescent possessed the greater their level of alienation. The adolescent's level of social power was only modestly related to their level of alienation. On the whole, it would appear that a lack of power at school, not at home, was more significantly related to alienation. Generally, social power appeared to be only modestly associated with alienation.

There are a number of other factors that could account for more of the variance of alienation than either oppression or social power. For example, it would have been interesting to examine the extent to which race and social class contributed to levels of alienation. Unfortunately, as mentioned before, the small sample size in this study did not allow for such analysis.

**Alienation and Delinquency**

Just as there was a positive relationship between oppression and alienation, so too was there a positive relationship between alienation and delinquency (See Table 4.4). The greater a student's level of alienation the more likely their participation in delinquency. Alienation alone explained only about 5.3 percent of the variation in delinquency. Once
again, the positive relationship between alienation and delinquency remained significant only for females.

Four social bonds were measured as an indication of social integration (e.g., commitment, attachment, belief and involvement). Strong social bonds have been viewed as a sign of social integration which is generally seen as the opposite of alienation (Hirschi 1969). It was anticipated that there would be a negative relationship between most social bond measures and delinquency. In other words, the stronger the social bond, the lower the delinquency.

Table 4.6a summarizes the correlational measures of commitment. The only significant relationship identified was between the number of hours a student studied and delinquency. The more hours studied, the lower their level of delinquency. This was a significant relationship for both males and females. None of the remaining measures of commitment were associated with delinquency.

Table 4.6b summarizes the correlational measures of attachment. The more a student cared about their teacher's opinion of them, the lower their rate of delinquency. Although this was a significant relationship for males; it was not significant for females. There was also a significant positive relationship between a student's willingness to leave their parents and delinquency. Those children who agreed that there was no reason good enough to leave home took part in less delinquency. All remaining measures of attachment were not associated with delinquency.

Belief in the legal system was also found to be associated with delinquency. A Pearson correlation coefficient established a negative association between belief and
delinquency. The more a student believed in the legal system, the lower their level of
delinquency. Belief explained almost 14.0 percent of the variance in delinquency.

Involvement is the final element of the social bonds tested in this study. A
negative correlation was identified between church attendance and delinquency (See Table
4.6d). This relationship was not significant when controlling for gender.

For females, the number of hours spent working at a job during school was
negatively associated with delinquency. The more hours worked, the lower the level of
delinquent activity.

Involvement in school activities was also negatively associated with delinquency.
The more involved students were in school activities (e.g., sports, clubs, organizations,
etc.) the lower their level of delinquency. School involvement accounted for
approximately 5.3 percent of the variance in delinquency. No gender differences were
found.

As predicted, measures of alienation were positively correlated with delinquency;
social bonds were negatively correlated with delinquency. Alienation and social
integration, on a number of dimensions, are significantly associated with delinquency.

This analysis suggests that oppression is not directly associated with delinquency.
Instead, alienation serves as an intervening variable (See Figure 1.0).

Alienation and Edgework Sensations

Interestingly, alienation was not only correlated with delinquency, it was also
correlated with edgework sensations. There is a significant positive association between
alienation and edgework sensations (See Table 4.9). This relationship held for both males and females. The more alienated the student, the more likely they were to identify delinquency as a risky, exciting and enjoyable activity. Less alienated students did not have this view of delinquency. Pearson's correlation coefficient estimates that edgework sensations accounts for approximately 7.0 percent of the variance in delinquency.

**Edgework and Delinquency**

Edgework sensations positively correlated with delinquency (See Table 4.10). Those students who perceived delinquency as risky, exciting and self-directing were involved in higher levels of delinquent activity. Pearson's correlation coefficient estimates that edgework accounts for more than 19.0 percent of the variance in delinquency.

**Conclusions**

This study served as one of the first attempts to test the theory of differential oppression. And although the results failed to demonstrate any significant relationship between oppression and delinquency, the study did identify a number of important associations used to construct a model of delinquency (See Figure 1.0).

The analysis suggests that various forms of oppression contribute to our children's sense of alienation. Alienation is in turn positively associated with delinquency. But why is alienation associated with delinquency? The explanation may rest with the concept of edgework.

Lyng (1990) argued that the more constraint and alienation a person experiences, the greater their need for freedom and autonomy. He suggested that edgework provided
people with an opportunity to escape alienation by participating in life-threatening activities. Such participation afforded people with a sense of excitement, freedom and power rarely found in their everyday lives.

The associations between alienation, edgework and juvenile delinquency illustrated in Figure 1.0 suggests that adolescents perceive delinquency as a form of edgework. Delinquency may provide the opportunity for adolescents to escape the marginal, powerless status they occupy in mainstream society.

Interestingly, the positive associations between oppression and alienation, as well as between alienation and delinquency, were significant only for females. This may mean that the model of delinquency illustrated in Figure 1.0 may be better suited for explaining female delinquency.

**Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

One major limitation of this study was the use of a small, non-random sample. This presented a number of problems. First, there were not enough cases to control for a number of important demographic variables like race and social class. This makes it difficult to know the extent to which race and/or social class can account for the variation in central variables like oppression, alienation, edgework sensations and delinquency. Secondly, the over representation of females and the under representation of men makes it difficult to interpret the results of the study. For example, it was noted that the relationship between oppression and alienation, and the relationship between alienation and delinquency, is only significant for females. This may be a legitimate finding or it may
be the product of a non-random sample that over represented women. The latter seems more likely since a number of the insignificant correlations for males were very close to the .05 alpha. In these cases, a larger sample may have produced significant results.

Thirdly, a non-random sample means that the results of this study are not generalizable beyond the sample used in this study.

The sample population was also a problematic. In the future it would be preferable to sample high school students instead of relying on college students to recall their high school experiences.

A number of very interesting results were generated by this study. In the future, it would be useful to use a random, representative sample of high school students to test the model of delinquency described above. Such a study might benefit from additional measures of oppression, as well as an improved measure of edgework sensations, and an updated measure of delinquency.

This study has contributed to the research literature on juvenile delinquency by: (1) empirically testing and analyzing a relatively new theory in the area of juvenile delinquency; and, (2) by expanding that theory to include the use of a concept not used before in the study of delinquency (e.g., edgework). It is my hope that this study can be used as the foundation for further research in the area of delinquency.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

Dear Student:

My name is William Miller and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I would like to invite you to participate in my dissertation research project which examines juvenile delinquency, gambling and other social issues that affect our communities.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Your responses are anonymous and can in no way be associated with you as an individual. If you should have any questions or concerns about this study, feel free to contact me at the UNLV Department of Sociology, 895-3322. You may also contact the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University (895-1357) to verify the legitimacy of this research. You are under no obligation to sign this consent form. However, only those students with signed forms will participate in the study.

Your support of this research is sincerely appreciated. It is extremely important to learn as much as we can about gambling and crime, and their impact on our youth. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

William J. Miller

CONSENT FORM

I have read the instructions provided above and agree to participate in this research project.

_________________________________________  _______________________
Signature                      Date
Please read each of the following questions carefully and then choose the most appropriate answer. Your responses will remain confidential.

A. The first few questions concern gambling behavior.

1. Indicate how often, if at all, you have done these activities in your lifetime.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>At Least Once</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   a. Played cards for money
   b. Flipped coins or rolled dice for money
   c. Bet on games of personal skill like pool, golf or bowling
   d. Bet on sports (e.g., football, baseball)
   e. Bet on horse or dog races
   f. Played bingo for money
   g. Played slot machines, poker machines or other gambling machines
   h. Played the lottery by picking numbers
   i. Bet at a casino (21, roulette)
   j. Bet with a friend

2. Indicate how often, if at all, you have done these activities in the last 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Less than Monthly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   a. Played cards for money
   b. Flipped coins or rolled dice for money
   c. Bet on games of personal skill like pool, golf or bowling
   d. Bet on sports (e.g., football, baseball)
   e. Bet on horse or dog races
   f. Played bingo for money
g. 1 2 3 4 5 Played slot machines, poker machines or other gambling machines

h. 1 2 3 4 5 Played the lottery by picking numbers

i. 1 2 3 4 5 Bet at a casino (21, roulette)

j. 1 2 3 4 5 Bet with a friend

3. What is the largest amount of money you have ever gambled with on any one day?

1. never have gambled
2. $1 or less
3. more than $1.01 up to $10
4. more than $10.01 up to $100
5. more than $100.01 up to $1000
6. more than $1000.01 up to $10,000
7. more than $10,000

4. Do either of your parents play any games of chance?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

If yes, which one?

1. Mother
2. Father
3. Both Mother and Father

5. Do you think that either or your parents gamble too much?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't know

If yes, which one?

1. Mother only
2. Father only
3. Both Mother and Father

6. In the past 12 months, how often have you gone back another day to try and win back the money you have lost?

1. Every time
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. Never

7. In the past 12 months, when you were betting, have you ever told others that you were winning when you really weren't?

1. Yes
2. No

8. Has your betting money, in the past 12 months, ever caused any problems for you such as arguments with family and friends, or problems at school or work?
1. Yes 2. No

9. In the past 12 months, have you ever gambled more than you had planned?
   1. Yes 2. No

10. In the past 12 months has anyone criticized your betting or told you that you had a gambling problem, regardless of whether you thought it was true or not?
    1. Yes 2. No

11. In the past 12 months, have you ever felt bad about the amount you bet, or about what happens when you bet?
    1. Yes 2. No

12. Have you ever felt, in the past 12 months, that you would like to stop betting money but didn't think you could?
    1. Yes 2. No

13. In the last 12 months, have you ever hidden from family or friends any betting slips, I.O.U.s, lottery tickets, money that you've won, or other signs of gambling?
    1. Yes 2. No

14. In the past 12 months, have you had money arguments with family or friends that centered on gambling?
    1. Yes 2. No

15. In the past 12 months, have you borrowed money to bet and not paid it back?
    1. Yes 2. No

16. In the past 12 months, have you ever skipped or been absent from school or work due to betting activities?
    1. Yes 2. No

17a. Have you ever borrowed money or stolen something in order to bet or cover gambling debts in the past 12 months?
    1. Yes 2. No
If yes, mark who or where you got the money or goods from (mark all that apply):

b. Parents
c. Brother(s) or Sister(s)
d. Other relatives
e. Friends
f. Loan sharks
g. You sold personal or family property
h. You passed a bad check on your checking account
i. You stole from someone

18. To what extent do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Gamble alone?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gamble with friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Gamble with people you wouldn't call friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Gamble with family members?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. To what extent do you gamble at each of the following locations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In a casino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. At a grocery or convenience store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. At school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. At home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. At the home of friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Each time you gamble, what is the typical amount of money you bet?

1. Less than $2.00
2. $2.01 - $5.00
3. $5.01 - $10.00
4. $10.01 - $25.00
5. More than $25.00

21. Thinking back, how old were you when you first gambled?

_____ years old         99____ don't recall
B. The next few questions ask for information about yourself.

22. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements which may or may not describe you. First, do you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD) with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am able to do most things as well as most people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about feelings toward life. First, do you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD) with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. There's little use writing public officials because they often aren't really interested in the problems of the average person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average person is getting worse, not better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. These days a person doesn't really know whom he or she can count on.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Do you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I don't mind taking orders and being told what to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I don't like anyone telling me what to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I don't like adults criticizing me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. By the time a person is a senior in high school, he/she should be able to come and go as they please.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Thinking back since the time you turned 13 years of age, indicate how often you engaged in the activities described below. Please be as truthful as possible answering these items. No one will see your individual answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Several Times</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Driven a car without a driver's license or permit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Taken little things (worth less than $5.00).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bought or drank beer, wine or liquor (include drinking at home).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Purposely damaged or destroyed public or private property that didn't belong to you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Skipped school without a legitimate excuse.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Defied your parents' authority (to their face).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Struck your boyfriend or girlfriend in a way that resulted in an injury.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Used marijuana or hashish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Used cocaine (also called &quot;coke,&quot; &quot;crack,&quot; &quot;rock&quot;).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Sniffed glue or breathed the contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaled other gases or sprays in order to get high.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
k. Carried a concealed weapon (gun or knife) to school. 1 2 3 4
l. Used a gun or knife in a threatening manner. 1 2 3 4
m. Ran away from home. 1 2 3 4
n. Had sexual relations with another person. 1 2 3 4
o. Smoked cigarettes. 1 2 3 4

26. Listed below are several reasons for breaking the law. On a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being not important (NI) and 4 being very important, please rate the importance of each to you as a reason for breaking the law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>V1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Peer pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Relief of boredom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Release of tension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Creates a natural high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provides a sense of personal accomplishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Enjoyment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The risk of being caught</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The sense of freedom it provides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. It's a challenge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. It's exciting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. The next few questions are about your high school years.

27. In general, did you like or dislike school?

1. Liked it
2. Liked it and disliked it equally
3. Disliked it
28. How important was getting good grades to you personally?
   1. Very important  3. Somewhat unimportant
   2. Somewhat important  4. Very unimportant

29. Did you care what teachers thought of you?
   1. I cared a lot
   2. I cared some
   3. I didn't care much

30. How much do you think most teachers liked your group of friends?
   1. Very much  4. Not at all
   2. Fairly well  5. I didn't have a group of friends
   3. Not much  6. I don't know

31. How often did you think about what you were going to be after you got out of school?
   1. Very often  4. Seldom
   2. Often  5. Never
   3. Sometimes

32. Were you very worried (VW), somewhat worried (SW) or not worried (NW) about the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Knowing what you will do after high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Knowing what work you are best suited for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Deciding whether you should go to college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Being able to find a job after you get out of high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. On average, how much time did you spend doing homework outside of school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3 or more hours per day</td>
<td>5. About 1/2 hour per day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. About 2 hours per day</td>
<td>6. Less than 1/2 hour a day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. About 1 1/2 hours per day</td>
<td>7. We were not given any homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. About 1 hour per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Did you finish your homework?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Always</td>
<td>4. Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Usually</td>
<td>5. We were not given homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Were you active in any school-connected activities like these?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Athletic teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cheer leading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hobby clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Science clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Service clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Future nurses, teachers, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Musical groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Art and dance clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Publications, school paper, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Student government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Honor societies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Human relations committees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Were your friends at school active in school activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very active</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat active</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very active</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not active at all</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. In general, how much say or influence do you feel each of the following had on how the high school was run (If you attended more than one high school, think in terms of the high school you spent the most time at.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Level</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. In general, how much say or influence did you, as an individual, have on how your school was run?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Level</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little of no influence</td>
<td>Considerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>A great deal of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. Do you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. School administrators did their best to make policy decisions that were in the best interest of the student body.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School administrators treated everyone fairly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. School administrators treated me fairly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. How many hours a week did you spend doing these thing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None at All</th>
<th>Less than One</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>5-8</th>
<th>9 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Playing team sports (e.g., football, volleyball)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Playing individual sports (e.g., swimming, pool)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sitting around and talking with friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sitting around and talking with parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Riding around in a car</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. The following questions are about jobs you may have maintained during high school.

41. How old were you when you got your first job at which you worked for pay at least five hours per week?

- 01. I have never had such a job
- 02. Age 10 or before
- 03. Age 11
- 04. Age 12
- 05. Age 13
- 06. Age 14
- 07. Age 15
- 08. Age 16
- 09. Age 17
- 10. Age 18 or older
42. On the average, how many hours a week did you work for pay while you were attending school?

1. Not at all  
2. Less than 6 hours  
3. 6-10 hours  
4. 11-15 hours  
5. 16-20 hours  
6. 21-25 hours  
7. 26-39 hours  
8. Full time (40 hours or more)

43. Did you give your family any of the money you earned?

1. I didn't earn any money  
2. All of it  
3. Most of it  
4. Half of it  
5. A little  
6. None of it

44. How much time did you spend doing work around the house (e.g., cleaning, cooking, cutting grass, washing the car, baby sitting, etc.) every week?

1. None at all  
2. At least 1 hour  
3. 2-3 hours  
4. 4-5 hours  
5. More than 5 hours

E. The following questions are about friends you had during high school.

45. Did you want to be the kind of person your best friends were?

1. In most ways  
2. In a few ways  
3. Not at all  
4. I didn't have any best friends

46. How important was it to develop close friendships?

1. Very important  
2. Important  
3. Not too important  
4. Not important at all

47. Did you respect your best friend's opinions about the important things in life?

1. Completely  
2. Pretty much  
3. Not at all  
4. I didn't have any best friends  
5. A little

48. How influential were your best friends in deciding what you did?

1. Very influential  
2. Somewhat influential  
3. Not too influential  
4. Not influential
49. Would your best friends have stuck by you if you got into big trouble?

1. Certainly
2. Probably
3. I doubt it
4. Don't know
5. I didn't have any best friends

50. How many people were you thinking of when you answered these questions about your "best friends"?

1. Seven or more
2. Six
3. Five
4. Four
5. Three
6. Two
7. One
8. None

F. The following questions are about your home life during your high school years.

51. Do you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Nothing was worth moving away from my parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I was very happy at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My parents gave me the right amount of affection.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Letting my parents down would have been one of the worst things that could have happened to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My parents were usually proud of me when I finished something that I worked hard on.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. My parents trusted me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I was closer to my parents than a lot of kids my age.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Do you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My parents wanted to know who I was going out with when I went out with other boys and girls.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In my free time away from home, my parents knew where I was and who I was with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I believe that my parents physically abused me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My parents required nothing less than complete obedience from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I believe that my parents verbally abused me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. When I asked my parents why I had to do something or why I couldn't do something, they often said something like "do so because I said so."  

g. Although my parents rarely told me that I couldn't do something that I wanted to do, they frequently tried to change my mind so that I would do things their way instead.

h. My parents wanted me to tell them where I was if I didn't come home right after school.

i. My parents used spankings to discipline me.

j. My parents rarely punished me

k. My parents gave me a great deal of personal freedom.

l. I was sexually abused by a family member.

53. How much influence did you have in making family decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3. Very little</th>
<th></th>
<th>4. None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. How were most decisions made between you and your mother?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3. I decided, but I had to get her permission</th>
<th></th>
<th>4. We talked about it until we agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>She told me what to do</td>
<td>We talked about it, but she decided</td>
<td></td>
<td>I did what I wanted to, but she wanted me to consider her opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We talked about it, but she decided</td>
<td>I decided, but I had to get her permission</td>
<td></td>
<td>I did what I wanted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I decided, but I had to get her permission</td>
<td>We talked about it until we agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. How were most decisions made between you and your father?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3. I decided, but I had to get his permission</th>
<th></th>
<th>4. We talked about it until we agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>He told me what to do</td>
<td>We talked about it, but he decided</td>
<td></td>
<td>I did what I wanted, but he wanted me to consider his opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We talked about it, but he decided</td>
<td>I decided, but I had to get his permission</td>
<td></td>
<td>I did what I wanted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I decided, but I had to get his permission</td>
<td>We talked about it until we agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. The following questions are about the legal system.

56. Do you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. People who break the law are almost always caught and punished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Being sent to juvenile court would have bothered me a lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The police always tried to give all kids an even break</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Most things that people call delinquency don't really harm anybody</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. It is alright to get around the law if you could get away with it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Most criminals really shouldn't be blamed for the things they did</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I respect the police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. The final few questions ask you for some background information.

57. What is your age? ____ years old.

58. What is your gender?
1. Male
2. Female

59. How do you describe yourself?
1. Native American or American Indian
2. Black or African American
3. Hispanic
4. Asian
5. White or Caucasian
6. Other ___________________________
60. What is the highest level of schooling your father completed?

1. Completed grade school or less
2. Some high school
3. Completed high school
4. Some college
5. Completed college
6. Graduate or professional school after college
7. Don't know or does not apply

61. What is the highest level of schooling your mother completed?

1. Completed grade school or less
2. Some high school
3. Completed high school
4. Some college
5. Completed college
6. Graduate or professional school after college
7. Don't know or does not apply

62. What is your religious preference?

1. Catholic
2. Jewish
3. Latter Day Saints
4. Muslim/Moslem
5. Protestant
6. Other religion ______________________
7. No religious preference

63. How often do you attend religious services?

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Once or twice a month
4. About once a week or more

64. Does your church have special programs for boys or girls your age?

1. Yes, but I never attend
2. Yes, and I go sometimes
3. Yes, and I attend all the time
4. No, there are no special programs
5. Don't know
6. I don't go to any particular church
65. How important is religion to your life?
   1. Not important
   2. Somewhat important
   3. Very important

66. Which of the following best describes your household during most of your high school years?
   1. Single parent, mother
   2. Single parent, father
   3. Live with guardian, grandparent, or aunt/uncle
   4. Birth parents
   5. Two parents, divorced, remarried
   6. Live alone
   7. Other __________________

67. Which of the following best describes your high school program?
   1. Academic or college prep
   2. General
   3. Vocational, technical or commercial
   4. Other or Don't know

68. Which of the following best describes your high school grade point average?
   01. A-A+ (93-100+)
   02. A- (90-92)
   03. B+ (87-89)
   04. B (83-86)
   05. B- (80-82)
   06. C+ (77-79)
   07. C (73-76)
   08. C- (70-72)
   09. D (69 or below)

69. What was your father's occupation during your high school years (If your father changed jobs, refer to the job that he held for the longest period of time)?
   1. ______________________
   2. Does not apply
   3. Do not know
   4. Did not work outside the home
   5. Retired
   6. Desired work, but did not work at that time
70. What was your mother's occupation during your highschool years (If your mother changed jobs, refer to the job that she held for the longest period of time)?

1. 
2. Does not apply
3. Did not work outside the home
4. Do not know
5. Retired
6. Desired work, but did not work at the time
DATE: July 19, 1995

TO: Dr. Frederick W. Preston (Sociology)
    Dr. James Frey (Sociology)
    M/S: 5033

FROM: Dr. William E. Schulze
      Social Behavioral Committee of the
      Institutional Review Board

RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol entitled:
    "Survey of Student Attitudes and Gambling Behavior"
    OSP # 114f0795-027

This memorandum is official notification that the protocol for
the project referenced above has been approved by the Social
Behavioral Committee of the Institutional Review Board. This
approval is approved for a period of one year from the date of
this notification, and work on the project may proceed. At the
end of the year, you must notify this office if the project will
be continued.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol
continue beyond a year from the date of this notification, it
will be necessary to request an extension.

If you have any questions or require any assistance, please give
us a call.
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