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ABSTRACT

Probably one of the biggest concerns today of most Americans is the problem of crime. Police depend heavily upon citizens to help them fight crime, and so attitudes towards police are important since it is these attitudes which can directly help or hinder police effectiveness. Adolescents are over-represented in committing crimes; therefore, they become a target group in establishing positive community-police relations. Attitudes towards the self are equally important since how we feel about ourselves influences our attitudes towards others. This research investigated the variables of sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, police contact, and self-esteem to determine their importance in predicting late adolescents' attitudes towards police. It also studied the relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards parents, teachers, and police. Subjects were 448 late adolescent college students drawn from two Midwestern universities who completed an in-depth questionnaire. Multiple regression, path analysis, and correlational analyses were the statistical procedures used. Results showed that delinquency was the best predictor in attitudes towards police, followed by self-esteem and then race. These were the only variables that achieved significance. All of the tested variables combined explained 13% of the total variance in attitudes towards police. Results further indicated that the more these late
adolescents liked themselves, the more they liked their mothers, their teachers, and police, in that order. There was some support that this relationship may also hold true regarding attitudes towards fathers. Limitations of the study are discussed as well as directions for future research and policy recommendations.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Pick up any newspaper and one is confronted with crime—stabbings, robberies, murders, and the like. Outside of drugs, to which crime is frequently linked, probably the biggest concern of most Americans today is the problem of crime. Crime is everywhere and efforts to thwart it seem to be failing. Police are a key component in society's battle against crime. Of the many elements of the justice system, such as lawyers, judges, and correctional officers, police are the most visible and are typically the first individuals a citizen encounters (Moretz 1980). Operating in the community, police have the power to make arrests, issue warnings, or take no action at all, depending on the situation. Dunham and Alpert (1993) view police as being the gatekeepers to the criminal justice system.

Thirty years ago, sociologist Michael Banton (1964) observed that police work in the future would depend more upon public cooperation than it did then. Clearly, in the area of solving crime, citizen cooperation with the police is vital (Cox and Falkenberg 1987); for example, police depend upon citizens to provide eye witness accounts, possible suspect information, and information about specific criminals and their activities (Gaines, Kappeler, and Vaughn 1994). Hence, attitudes citizens have towards police are of paramount importance since these
attitudes directly help or hinder police effectiveness. If community opinion towards police is positive, citizens are more likely to cooperate with police. This results in police being more satisfied with their job and more effective in maintaining order (Brooks 1993), which ultimately provides a hedge against social decay and more crime (Greene 1989). On the other hand, if community opinion is negative towards police, citizens are less likely to cooperate with police. This results in police being cynical about their job and less effective in maintaining order (Brooks 1993), which provides the opportunity for further criminal invasion (Greene 1989).

A disproportionate share of crime today is committed by those between the ages of thirteen to twenty-four (Nettler 1984), roughly the age of adolescence (Schiamberg 1988). Consider that in 1991 those thirteen to twenty-four years old constituted 17.1% of the United States' population and yet comprised 43.7% of those arrested (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics 1993). This group, then, becomes a target group in efforts to combat crime. If we know what predictors are important in adolescents' attitudes towards police, we can work towards enhancing positive attitudes towards them. Setting up a positive image of police sets up a positive image of law and a respect for it, which decreases the likelihood of criminal involvement (Fortune 1971). Precisely how this process works addresses the relationship between attitude and behavior; specifically, is behavior a function of attitude? Hill (1990) debates this issue at length and concludes that, "under a variety of conditions, attitudes have at least
modest utility in predicting behavior [and] . . . the evidence remains convincing despite differences in the methods employed, the populations studied, and the situations analyzed" (pp. 373-374). Thus, as cognitive consistency theories (Shaw and Costanzo 1970), such as balance theory (Heider 1946) and cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger 1957) suggest, people tend to behave in accordance with their attitudes (Fortune 1971).

Just as attitudes towards police are important, attitudes towards oneself are equally so. Self-esteem, achieving and maintaining a favorable attitude towards oneself, is a topic of study which has always generated a great deal of interest as evidenced by the number of books and articles, both professional and popular, dealing with it. This interest is indeed justified when one recognizes that attitudes towards the self impact upon our every psychological process (Adler 1956). Self-esteem appears to be a major factor in determining behavior (Coopersmith 1959). Positive attitudes towards oneself tend to be projected onto others (Sullivan 1940) in such a way that the more one accepts oneself, the more likely one is to accept others (Hjelle and Ziegler 1976).

The field of psychology has a long history of interest in the area of self-esteem, beginning in 1890 with the work of William James. Psychologists have typically addressed this topic in terms of how self-concept affects behavior, treating self-esteem as a social force (Rosenberg 1990). Sociologists, though they lack a history of tradition within this domain and have approached the topic with less fervor, have also examined self-esteem but with a slightly different focus,
addressing how external variables affect self-concept. Here, self-esteem is treated as the product of social influences (Rosenberg 1990). These two perspectives on self-esteem, the psychological and the sociological, have tended to remain separate, with the interest psychologists have shown in this topic still greatly exceeding that shown by sociologists. Self-esteem is an important area for sociologists to investigate, however, because one's self-concept has significant sociological implications. Consider that those low in self-esteem are less socially integrated than others and so tend to be rebellious in school, show little interest in public affairs, and have values and norms at variance with mainstream society (Rosenberg 1989); these are issues which are of definite concern for the sociologist.

Statement of the Problem

Two arguments have been put forth in this paper thus far. One is that police are important in the battle against crime and that they depend upon citizen involvement to be effective. The public is more likely to be helpful towards police when their attitudes are positive rather than negative. Positive attitudes towards police tend to provide a barrier against a criminal lifestyle. Since adolescents are over-represented in committing crimes, they are a target group in establishing positive community-police relations. In an effort to meet this goal, it is first useful to identify what variables play a part in adolescents' attitudes towards police.
A second argument that has been made is that self-esteem is important, since how we feel about ourselves influences how we feel about others. Many early theorists, such as Adler (1956), Horney (1945), Fromm (1947; 1956), Sullivan (1940), and Rogers (Hjelle and Ziegler 1976), put forth this idea, with Mead (1956) providing the framework as to how the process works. The work of Rosenberg (1989), Coopersmith (1967), and other researchers (e.g., Epstein 1979; Kutnick 1980; Rosenberg and McCullough 1981) utilize this idea as a foundation upon which to build. In essence, then, the idea that self-esteem affects attitudes towards others is not new. Though this is so, however, research specifically addressing the relationship of self-esteem and attitudes towards authority figures is extremely sparse. Only two such studies were found, one (Amoroso and Ware 1983) a Canadian study and the other (Rathus and Siegel 1973) completed twenty years ago. The goal of this research, therefore, is to further knowledge in the area of self-esteem and attitudes towards authority figures. The guiding premise of the proposed study is that self-esteem influences attitudes towards authority figures such that youth with high self-esteem will tend to feel positive towards authority figures and youth low in self-esteem will tend to feel negative towards authority figures.

The purpose of this study is twofold: (1) investigate predictors in attitudes towards police; the specific research questions are: What variables are important to consider when predicting late adolescents' attitudes towards police? How important are these variables?
(2) investigate the relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards authority figures; here the research questions are: What is the relationship between late adolescents' self-esteem and their attitudes towards parents? What is the relationship between late adolescents' self-esteem and their attitudes towards teachers? What is the relationship between late adolescents' self-esteem and their attitudes towards police? What is the relationship between late adolescents' self-esteem, their attitudes towards parents, their attitudes towards teachers, and their attitudes towards police?
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES

Review of the Literature: Self-esteem

Historical Roots

Numerous individuals have contributed to the self-esteem literature. What will be presented here, however, are those theorists who have had substantial impact. In particular, selection for inclusion in this discussion was guided by two criteria: (1) an examination of all the books on self-esteem which highlighted its historical roots, (2) selecting only those theorists presented in every one of the historical reviews. The first criterion produced three books—two (Coopersmith 1967; Samuels 1977) specifically addressing self-esteem in children, with the third (Wells and Marwell 1976) being more general. The second criterion yielded nine theorists: Mead, Rosenberg, James, Alder, Horney, Fromm, Sullivan, Rogers, and Coopersmith. These theorists, therefore, will be discussed. Those with more of a sociological focus (Mead and Rosenberg) will be examined first, followed by the theorists emphasizing a psychological perspective (James, Adler, Horney, Fromm, Sullivan, Rogers, and Coopersmith).
Mead

The importance of the work of George Herbert Mead to the self-esteem field lies within his ideas on the development of the self. For Mead (1956), the self is a social product—one is not born with a self but rather the self emerges through a process of social experience and activity, as the individual develops language and the ability to take on the role of others. Role taking involves being able to see oneself as others do, as an object. To explain, as the individual grows and develops, she or he begins to internalize the ideas and attitudes of significant others and expresses them as her or his own. This process holds equally true for self-attitudes as it does for attitudes towards any external object. Thus, one observes and incorporates how one is regarded and valued by key others and responds to oneself in kind: If important others, such as parents, have treated one with concern, respect, and value, one sees oneself as an object of worth; conversely, if significant others have treated one in a cold, rejecting, demeaning manner, one sees oneself as an object of little worth. Therein lies Mead's contribution to this area: Though he did not deal explicitly with self-esteem, it can be concluded from his ideas regarding the self that self-esteem is derived from the reflected appraisal of significant others (Coopersmith 1967).

Rosenberg

Morris Rosenberg has been writing about self-esteem for nearly thirty years. Perhaps his best known and most influential work is his
book *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*, published in 1965. In the Introduction of the recent revised edition (1989), Rosenberg writes that he feels more confident today about the findings from his study than he did when the work was originally published, commenting that the results have stood the test of time and, even considering subsequent research, require little modification. An in-depth look at this work follows.

Utilizing the survey method, subjects were 5,024 junior and senior high school students in New York who were approximately fifteen to eighteen years old. Following Mead, for Rosenberg (1989), self-esteem is simply "a positive or negative attitude toward a particular object, namely the self" (p. 30); this was measured via a ten-item self-report scale. In terms of descriptors, high self-esteem individuals respect themselves and consider themselves worthy; they are neither better nor worse than others; they recognize their failings and use them as areas in which to improve and grow. Low self-esteem individuals, on the other hand, see themselves in an opposite light; they are dissatisfied and even contemptuous towards themselves and wish they could feel otherwise.

Results showed social class, religion, ethnicity, birth order, and coming from a broken family to be only weakly related or unrelated to self-esteem. However, parental interest and respect were related to feelings of self-worth such that subjects who characterized their parents as being uninterested or indifferent towards them had significantly lower self-esteem than others. In fact, it was found that extreme parental indifference had a more injurious effect on adolescents' self-esteem than whether punishment received as a child was
deserved or undeserved. Adolescents who received punishment in childhood that was undeserved but whose parents were interested in them had higher self-esteem than those who felt their punishment was deserved but their parents showed little interest in them. Thus, it appears that some parental interest, even of a negative type, is better than none at all. Rosenberg argues that "the feeling that one is important to a significant other is probably essential to the development of a feeling of self-worth" (p. 146).

A number of characteristics were found by Rosenberg to be associated with low self-esteem: high levels of anxiety, interpersonal difficulty, a lack of participation and leadership in formal and informal groups, little interest in public affairs, and occupational frustration. What is of particular relevance for this discussion, though, is the relationship between self-esteem and social integration. Social integration is an individual's connectedness or feelings of attachment to society. Of the various ways this may manifest itself, Rosenberg considers three: (1) interpersonally--low self-esteem adolescents had more distant, less intimate relationships with others, felt less socially supported, and had more feelings of rejection by others, (2) institutionally--subjects with low self-esteem held less positive attitudes towards school, were more negative in orientation towards school, and were more likely to engage in rebellious behaviors at school, and (3) normatively--low self-esteem subjects valued less and were less enthusiastic in their support of such qualities as social skills, academic achievement, reciprocity, religiousness, honesty,
kindness, and social responsibility. In short, adolescents characterized by low self-worth were less socially integrated or less tied to society than were those with high self-esteem. Elsewhere, Rosenberg (1985) notes that low self-esteem adolescents tend to feel, but do not necessarily show, greater interpersonal hostility.

James

The field of psychology has a long history of interest in the area of self-esteem. The ideas of William James, written in 1890, are still considered to be the starting point of reference for this topic (Wells and Marwell 1976). James described the self as consisting of the material self, the social self, the spiritual self, and the pure ego. He argued that in order to understand the self as a total, one must not only look at the constituents of the self but also the feelings and emotions they arouse, self-feelings, and the actions which they prompt, self-seeking and self-preservation. Self-feelings are primary feelings, dependent entirely upon "what we back ourselves to be and do" (1890:310). Thus, self-esteem is a function of what we would ideally like to be and how we actually measure up to that standard—we apply to ourselves the same community standards of success and failure that we apply to others. As James states, in his now classic definition, self-esteem is the ratio of successes to pretensions. Further, how we feel about ourselves influences our behavior.
Adler

In the early 1900s, it was a known fact that when a biological organ was defective, an individual tended to compensate for it by overdeveloping another. Alfred Adler extended the medical interpretation of defect and compensation by applying it to social behavior, arguing that human beings, being both biologically and psychologically inadequate to cope with their environment, develop feelings of inferiority. These feelings of inferiority are normal, originate in childhood, and become an integral part of the developing personality (Smith and Vetter 1982). With acceptance and support from others, especially parents and, to a lesser degree, teachers, children compensate for their weaknesses and turn them into strengths; without such help, they become hopeless, embittered, and likely deviant. Overindulgence, however, results in a pampered child who is self-centered, demanding, and inflated in self-worth. In short, for Adler, to be human means to feel inferior. A major goal of the individual, therefore, is a striving away from feelings of inferiority towards feelings of superiority or self-perfection (Adler 1956). It is through this process that self-esteem is enhanced. Adler believed that the individual cannot be considered apart from the social situation. He also argued that an individual's opinion of herself or himself and of the world, as well as her or his interpretation, influences every psychological process (Adler 1956).
Horney

A key assumption in Karen Horney's (1950) theory is the individual's desire to value himself or herself and to be valued by others (Wells and Marwell 1976). Her whole theoretical structure rests upon the basic principle that human beings possess an innate capacity for growth—that they are always striving for, yet never achieving, self-realization, the fullest attainment of their potentialities (Smith and Vetter 1982). Parents play a paramount role in the process of self-realization. A home environment characterized by warmth, understanding, and dependability creates security for a child, allowing her or him to grow and develop normally. However, a lack of love and understanding from one's parents hinders a child's ability to adapt to and confront the world, thereby increasing basic anxiety, a "terrible feeling of being isolated and helpless in a potentially hostile world" (1945:39). This anxiety is a severe threat to any sense of security a child may have, the need for security being a guiding principle in this theory. An important component of the need for security is self-esteem (Wells and Marwell 1976).

According to Horney (1937), basic anxiety is interwoven with basic hostility—a feeling that develops from resentment over parental indifference and inconsistency. Because a child needs and fears his or her parents and must have their love, this hostility is repressed, increasing anxiety. Thus, the child is torn between hostility towards the parents and a dependence upon them. This conflict leads to the development of three styles of adaptation: (1) moving toward people—
the compliant neurotic who craves approval and affection from others in a dependent fashion; (2) moving against people—the aggressive neurotic who is demanding, hostile, and exploitive; and (3) moving away from people—the detached neurotic who is independent, aloof, and withdrawn (Horney 1945; Smith and Vetter 1982). Horney (1945) argues that the normal personality integrates these styles of behavior and uses them appropriately, accordingly to the situation. Neurosis develops when one of these styles becomes the only mode of interacting with others.

Fromm

Erich Fromm is part of the neo-Freudian movement, utilizing the ideas of Freud as a basis upon which to build. He clearly departs company with other neo-Freudians, however, with his writings being influenced by the ideas of Karl Marx. Fromm (1956) is concerned with both the individual and society, as well as their interaction; he argues that both have needs and the fulfillment of individual needs and societal needs is a function of the nature of the interaction between the two. It is Fromm's ideas concerning individual needs that relate to self-esteem. Fromm believes that people are social beings who must be understood in terms of their relations to others. He (1956) posits that human beings have five basic needs, which stem from the conditions of human existence: relatedness, transcendence, rootedness, a sense of identity, and a frame of orientation and devotion. Each individual experiences and must attempt to satisfy these needs. Relatedness is the need to establish and maintain positive relationships with others.
Self-love (the opposite of selfishness) is a form of relatedness and is a necessary prerequisite for the capacity to love others, as Fromm (1947) states, "the love for my own self is inseparably connected with the love for any other self" (p. 129). He (1956) further notes that a failure to love oneself is accompanied by a basic hostility towards others. Rootedness, or the need to feel that one belongs, and a sense of identity, one's desire to know who one is and to understand one's role in society, also relate to self-esteem, though indirectly.

**Sullivan**

Harry Stack Sullivan (1953) strongly advocated for the convergence of psychiatry and social psychology, defining both as the study of interpersonal interaction. Freud's failure to recognize the impact of interpersonal interaction on personality development and functioning was one of Sullivan's primary criticisms of psychoanalytic theory (Smith and Vetter 1982). The influence of George Herbert Mead's ideas of the self as a reflexive structure are apparent in Sullivan's beliefs concerning the development of the personality or self-system: (1) it does not exist independently from the individual's social, interpersonal field in which she or he develops and functions (2) it develops primarily through interpersonal interactions, parents being especially important (3) it develops in order to satisfy needs (Smith and Vetter 1982). Individuals have two kinds of needs--satisfaction needs or biological requirements necessary for survival and security needs or interpersonal needs such as kindness, warmth, and understanding from others (Sullivan 1940). The
self-system or self (Mullahy 1945) develops in childhood. Images of the self, self-evaluations being self-esteem (Wells and Marwell 1976), arise from the child's perceptions of other persons' evaluations of him or her. Positive attitudes towards the self are of significance because self-attitudes are manifested towards others (Sullivan 1940), an idea discussed earlier with the work of Fromm. Consequences of low self-esteem may be social isolation, exploitation of others in several ways, or engagement in dissociative processes (Sullivan 1953).

As a child develops more and more ways to cope with the environment, he or she also develops sets of social expectations which aid in interpersonal relations. Each set of expectations that is learned is initially specific to just one individual or type of individual; this is termed personification (Sullivan 1953). An important aspect of personifications is that they generalize to others (Smith and Vetter 1982). In other words, the good or bad characteristics seen in one person tend to be applied to many similar others. For example, if the mother is personified primarily as kind, understanding, loving, and warm, a child will expect to find these same qualities in other adult women who are perceived as similar to the mother, such as aunts, teachers, and the like. On the other hand, if the mother is personified as rejecting, domineering, and cold, a child will expect to find these characteristics in similar adults.
In developing his own theory of personality and behavior, Carl Rogers (1951) identifies Sullivan (1940), as well as others, as having contributed to his thinking. For Rogers, the structure of personality consists of experience, a fluid and changing field representing the totality of experience, and self-structure, which is defined as the self-concept or self and includes "patterned perceptions of the individual's characteristics and relationships, together with the values associated with these" (1951, 525). Further, "it is a gestalt which is available to awareness, though not necessarily in awareness" (Rogers 1959, 200). It is Rogers' ideas concerning the self that adds to our understanding of self-esteem.

Rogers (1951) acknowledges that Mead and others have contributed significantly to what we know about the development and functioning of the self. According to Rogers, early in life the self does not exist, and it is only gradually as an infant develops that she or he becomes aware of herself or himself as being separate and distinct from the rest of the world. Rogers believes that all individuals possess a need for positive regard, a basic desire to experience warmth, respect, acceptance, and the like from significant others. This need develops as an awareness of the self emerges and is pervasive and persistent. Given a child's compelling need for positive regard, he or she becomes increasingly influenced by, and sensitive to, the attitudes and expectations of important others, especially his or her parents, towards
him or her. Thus, conditions of worth develop, whereby the child only receives praise and attention or other forms of reward contingent upon behaving in accordance with standards imposed by others, others' ideas of what he or she ought to be. In essence, opinions and evaluations about one's self, one's self-concept, are derived from social interaction. The self-concept includes not only perceptions of what one is really like but also perceptions of what one would like to be; the greater the congruence between the real self and the ideal self, the greater the self-acceptance and the higher the self-esteem (Wells and Marwell 1976). Self-opinions are important because the more one accepts oneself, the more likely he or she is to accept others (Hjelle and Ziegler 1976).

**Coopersmith**

Stanley Coopersmith's work (1959, 1967) is characterized by a focus on the development, correlates, and consequences of self-esteem, centering particularly on the age group of ten to twelve years old, since by this time, he believes, children have developed an overall self-appraisal that is stable and enduring. Coopersmith (1959) argues that self-esteem is a major factor in determining behavior. For him, self-esteem is an evaluation "which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy."
In short, self-esteem is a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself" (1967, 4-5). Further, Coopersmith (1959, 1967) identifies two dimensions or aspects of self-esteem: (1) subjective evaluation or one's own feelings towards oneself (covert), (2) its behavioral expression or the way in which one expresses one's self-evaluation (overt). Congruence between the two dimensions (high-high, medium-medium, low-low) is referred to as genuine self-esteem (i.e., being accurate), whereas marked incongruence (high-low, low-high) yields defensive self-esteem (i.e., being inaccurate). To explain more fully, high-high means one feels very positive towards oneself and is rated quite favorably and is well thought of by others; conversely, high-low means one rates oneself highly but is rated poorly by others.

Coopersmith's contributions to the self-esteem literature can be best understood by examining his major works in this area in more detail. The main purpose of his 1959 study was to devise and test a procedure for determining types of self-esteem. Utilizing a sample of ten to twelve-year-old boys and girls from an upper-middle-class public school system, Coopersmith developed and administered a self-evaluation inventory and an inventory designed to measure behavioral evaluations, which was completed by the subjects' teachers and principal. Based upon the scores on these two inventories, a sub-sample of forty-eight children, four groups of twelve each, was selected yielding: (1) a group high on both dimensions, high-high; (2) a group low on both dimensions, low-low; (3) a group high on self-evaluation but low on
behavioral evaluation, high-low; (4) a group low on self-evaluation but high on behavioral evaluation, low-high. Various other academic, social, and personality measures were taken on these groups as well. Results showed that the four groups seemed to represent distinct types of self-esteem and that the groups differed significantly in achievement, sociometric status, ideal self, and achievement motivation. Further, in the groups where incongruence existed, where self-evaluation and behavioral evaluation were at variance (the high-low and the low-high groups), significantly higher levels in achievement motivation were present as compared to those where there was congruence (the high-high and the low-low groups). Thus, for the high-low group, these boys and girls apparently believed they fell far short of absolute standards of excellence.

Of the work he has done on self-esteem, it is Coopersmith's book (1967) that is best known and most often cited. In this investigation, Coopersmith extends the conclusions he draws from this 1959 work; specifically, here he delves more deeply into characterizations of children of varying levels of self-esteem, incorporating family influence as well. Subjects were eighty-five white, middle-class, urban boys aged ten to twelve who differed in levels of self-esteem--high, medium, or low. These boys completed a battery of tests and interviews designed to measure their ability, aptitude, and personality style. Interviews with their parents were also conducted. Results indicated distinct differences between the three groups. Boys with a high level of self-esteem tended to be active, expressive individuals who were
academically and socially successful. In discussions, they were leaders rather than just listeners, being eager to express their opinions even if it was at variance with others, and were only slightly sensitive to criticism. They were also very interested in public affairs, engaged in little destructiveness in early childhood, and had a low level of anxiety. Overall, these boys were self-confident, optimistic, and rather creative. The boys in the medium-self-esteem group were very much like those in the high-self-esteem group; these youngsters also tended to be optimistic, expressive, and able to handle criticism. In contrast to the boys in the other two groups, however, these boys were the most uncertain about their own personal worth and so tended to be particularly dependent on social acceptance. They also showed the strongest tendency to support and comply with the middle-class value system. The boys in the low-self-esteem group were basically polar opposites of those in the high-self-esteem group. These boys tended to be passive, discouraged, and depressed individuals who felt unlovable, were fearful of angering others, were highly sensitive to criticism, were relatively anxious, and who engaged in considerable destructiveness in early childhood. In short, these boys were self-conscious, pessimistic, and somewhat constrained. Coopersmith (1967) notes that children low in self-esteem tend to be generally submissive and withdrawn, though occasionally they veer to the opposite extreme and are aggressive and dominating.

Before turning to an examination of the factors related to the development of self-esteem in children, it is useful to first point out
the ones that were found to have little or nothing to do with self-esteem: family size, religious affiliation, social class, mother’s employment, type of feeding employed during infancy (breast-feeding versus bottle-feeding), early trauma, or physical attractiveness. Three characteristics of the parent-child relationship, however, emerged as strongly conducive to the development of high self-esteem: (1) parental warmth—acceptance of the child as a person of worth and value demonstrated by availability for discussions concerning the child’s problems, participating in joint activities, knowledge and concern regarding the child’s friends, and the like; (2) clearly defined limits—parents not being permissive nor punitive; demanding high standards of behavior and being strict and consistent in enforcing rules and yet not being harsh in discipline, using rewards rather than physical punishment or withdrawal of love as disciplinary techniques; (3) respectful treatment—parents being democratic in attitude such that they establish and define the rules for the family but are respectful towards the child’s view and allow the child to partake in the making of family plans.

It is clear that parents play a significant role in the development of self-esteem in their children. Their effect may be greater than what just appears on the surface, though, since, as Coopersmith (1967) notes, attitudes towards parental authority tend to be generalized to other sources of authority (Freud 1939). Interestingly, it is not only how parents behave towards their children that has an impact but the qualities the parents value most in their
children also exerts an influence. It was found that the parents of the boys high in self-esteem placed a greater value on achievement or doing well in school as opposed to accommodation or displaying attention and concern for others (e.g., helpfulness, kindness, and obedience), the quality most valued by the parents of the boys low in self-esteem. This impacted on the boys' expectations such that those high in self-esteem set higher goals for themselves and believed they would be, and were, more successful in achieving their goals. Parents play a role in their children's self-esteem in less obvious ways as well. It was found that the mothers of the boys high in self-esteem tended to be high in self-esteem themselves and that the boys with high self-esteem had a closer relationship with their father than they did with their mother or with others. Further, children from families characterized by divorce and separation tended to be lower in self-esteem. It is interesting to note that the parents of the children with medium self-esteem were found to be more protective and intrusive in terms of privacy issues than those of the other two groups. Children reared under these circumstances are likely to become dependent rather than independent.

Summary of Historical Roots

The preceding discussion examined the contributions of the main theorists in the self-esteem area. A summary of their contributions is deemed useful and will now be presented. Answers to the following questions will be addressed: (1) What is self-esteem? (2) What is the
nature of self-esteem? How does it develop? (3) Why is self-esteem important? (4) What are the consequences of low self-esteem?

Probably one of the first writers in the area of self-esteem was James. He described self-feelings as being primary feelings and specifically defined self-esteem as successes compared to aspirations. Though this definition still has meaning and utility today, others (Rosenberg) have adopted a different one, defining self-esteem as simply a positive or negative attitude toward the self. Rogers does not define self-esteem per se but from his writings on the importance of positive regard, a basic desire to experience warmth and acceptance from key others, one can infer that he equates self-esteem with a need.

Many theorists (Mead, Rosenberg, Adler, Fromm, Sullivan, and Rogers) have argued that attitudes towards the self are derived from social interaction, from one's particular social interpersonal field. Mead provides the framework as to how this process works: One observes how one is regarded and valued by significant others, incorporates this, and responds to oneself in kind. In essence, self-esteem is derived from the reflected appraisal of significant others. It appears that being important to significant others is vital to self-worth (Rosenberg). A pivotal question becomes, then: Who is a significant other? Perhaps the most important significant other is one's parents (Rosenberg, Adler, Horney, Sullivan, Rogers, and Coopersmith). These individuals play an enormous part in the development of self-esteem, so much so, in fact, that some parental interest, even in the form of negative attention, appears to be better than none at all (Rosenberg).
Horney argues that parental indifference can lead to basic hostility. Parents also play an important role in a less obvious way, through personification (Sullivan), whereby attitudes towards parents generalize to other authority figures (Freud). Teachers also seem to be significant others (Adler).

Perhaps the most basic reason why self-esteem is important is because attitudes towards the self influence our ability to adapt to and confront the world (Horney), self-feelings impacting upon our every psychological process (Adler). Self-esteem appears to be a major factor in determining behavior (James and Coopersmith); specifically, different types or levels of self-esteem lead to different behaviors (Coopersmith). Interestingly, positive attitudes towards the self tend to be projected onto others (Sullivan and Rogers) in such a way that the more one accepts oneself, the more likely one is to accept others (Rogers). In fact, self-love seems to be a necessary prerequisite for the capacity to love others (Fromm).

The consequences of low self-esteem can be seen on both the micro or individual level and on the macro or societal level. These will be referred to as psychological consequences and sociological consequences, respectively. Psychologically speaking, the individual low in self-worth presents a pathetic picture: She or he is likely to be highly anxious (Rosenberg and Coopersmith), passive, discouraged (Coopersmith), and hopeless (Adler); this individual will probably have difficulty in interpersonal relations (Rosenberg), relying either on an aloof or withdrawn posture (Horney) or, because of a need for approval and
affection from others, displaying compliance and dependence (Horney). Because of his or her interpersonal style, this person is likely to experience occupational frustration (Rosenberg).

The psychological consequences of low self-worth overlap and lead into the sociological ones. Destructiveness in childhood may be a characteristic of the individual with a low self-opinion (Coopersmith). If this is so, it is likely the same behavior will manifest itself as an adult, resulting in aggressiveness, hostility, and an exploitive attitude towards others (Horney). In turn, this individual is likely to be rebellious at school (Rosenberg), have little interest in public affairs (Rosenberg and Coopersmith), and may question many of the norms and values held in high regard by mainstream society (Rosenberg, Adler, and Coopersmith). In short, the person low in self-esteem is less socially integrated than others.

**Current Studies**

By the time children are five years old, the self-concept is formed (Nagaraja 1981) and the basic characteristics of self-esteem are already in place (Reasoner 1983). Parents are the primary socializing agents of children and are the main source children use to develop their self-image (Baumrind 1978a). Parents being identified as a significant other, a person whose opinion children care about, is often seen in the literature. For example, consider Rosenberg (1979) and Galbo (1983). In his study of nearly 2,000 public school children in grades three to
twelve, Rosenberg (1979) found significant others to be the following, in this order: (1) mothers, (2) fathers, (3) siblings, (4) teachers, (5) friends. Galbo (1983) found parents identified as significant adults for his small sample of high school juniors, with the same-sex parent most likely to be selected as a significant other. Some have argued that the self-esteem of boys is specifically tied to the relationship with the father (Coopersmith 1967; Dickstein and Posner 1978; Harper and Ryder 1986), with girls' self-esteem being tied to the mother (Dickstein and Posner 1978; Elrod and Crase 1980). One current study (Richards, Gitelson, Petersen, and Hurtig 1991) suggests the importance of the cross-sex parent in the development of self-esteem in children. Others have examined whether parental behavior has more of an effect on the self-esteem of girls (Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, and Mueller 1988; Felson and Zielinski 1989) or on boys (Demo, Small, and Savin-Williams 1987; Gecas and Schwalbe 1986; Growe 1980). Regardless of how the problem is approached, of the articles examined for this review, none was found which indicated, or even suggested, that parental behavior has nothing to do with the development of self-esteem in children. Further, it appears parental behavior continues to exert an influence on self-esteem through adolescence as well (Buri, Murphy, Richtsmeier, and Komar 1992; Greenberg, Siegel, and Leitch 1983; LeCroy 1988; Openshaw, Thomas, and Rollins 1984).

Numerous studies (e.g., Bartle, Anderson, and Sabatelli 1989; Buri et al. 1988; Conger 1980; Litovsky and Dusek 1985) have suggested a positive association between authoritative parenting and self-esteem in
children. According to Baumrind (1971, 1978a), authoritative parents are clear, firm, and demanding of their children, yet are also rational, flexible, and encouraging of verbal give and take; these parents enforce the adult perspective but recognize and take into account the child's point of view. Authoritative parenting is likely to produce children who are independent, self-controlled, and achievement motivated (Baumrind 1971, 1978b)—in short, children high in self-esteem. High self-esteem individuals have a positive self-attitude; they believe themselves to be capable and worthy of respect (Coopersmith 1967), have a low tendency to aggress against others (Bachman 1970), and feel in control of their lives (Coopersmith 1967; Paul and Fischer 1980). They are also more likely to be parent-oriented rather than peer-oriented (DiCindio, Floyd, Wilcox, and McSeveney 1983).

On the other hand, parents who are very restrictive, rejecting, and dominating or who are very permissive and hostile are likely to produce children who are low in self-esteem (Becker 1964; Coopersmith 1967; Loeb, Horst, and Horton 1980). Persons low in self-esteem are characterized by a negative self-attitude; they are likely to be submissive (Luck and Heiss 1972), conforming (Janis 1954), have a weaker sense of personal control (Campbell 1981), and desirous of approval from others (Rosenberg 1989); they are also likely to experience high levels of anger and feelings of threat (Epstein 1979) but be nonaggressive (Janis 1954). In his work on adolescents, Rosenberg (1988) argues that those low in self-esteem are hypersensitive to criticism and may tend to feel, though not necessarily show, greater
interpersonal hostility (Rosenberg 1985); they also are less attached to significant others (Rosenberg 1989) and tend to feel they "matter" less to others (Rosenberg and McCullough 1981). Adolescents who have a poor relationship with adults have a tendency to interact and depend more upon peers (Iacovetta 1975). Simons, Robertson, and Downs (1989) argue that parental rejection may lead to deviance for some adolescents.

While parents exert the greatest influence in the development of self-esteem in their children, teachers play an important part as well. As children venture out into the world, one of the first persons they encounter is the teacher. In her study of 416 primary school children, Burger (1973) argues that the increase in self-esteem she found between kindergartners and first graders was likely due to the influence kindergartner teachers have in making school a positive experience for children. Battle (1987a) believes that teachers share many of the responsibilities of parents, functioning "in loco parentis." Cross-culturally, in a study (Ghazi 1986) comparing Iranian and American children, it was found that both groups of children desire warm, close, and friendly relationships with their teachers. A longitudinal study (Hoge, Smit, and Hanson 1990) of sixth and seventh grade students found that teachers' evaluations had significant effects on students' self-esteem. Students themselves list teachers as significant others (Rosenberg 1979).

A popular belief in child psychology is that the attitudes a child has toward his or her parents is generalized to other individuals (Cox 1962). Sullivan (1953) argues that the generalization of attitudes
applies specifically to those who are perceived as occupying a similar position; thus, attitudes towards the mother tend to be transferred to other adult women seen as being like the mother, such as aunts and teachers, but not to those who are dissimilar, such as sisters. There is some debate concerning this, however. In a study by Marsten and Coleman (1961) of 100 males with an average age of twenty, it was found that attitudes towards the father did not generalize to other authority figures such as teachers and employers. Another study (Lapsley, Harwell, Olson, Flannery, and Quintana 1984) found the opposite; here, subjects were high school freshmen and juniors and college undergraduates, with the researchers concluding that their results support the commonly held assumption that attitudes towards institutional authorities, such as police and government, are partly determined by attitudes towards the parents, particularly the father. Perhaps the answer lies in the age of the subjects. Utilizing a sample of 1,154 students in grades six to twelve, Clark and Wenninger (1964) found that the attitudes of these teens towards the legal institution were strongly related to their adjustment in other authority situations, specifically, the school and the home. Rigby and Rump (1981) and Jones and Ray (1984) found results to support attitudes towards parents predicting attitudes towards other authority figures, such as police, teachers, and the like, only during early adolescence, approximately ages twelve to fifteen.

Kutnick's (1980) study provides some understanding as to how attitudes towards authority may be generalized. In his study of nearly
1,000 children aged four to twelve, Kutnick (1980) argues that as children enter school, they show a strong affective tie to their teacher. The teacher is even described in similar terms as the parent. What happens is that the child's dependent and trusting relationship with the parent is transferred to the teacher, with the process gradually expanding out to other types of authority figures as well. This entire process of transference from parents to teachers to other authority figures is not due to sex, social class, or religious background. Following Kutnick (1980) then, if children have a good relationship with their parents, this is transferred to the teacher and, eventually, to other persons in authority. Amoroso and Ware (1983) found that attitudes towards the teacher predicted attitudes towards police. Also, the results of a study by Reicher and Emler (1985) indicated a high correlation between attitudes towards school authority and police and law.

It might be useful at this point to examine more closely how this entire process works. Self-esteem is derived from incorporating the viewpoint of significant others, primarily one's parents. Quite simply, we come to value ourselves as we are valued (Coopersmith 1967). If our parents have communicated to us that we are worthwhile, that they love us unconditionally, that we matter, and the like, we are likely to develop high self-esteem. As we go out into the world and interact with others, we will be influenced by what we imagine others think of us; if we think well of ourselves (i.e., have high self-esteem), we are likely to believe others think the same (Rosenberg 1989). We may, in fact, be
right as this process is circular and mutually reinforcing (Rosenberg, 1989). According to Jones (1973), we will like those who think well of us and dislike those whose opinion of us is negative. Thus, if our parents think we are worthwhile, we will think likewise, we will like our parents, and so, through personification (Sullivan 1953), like those who are similar to our parents, i.e., other authority figures. Hence, it can be argued that one's self-esteem influences one's attitude towards authority figures.

Conclusions

From the review of the literature, the following conclusions can be drawn: (1) self-esteem, as a topic of research, is important because one's attitude towards oneself has ramifications in numerous other areas of one's life; it influences one's perception of the world and one's behavior in it; (2) the area of self-esteem has a long history of interest in the field of psychology, but this topic should be of interest to sociologists as well since individuals low in self-esteem are less socially integrated than others and, therefore, demonstrate behaviors that are of traditional concern to sociologists (e.g., rebellious in school, hostile/aggressive to others, little interest in public affairs, values and norms at variance with mainstream society, etc.); (3) parents play a vital role in the development of self-esteem; teachers may also play a role; (4) attitudes towards one's parents generalize to other authority figures, likely teachers, and police. These conclusions provide the rationale for the topic of study.
Review of the Literature: Attitudes towards Authority Figures

We now turn to a discussion of the literature addressing youths' attitudes towards police and/or authority figures in general. This literature will be examined in terms of the variables of sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, and police contact. These variables were selected because they are the most common ones investigated when studying attitudes towards police.

Sex

A recent Australian study by Rigby, Schofield, and Slee (1987) investigated young adolescents' attitudes towards personal authorities (parents and teachers) and impersonal authorities (police and the law). Results showed that attitudes towards these authority figures were generally positive and supportive for both sexes. Further, a high degree of similarity in rating was found amongst the authority figures, suggesting some generality of attitude towards authority. A study yielding similar results was one by Murray and Thompson (1985). Here, over 2,000 English adolescents' attitudes towards parents, teachers, and police were assessed. Generally speaking, favorable attitudes towards all three authority figures were found, particularly towards parents and police. However, girls were more favorable to the authority exercised by police and teachers than were boys. Many studies (e.g., Amoroso and Ware 1981; Bouma 1969; Fortune 1965, 1971; Reicher and Emler 1985; Torney 1971) echo the theme that girls are more positive in attitude...
towards police than are boys. This finding appears to hold true across different age groups as well (Emler and Reicher 1987).

Race

Concerning race, blacks express less favorable attitudes towards police than whites. Derbyshire (1968) found that lower-class black third graders viewed the police officer's tasks as aggressive, negative, and hostile. However, after participation in the "Policeman Bill" program, a program designed to teach children the function of the police through some fun experiences, the black children expressed significantly less antipathy towards the police. Among twelve to sixteen year olds, Fortune (1965, 1971) found blacks to be more negative in their ratings of police than whites. Bouma's (1969) study included students in grades three through twelve, though the primary focus was on the junior high school years. Again, whites held more positive attitudes towards police than blacks. A London study done by Gaskell and Smith (1985) set out to investigate the origins of negative attitudes towards police among a sample of 200 eighteen year olds. It was found that black adolescents were more hostile towards police than white teens, partially explained by their negative contact with the police. However, as these researchers point out, this does not appear to be the whole story; rather, they argue that negative beliefs about police have filtered into the minds of black youth such that even without direct personal experiences, these youth develop unfavorable stereotypes of police. One can see how this explanation applies equally well to American black
youth, Derbyshire's (1968) results, discussed above, serving as an example. Some (e.g., Scaglion and Condon 1980; Thomas and Hyman 1977) argue that race is an important predictor in attitudes towards police.

**Age**

Adolescents strongly desire support from parents and teachers (Coleman and Coleman 1984) and are generally pro-authority in attitude (Murray and Thompson 1985; Williams, Fitzgerald, and Kinsella 1989). Children early on view the police officer as important and in complimentary terms (Walker, Richardson, Williams, Denyer, and McGaughey 1972). Several studies (e.g., Amoroso and Ware 1981; Cox and Falkenberg 1987; Fortune 1965) indicate older youth have favorable attitudes towards police as well, though with increasing age, positive attitudes towards authority figures, such as parents, teachers, and police, decline. Consider the following examples.

In a Canadian study (Amoroso and Ware 1981) of over 1,500 students in grades six, eight, ten, and twelve, it was found that older adolescents evaluated police less favorably than did younger ones. Bouma (1969), Fortune (1966), and Rigby et al. (1987) found similar results for junior high students, with Rigby et al.'s (1987) results including parents and teachers as well. Ferguson and Kennelly (1974) studied seventy-six males ranging in age from fourteen to eighteen and found that as age increased, the tendency to perceive authority figures as positive decreased. Lapsley et al. (1984) argue that young adolescents are more conservative and conforming in attitude towards authority
figures than are older adolescents, basing this on their study of high school freshmen and juniors and college undergraduates. To conclude, these studies show that youths' favorability ratings towards authority decline as they age but not that they become anti-authority with age.

**City Size**

There is very little research upon which to draw regarding the variable city size, rural versus urban, and how it affects adolescents' attitudes toward police. In their investigation of over 800 high school students, Winfree and Griffiths (1977) found that city size had little to do with adolescents' evaluations of their contacts with the police, their prestige ratings of the officer's job, or their attitudes towards police. Preiss and Ehrlich (1966) found rural youth (under the age of twenty-one) to be slightly less favorable in attitudes towards police than their urban counterparts. It is important to note, however, that youth under the age of twenty-one only numbered twenty-three; such a small sample size leaves the result much in question. Clark and Wenninger (1964) studied adolescents' attitudes towards the legal institution: specifically, the law, lawyers, law enforcement officials, judges, and courts. They found rural youth to be more favorably disposed towards the legal institution than youth in urban areas. This result is typically found in studies involving adults (e.g., Albrecht and Green 1977; Zamble and Annesley 1987).
Socioeconomic Status (SES)

There is research to support the position that higher SES individuals feel more positive towards authority than do lower SES individuals. In his study of third graders, Derbyshire (1968) found that lower-class black children and lower-middle-class Mexican American children viewed the police officer's tasks as aggressive, negative, and hostile whereas upper-middle-class white children rated the officer's tasks as neutral, nonaggressive, and assisting. Here, though, the issue of race is a confounding variable since only black, Mexican-American, and white children were in the lower, middle, and upper class, respectively.

Bouma's (1969) study included over 10,000 students in grades three through twelve in Michigan; he found that youth of higher SES were more favorable in attitudes towards police than those of lower SES. Amoroso and Ware (1981) found similar results in their Canadian sample of students in grades six, eight, ten, and twelve—again, those in the lowest socioeconomic groups gave the lowest evaluation of police. Clark and Wenninger's (1964) research included not only adolescents' attitudes towards law enforcement officials but also their attitudes towards the law, lawyers, judges, and the courts. In their sample of over 1,100 students in grades six through twelve, they found only weak support for their hypothesis that the lower the youths' socioeconomic class, the greater their negative attitude towards the legal institution. In his 1971 book, Fortune states that there is a tendency for lower SES adolescents to have a less favorable attitude toward police than do
higher SES adolescents; yet, in his research (1965) upon which this book is based, he argues that the relationship between SES and attitudes towards police is not conclusive.

Other research supports different positions. Weissberg's (1972) study of the political socialization of adolescents found some evidence that lower-class individuals idealize political authority (i.e., schoolteachers, police, courts, and licensing officials), though a clear linear relationship was not established. In her investigation of white children in grades two through eight, Torney (1971) found a curvilinear relationship between social class and attitudes towards police; specifically, lower-middle-class children tended to glorify the authority of the police, in contrast to the attitudes of lower-class and upper-middle-class children.

Two studies did not find SES to be useful regarding adolescents' attitudes towards police. Particularly, Bowlus, Brown, Castiglione, and Jennings (1974) did not find SES to be systematically related to adolescents' ratings of law officers. Similarly, Winfree and Griffiths (1977) found SES to have little effect upon adolescents' evaluations of their contacts with the police, their prestige ratings of the officer's job, or their attitude towards police. This, it may be recalled, is the same result they found regarding city size as well.

**Delinquency**

Control theory (e.g., Hirschi 1969), a popular theory in deviance (Clinard and Meier 1992), argues that delinquents, by virtue of being
poorly integrated into society's norms and values, fail to bond to social institutions. From this premise, a logical prediction is that delinquents would be more negative in attitudes towards authority figures than nondelinquents. Perhaps the only study that finds results counter to this expectation is the one by Johnson and Stanley (1955) in which twenty delinquent and twenty nondelinquent boys aged ten to twelve were administered a projective test; the hypothesis that there would be differences in attitudes of these two groups towards authority was not supported.

Studies involving older adolescents are consistent with control theory, however. In a study comparing fifteen-year-old delinquent and nondelinquent white males, Chapman (1956) found attitudes of the delinquent group to be more hostile towards legal authorities than the nondelinquent group. Gibson (1967) found similar results for his fifteen-year-old male subjects, positive attitudes towards police being correlated with a low rate of criminal involvement. Washburn (1963) believes that delinquents structure visual cues differently than nondelinquents. Here, matched groups of thirty-six delinquent and thirty-six nondelinquent senior high school males were presented with ten pictures depicting various kinds of social interaction, an equal number of "friendly" and "hostile" cues being present. Results showed the delinquents more often made hostile comments regarding the authority figures in the pictures, whereas the nondelinquents more often made friendly remarks, these findings being interpreted as reflecting underlying differences in personality characteristics.
Turning now to research utilizing males and females, the inverse relationship between delinquency and attitude towards authority continues to hold. Rigby, Mak, and Slee (1989) found that impulsiveness, gender, and attitude towards authority were all significantly correlated with self-reported delinquency. Specifically, for their Australian sample of fourteen year olds, the more delinquent youth tended to be more impulsive, relatively negative in attitude towards authority, and male. Emler and Reicher (1987) report that attitudes towards institutional authority, such as police, law, and school, are strongly linked to behavioral compliance with such authority and that males are significantly higher on behavioral noncompliance than are females. Their results are based on a Scottish sample of fourteen to nineteen year olds. Other research by them (Reicher and Emler 1985) indicates that those with a more negative attitude towards authority are more involved in delinquent activity. An American study (Cox and Falkenberg 1987) of over ninety high school adolescents also found that involvement in delinquency or crime was associated with less favorable attitudes towards police.

**Police Contact**

An important variable to consider when investigating attitudes towards police is police contact; specifically, does contact with police influence attitudes towards police? A study which basically stands alone in its findings is one by Munn and Renner (1978). Subjects of concern were 159 college students with an average age of 21.4. Contact
with police was measured by frequency of previous traffic tickets and arrests. Results indicated that contact with police in terms of its noncriminal, regulatory function did not, in and of itself, produce a negative evaluation of police.

Several studies echo the general theme that contact with the police produces more negative attitudes towards police. Bouma (1969) and Fortune (1966) found this result among junior high students as did Cox and Falkenberg (1987) for their sample of delinquent and nondelinquent rural high school students. Two studies conducted abroad also show support for this position, one being a Scottish study (Dobash, Dobash, and Ballintyne 1984) sampling sixteen to twenty-one year olds and the other (Dobash, Dobash, Ballintyne, Schumann, Kaulitzki, and Guth 1990) comparing Scottish and West German adolescents. It is interesting to note that in the study by Dobash et al. (1990), attitudes towards police were more negative whether contact with police was as a suspect, a witness, or as a victim.

The remaining studies to be discussed are more specific concerning the relationship between police contact and attitudes towards police. Weissberg (1972) sampled seventeen and eighteen year olds and found that among university students and delinquents, those with more than ten contacts with police were less positive in attitudes towards police than those with fewer contacts. However, for technical college students, number of contacts with police did not effect evaluations of police. Weissberg explains these mixed results by arguing that among university students and delinquents, police are not widely admired and so greater
exposure to police does not build admiration, whereas for technical college students, evaluations of police are already high so increased exposure to police appears to make little difference.

A study conducted on Belgian high school students (Tisseyre 1976) found that police image was influenced by contact such that for those who felt they had been helped by police, evaluations were quite positive, but for those who believed they had been subject to identity checks, which they viewed as harassment, evaluations were negative. Winfree and Griffiths (1977) and Rusinko, Johnson, and Hornung (1978) found similar results in their samples of high school students; particularly, positive contact with police was found to be predictive of positive attitudes towards police, while negative contact with police predicted negative attitudes towards police. In addition, Winfree and Griffiths (1977) found that negative contacts carry more "weight," meaning that even with positive contacts with police, negative contacts were likely to result in lower attitudes towards police.

Summary

To summarize this section regarding youths' attitudes towards authority figures, the following conclusions can be drawn: (1) males and females are generally positive in attitude towards authority, though females are more positive than males; (2) race may be an important predictor in attitude towards police; whites are more favorable in attitude towards police than blacks; (3) while adolescents are typically pro-authority in attitude, younger adolescents are more so than older
adolescents; (4) though studies involving adolescents have been rather contradictory, those utilizing adults have typically found rural individuals to be more favorable in attitudes towards police than urban individuals; (5) youth of higher socioeconomic status tend to be more positive in attitudes towards police than youth of lower socioeconomic status; (6) nondelinquents are more positive in attitude towards authority figures than delinquents; (7) positive contact with police tends to yield positive attitudes towards police, while negative contact with police produces negative attitudes towards police.

From the review of the literature regarding self-esteem, the argument was made that self-esteem influences one's attitude towards authority figures. Typical predictors examined in attitudes towards police are sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, and police contact. Though no study was located from 1975 to the present which utilized all of these variables together to explain attitudes towards police, three studies do provide a point of reference regarding this issue.

Winfree and Griffiths (1977) concluded that sex, race, city size, and socioeconomic status had little effect upon adolescents' attitudes towards police. However, contacts with police and prestige ratings of the officer's job taken together accounted for 20% of the variance in attitudes towards police.

Amoroso and Ware (1981) found that their demographic variables of sex, age, city size, socioeconomic status, and type of school (public or private) each made some contribution to explaining adolescents'
attitudes towards police but the contribution of each was 1% or less of the variance. Unfortunately, the influence of these demographic variables taken as a total was not computed.

From their sample of adults polled in 1973, Peek, Lowe, and Alston (1981) found, ranked in order of best predictor to worst predictor, that the standard demographic variables of age, race, city size, income, education, sex, region of the country, occupation, political party, and religious affiliation, taken together, accounted for only 6% of the variance in how well people like their local police. They concluded that "obviously, the most important determinant of attitudes toward local police have yet to be considered" (p. 370).

Therefore, based upon the review of the literature, it appears self-esteem will be the best predictor in attitudes towards police.

Hence:

Hypothesis 1

Of the variables sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, police contact, and self-esteem, self-esteem will be the best predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police.

Sub Hypothesis 1a: It is predicted that the rank ordering of these variables from best predictor to worst predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police will be: (1) self-esteem (2) delinquency (3) police contact (4) race (5) sex (6) socioeconomic status (7) age (8) city size.
Thus far, a review of the self-esteem literature has been presented, followed by a literature review regarding attitudes towards authority, both as they pertain to youth. Here a synthesis is presented; specifically, studies concerning the relationship between youths' self-esteem and attitudes towards authority will be discussed. These studies total five—the first three (Ferguson and Kennelly 1974; Heaven 1988; Paul and Fischer 1980) relate indirectly to the topic, while the last two (Amoroso and Ware 1983; Rathus and Siegel 1973) are more direct.

Ferguson and Kennelly (1974) set out to investigate the relationship between locus of control and perception of authority figures. Locus of control is dichotomized as being internal in locus of control (i.e., feeling like one is responsible for one's own fate) or being external in locus of control (i.e., feeling like others are responsible for one's own fate). Subjects were seventy-six males between the ages of fourteen and eighteen. It was hypothesized that those with an internal locus of control would see authority figures (teachers, police, and the like) as sources of help or support and as having predictable standards, while those with an external locus of control would see authority figures as sources of criticism or rejection and as being more arbitrary in behavior. Results supported the hypotheses.
An Australian study by Heaven (1988) also addressed the connection between locus of control and attitudes towards authority. Subjects here were 100 males and females, averaging sixteen years old. It was found that those with an internal locus of control held more positive attitudes towards authority (police, teachers, and the army) than did those with an external locus of control. These results are thus similar to those of Ferguson and Kennelly (1974), just discussed. Further, it was also found that attitudes towards various authorities tend to be interrelated.

A study by Paul and Fischer (1980) studied self-concept among black youth. Subjects numbered fifty-nine and were between thirteen and fourteen years old. It was found that those in the high self-concept group were more internal in locus of control than those in the low self-concept group.

Keeping the results of these three studies in mind, it seems reasonable to conclude that youth high in self-esteem are internal in locus of control and view authority positively or, more simply and to the point, adolescents high in self-esteem view authority figures positively and, by the same token, youth low in self-esteem view authority figures negatively. These studies, therefore, provide indirect evidence that a relationship exists between self-esteem and attitudes towards authority and provide some guidelines as to the particulars of this relationship.
Thus:

Hypothesis 2

There will be a positive correlation between youths' self-esteem scores and their authority figures' (mother, father, teachers, and police) scores.

Turning now to more direct evidence, major premises of the Amoroso and Ware (1983) study were that attitudes of youth toward police, positive or negative, would be primarily a reflection of their attitude towards their parents and that youths' attitudes toward police would reflect their attitude toward the teacher. Subjects were 1,667 male and female Canadian students in grades six, eight, ten, and twelve, who completed a general measure of attitudes towards police and rated the concepts "police," "mother," "father," "teacher," and "myself" on sixteen bipolar scales. Results were factor analyzed along the dimensions of general evaluation, understandability, and potency. Overall results indicated that attitudes towards the teacher generalize to police and "to a lesser extent, attitudes toward parents and even toward self (presumably developed during the course of socialization) are likewise reflected in attitudes toward police" (p. 198). Further, results supported a generalized attitude towards authority for youth such that if attitudes towards parents and teachers are positive, attitudes towards more impersonal authority, such as police, will likely also be positive.

Therefore:
Hypothesis 3

There will be a linear relationship between self-esteem, attitudes towards parents, attitudes towards teachers, and attitudes towards police such that:

a. There will be a direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes toward parents.

b. There will be a direct effect of attitudes towards parents on attitudes towards teachers.

c. There will be a direct effect of attitudes towards teachers on attitudes towards police.

Rathus and Siegel (1973) provide insight regarding the relationship between delinquency, self-esteem, and attitudes towards authority (police and the law). Subjects were delinquent and nondelinquent males, approximately twelve to seventeen years old, who rated the concepts "myself," "policeman," "the law," and "crime," amongst others, by the technique of semantic differential scales. Four scales comprised the measure of self-esteem; "myself" was rated along the dimensions of "nice-awful," "fair-unfair," "smart-dumb," and "strong-weak." Results showed a positive relationship between attitudes towards authority and self-esteem among nondelinquents, while a negative relationship was found between attitudes towards authority and self-esteem for delinquents.

To conclude, Amoroso and Ware (1983) suggest that self-esteem influences attitudes towards authority, while Rathus and Siegel (1973) demonstrate this for delinquents and nondelinquents.
Studies by Rigby et al. (1987) and Murray and Thompson (1985) indicate that adolescents' attitudes towards authority figures are generally positive for both males and females, though typically females are more positive in attitude than are males (Amoroso and Ware 1981; Bouma 1969; Fortune 1965, 1971; Reicher and Emler 1985; Torney 1971), a finding explained by the process of female socialization (Murray 1977).

Therefore:

**Hypothesis 4**

There will be a positive correlation between male adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

**Hypothesis 5**

There will be a positive correlation between female adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

**Hypothesis 6**

Female adolescents' attitudes towards police scores will be higher or more positive than male adolescents' attitudes towards police scores.

Generally speaking, adolescents, taken as a total group, are pro-authority in attitude (Amoroso and Ware 1981; Cox and Falkenberg 1987; Murray and Thompson 1985; Fortune 1965; Williams et al. 1989). Nevertheless, it has been found that as adolescents age, favorability ratings towards authority decline (Amoroso and Ware 1981; Bouma 1969;
Hypothesis 7

There will be a positive correlation between younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 8

There will be a positive correlation between older adolescents' (22-24 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 9

Younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) attitudes towards police scores will be higher or more positive than older adolescents' (22-24 years old) attitudes towards police scores.

There are many studies (e.g., Chapman 1956; Cox and Falkenberg 1987; Gibson 1967; Reicher and Emler 1985; Rigby et al. 1989; Washburn 1963) which indicate that delinquent adolescents hold more negative attitudes towards authority figures than do nondelinquent adolescents. However, the study by Rathus and Siegel (1973) is the only one which addresses the specific relationship between delinquency, self-esteem, and attitudes towards authority. For delinquents, a negative relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards authority was found, whereas a positive relationship existed between self-esteem and attitudes towards authority among nondelinquents.

Hence:
Hypothesis 10

There will be a negative correlation between delinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 11

There will be a positive correlation between nondelinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

In conclusion, Table 1 presents all of the hypotheses for this research.
Table 1. List of hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Of the variables sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, police contact, and self-esteem, self-esteem will be the best predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police.

Sub Hypothesis la: It is predicted that the rank ordering of these variables from best predictor to worst predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police will be: (1) self-esteem, (2) delinquency, (3) police contact, (4) race, (5) sex, (6) socioeconomic status, (7) age, (8) city size.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a positive correlation between youths' self-esteem scores and their authority figures' (mother, father, teachers, and police) scores.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a relationship between self-esteem, attitudes towards parents, attitudes towards teachers, and attitudes towards police such that:
   a. There will be a direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes toward parents.
   b. There will be a direct effect of attitudes towards parents on attitudes towards teachers.
   c. There will be a direct effect of attitudes towards teachers on attitudes towards police.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a positive correlation between male adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 5: There will be a positive correlation between female adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 6: Female adolescents' attitudes towards police scores will be higher or more positive than male adolescents' attitudes towards police scores.
Hypothesis 7: There will be a positive correlation between younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 8: There will be a positive correlation between older adolescents' (22-24 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 9: Younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) attitudes towards police scores will be higher or more positive than older adolescents' (22-24 years old) attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 10: There will be a negative correlation between delinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 11: There will be a positive correlation between nondelinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.
Subjects

Subjects for this research were college men and women recruited from introductory sociology courses who voluntarily completed a survey. Students from Iowa State University (Ames, Iowa) and Grand Valley State University (Allendale, Michigan) were the participants. For convenience purposes, Iowa State University students will be referred to as the Ames sample and Grand Valley State University students will be labeled the Grand Rapids sample, because of their close proximity to this city. There were strictly pragmatic reasons for selecting students from two universities. First, a rather large data base of young college students was sought, and second, there was access at both of these schools.

From the original total sample of 537 people (Ames = 230; Grand Rapids = 307), 487 useable surveys were obtained (Ames = 211; Grand Rapids = 276), representing a failure rate of approximately 9%; 8% from the Ames sample (N = 19) and 10% from the Grand Rapids sample (N = 31). Of these 487 completed surveys, 39 were discarded (11 from the Ames sample; 28 from the Grand Rapids sample) because of subjects being older than the age of twenty-four, the uppermost age limit for this study. Therefore, the total number of subjects for this research was 448, 200 being the Ames Sample and 248 the Grand Rapids one.
The main focus of interest in this research is late adolescents' attitudes, not their location per se. Therefore, it is useful to illustrate the comparability of the Ames sample and the Grand Rapids sample in order to justify their being grouped together and treated collectively. As Table 2 illustrates, the most notable difference between the two samples, though not an important one, is that the Ames sample is 50.0% female whereas the Grand Rapids sample is 67.3% female. In terms of race (94.5% of the Ames sample is Caucasian, while 90.3% of the Grand Rapids sample is Caucasian), age (68.5% of the Ames sample is 17 through 20 years old compared to 73.8% of the Grand Rapids sample being 17 through 20 years old), size of home town (71.0% of the Ames sample is non-metro, 68.5% of the Grand Rapids sample is non-metro), and principal wage earner (74.5% of the Ames sample identify Father as the principal wage earner compared to 69.0% identifying Father as the principal wage earner for the Grand Rapids sample), the two samples are remarkably similar. Henceforth, no further distinction will be made between the Ames sample and the Grand Rapids sample. Overall, the subjects for this research are primarily female (59.6%), Caucasian (92.2%), age seventeen through twenty (71.4%), from a non-metro background (69.6%), and identify Father as the principal wage earner (71.5%). How representative this sample is in terms of reflecting college students as a population is a legitimate question. There are no data with which to make exact comparisons. However, in terms of race, this sample is typical of college students (Dey, Astin, Korn, and Riggs 1992; Kurian 1988).
Table 2. Comparison of Ames sample and Grand Rapids sample by sex, race, age, size of home town, and principal wage earner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ames</th>
<th>Grand Rapids</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>100 (50.0%)</td>
<td>167 (67.3%)</td>
<td>267 (59.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100 (50.0%)</td>
<td>81 (32.7%)</td>
<td>181 (40.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>6 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2 (1.0%)</td>
<td>8 (3.2%)</td>
<td>10 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>189 (94.5%)</td>
<td>224 (90.3%)</td>
<td>413 (92.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>8 (3.2%)</td>
<td>9 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>7 (2.8%)</td>
<td>10 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>61 (30.5%)</td>
<td>62 (25.0%)</td>
<td>123 (27.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31 (15.5%)</td>
<td>84 (33.9%)</td>
<td>115 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>45 (22.5%)</td>
<td>37 (14.9%)</td>
<td>82 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>137 (68.5%)</td>
<td>183 (73.8%)</td>
<td>320 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>36 (18.0%)</td>
<td>30 (12.1%)</td>
<td>66 (14.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18 (9.0%)</td>
<td>19 (7.7%)</td>
<td>37 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8 (4.0%)</td>
<td>9 (3.6%)</td>
<td>17 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>7 (2.8%)</td>
<td>8 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Home Town</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metro</td>
<td>142 (71.0%)</td>
<td>170 (68.5%)</td>
<td>312 (69.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>58 (29.0%)</td>
<td>78 (31.5%)</td>
<td>136 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Wage Earner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>149 (74.5%)</td>
<td>171 (69.0%)</td>
<td>320 (71.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>16 (8.0%)</td>
<td>28 (11.3%)</td>
<td>44 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father &amp; Mother</td>
<td>33 (16.5%)</td>
<td>41 (16.5%)</td>
<td>74 (16.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepfather</td>
<td>2 (1.0%)</td>
<td>8 (3.2%)</td>
<td>10 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Percentages are listed in parentheses and are approximate.
Instrumentation

The questionnaire developed for this research (see Appendix A) is self-administered and anonymous. It consists of a cover letter followed by twelve pages of questions, for a total of ninety-six questions. An estimated amount of time required to complete the survey is about fifteen minutes. Survey questions consist of demographic information (sex, race, age, size of home town, and socioeconomic status) plus self-report instruments (delinquency and police contact) and attitudinal scales (self-esteem and attitudes towards authority figures). Demographic information questions ask the respondent's sex, ethnicity, age, size of home town, and, to establish socioeconomic status, principal wage earner's occupation and education. An in-depth examination as to how delinquency, police contact, self-esteem, and attitudes toward authority figures are measured in this study follows.

Delinquency


Delinquency in this research was measured via self-report which has been found to be both a valid and reliable method (Johnson 1979), especially for populations not seriously delinquent such as students (Hindelang et al. 1981). Searching the literature for self-report delinquency measures yielded eight: Behavioral Research Institute 1975; Clark and Wenninger 1962; Gibson 1967; Gold 1970; Hindelang et al. 1981; Johnson 1979; Nye and Short 1957; and Rusinko et al. 1978. The Seattle
Self-report Instrument by Hindelang et al. (1981) was selected for use here for the following reasons: (1) it is relatively current, (2) it has been subjected to various analyses and has been found to be reliable and valid (Hindelang et al. 1981), (3) it is specifically geared toward adolescent populations, and (4) it covers a broad range of delinquent behaviors.

The Seattle Self-Report Instrument consists of sixty-nine questions encompassing five categories: official contact (five questions), serious crime (twenty-four questions), delinquency (twenty-two questions), drug usage (eleven questions), and school and family offenses (seven questions). The authors argue that each category of questions can stand independently as a separate index. The format is a yes/no forced choice one. Every question begins with the stem, "Have you ever . . .?"

Given that a self-report delinquency measure with sixty-nine items was excessive for the requirements of this study, it was decided that eleven representative items would be selected instead. Eleven items were decided upon for two reasons: (1) it was desired that the delinquency scale fit comfortably on one page of the questionnaire to enhance readability and understandability for respondents and eleven questions, with accompanying directions, fit this requirement; (2) an eleven-item delinquency scale falls within the recommendation by Hindelang et al. (1981) that if a delinquency scale samples a broad range of delinquent behaviors, it need not be more than ten to fifteen items.
The Official Contact Index of the Seattle Self-Report Instrument contains five questions concerning involvement with the police and/or criminal justice authorities. Since this research specifically has a police contact scale and no other self-report delinquency scale reviewed contained questions like those on this particular index, a decision was made that these five items would be eliminated for consideration when selecting the eleven representative items for the new, shortened scale. Further, it was decided that the number of items selected from each of the remaining four indexes would be roughly proportional to the number of items that that index constituted on the remaining sixty-four-item survey. For example, the School and Family Offenses Index items comprise approximately 10% of the entire scale and so are 10% of the shortened scale. Hence, on the new scale, there are four items measuring serious crime, four for delinquency, two for drug usage, and one item for school and family offenses.

To accomplish the goal of selecting the eleven items for the new scale, each item on the Seattle Self-Report Instrument was compared to the other seven self-report delinquency measures, stated above (see Appendix C), to search for commonality—to locate the same questions on other surveys, if possible. A tally was kept for each of the sixty-four items on the Seattle survey in terms of how many times each particular question appeared on another survey. Then, the questions that appeared most often (keeping in mind the number of questions needed for each of the categories) were the ones selected for usage here. By this method, all of the questions selected were present on at least two other
questionnaires. Regarding wording, of the eleven selected questions, four (Questions 10, 12, 15, and 16 on the college student questionnaire) are worded exactly as on the Seattle Self-Report Instrument. The remaining seven questions (Questions 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, and 20 on the college student questionnaire) have been altered minimally, in order to be more general and less specific than that on the Seattle questionnaire. In these instances, wording is reflective of that found on the other surveys. The reliability for this new scale is .66.

Police Contact

A review of the literature yielded that contact with the police tends to fall within two broad types—situations in which contact is initiated by the police, termed police-initiated contact (Boggs and Galliher 1973), negative contact (Rusinko et al. 1978; Winfree and Griffiths 1977), or involuntary contact (Decker 1981; Walker et al. 1972), and situations in which contact is initiated by a citizen, termed citizen-initiated contact (Boggs and Galliher 1975), positive contact (Rusinko et al. 1978; Winfree and Griffiths 1977), or voluntary contact (Decker 1981; Walker et al. 1972). Within this investigation, police-initiated contact and citizen-initiated contact (Boggs and Galliher 1975) will be the terms used.

Concerning the measurement of police-initiated contact, three issues were found to be repeatedly addressed within the literature: (1) being stopped by the police for a traffic violation (Jacob 1971; Klein, Webb, and DiSanto 1978; Smith and Hawkins 1973; Walker et al. 1972).
(2) being picked up by the police for questioning (Klein et al. 1978; Rusinko et al. 1978; Walker et al. 1972), and (3) being arrested by the police (Boggs and Galliher 1973; Jacob 1971; Rusinko et al. 1978; Smith and Hawkins 1973; Winfree and Griffiths 1977). Three persistent themes were also reflected in measuring citizen-initiated contact: (1) being a victim of a crime (Decker 1981; Klein et al. 1978; Walker et al. 1972), (2) reporting suspicious activity or witnessing a crime (Boggs and Galliher 1975; Decker 1981; Walker et al. 1972), and (3) asking for assistance (Boggs and Galliher 1975; Decker 1981; Jacob 1971; Klein et al. 1978; Walker et al. 1972). It is these six issues, therefore, which constitute the questions measuring police contact in this research.

Questions address contact with the police within the past twelve months, a time frame frequently used by others (e.g., Boggs and Galliher 1975; Klein et al. 1978; Smith and Hawkins 1973). Further, how many times a person has had contact with the police under a given condition is also addressed. The reliability for this scale is .78.

**Self-esteem**

*Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale*

The scale selected for measuring self-esteem in this research is Rosenberg's (1965). Originally developed for use with high school students, primarily eleventh and twelfth graders, Rosenberg's scale has been used with a variety of grade levels since then, ranging from sixth graders (Streitmatter and Jones 1982) to university students (Larzelere,
Klein, Schumm, and Alibrando 1989). It has also been used across racial categories; specifically, with whites, blacks (e.g., McCarthy and Hoge 1984), and Hispanics (Grossman, Wirt, and Davids 1985).

Rosenberg's scale consists of ten items, five stated positively and five stated negatively, in a four-point Likert format, with responses ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." The scale measures the self-acceptance aspect of self-esteem and has a Gutmann scale reproducibility coefficient of .92, although it is easier and as valid to score the scale as a simple additive one (Robinson and Shaver 1973). Over two weeks, a test-retest correlation was found to be .85 (Silber and Tippett 1965). Here the reliability is .87.

**Attitudes Towards Authority Figures**

**Attitude towards police—Fortune's (1965) Attitude Towards Police Scale**

In reviewing the literature regarding scales measuring attitudes towards police, it was found that Fortune's (1965) scale was widely utilized, particularly in one of three ways: (1) several items were taken from the scale, with the wording slightly modified (e.g., Murray and Thompson 1985), (2) several items were taken from the scale, in the original language (e.g., Amoroso and Ware 1981), or (3) the scale was used in its complete, unaltered form (e.g., Cox and Falkenberg 1987). In its various formats, this scale has been used with many different age groups, including undergraduates (Curtis, Billingslea, and Wilson 1988) and adults (Albrecht and Green 1977).
Fortune's scale was designed for twelve to sixteen year olds, and it consists of twenty items with a five-point Likert-type response, from "Strongly Agree" to "Undecided" to "Strongly Disagree." Ten items are written in a positive direction, and ten are written in a negative direction. The items are evaluative statements regarding the police's function and behavior.

Because of its widespread popularity, it was decided Fortune's (1965) scale would serve as the foundation for measuring attitudes toward police in this study. However, given that only two studies (Cox and Falkenberg 1987; Rusinko et al. 1978) were located which used Fortune's (1965) scale in its original form and since the scale was written nearly thirty years ago, it was decided that each of the twenty statements on the scale would be evaluated individually in terms of whether it should be included here; specifically, the literature was again reviewed and a tally was kept for each statement in terms of how many times it was found in usage, meaning intact, wording could be altered somewhat. In order to be included here, an item needed to appear in at least three different articles. On the basis of this criterion, fourteen of the original twenty statements were selected, nearly all of which appeared in at least four articles. Of these fourteen statements, six were stated in a positive direction and eight were stated negatively. A change was made such that there would be seven positive statements and seven negative statements. Also, wording was modified somewhat on a few items to reflect more current usage and to be appropriate for older adolescents. For example, "Police are
interested in doing their job well" (Amoroso and Ware 1981), rather than "Police are dedicated men" (Fortune 1965). As revised, six items are stated exactly as in the original, three have only slight changes in wording, and five are reworded. The order of positive and negative statements was determined by the flip of a coin. This scale has a reliability of .89.

Three other issues or themes were found frequently appearing in scales measuring attitudes towards police but which are not reflected in Fortune's (1965) scale: honesty/dishonesty, fairness/unfairness, and goodness/badness. These issues are included in the survey used for this research and are discussed below.

**Attitude Towards Mother, Father, Teachers (and Police)**

Scale developed by Johnson, Hogan, Zonderman, Callens, and Rogolsky (1981)

An ideal scale for measuring attitudes towards mother, father, teachers, and police for this investigation would be one which would meet the following four conditions: (1) it would evaluate mother, father, teachers, and police along the same dimensions or scales so that direct comparisons could be made across the four authority figures; (2) it would contain the needed three issues deemed important but not reflected in Fortune's (1965) attitudes towards police scale: honesty, fairness, and goodness; (3) it would be appropriate for a college sample; (4) it would be a scale of legitimacy in terms of usage by other social scientists. Keeping these desired criteria in mind, a search of
the literature determined that a scale developed by Johnson et al. (1981) best fit the needs of this research. Johnson et al. (1981) had over 500 undergraduates rate mother, father, police, and government on ten bipolar adjectives along a five-point semantic differential scale; a four being given for the most positive side of the adjective pair ranging down to a zero for the most negative side. The adjectives selected were "known to have high factor loadings on the evaluative dimension" (p. 371). These adjective pairs were: good-bad, optimistic-pessimistic, friendly-hostile, altruistic-egoistic, honest-dishonest, kind-cruel, fair-unfair, important-unimportant, valuable-worthless, and successful-unsuccessful. A flip of a coin determined whether the positive or negative form of the adjective pair appeared at the left. Scoring was additive, with high scores being positive towards the particular authority figure.

Others have utilized the Johnson et al. (1981) scale. Lapsley et al. (1984) had a sample of high school freshman, juniors, and college undergraduates rate the four authority figures on the ten bipolar adjectives. Similarly, a relatively recent study by Curtis et al. (1988) had 105 undergraduates rate the concepts mother, father, professor, police, church, and government along the bipolar adjectives. Thus, within these two studies, undergraduates have rated mother, father, teachers, and police along the same scale and one which evaluates honesty, fairness, and goodness. In sum, the Johnson et al. (1981) scale fits the goals of this research remarkably well.
Procedure

In June of 1992, approval was granted from the Human Subjects Review Committee at Iowa State University and from Dr. John Gracki, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at Grand Valley State University, for administering the researcher's questionnaire to college students at these schools.

Data collection began in Ames, Iowa, the first day of the fall semester, late August, 1992. Dr. Martin Miller, dissertation chairperson, presented, distributed, and collected surveys for the Ames sample. Students enrolled in "Youth and Crime," a basic sociology course, were asked to voluntarily complete a survey. This class consisted of seventy-five students and served as a pretest group. Completion of the survey took about fifteen minutes. After all surveys were collected, the students were asked for feedback regarding difficulty they may have had understanding the questionnaire. No particular problems were identified and so this pretest group became part of the total Ames sample. The questionnaire was then administered without any changes (and later to the Grand Rapids sample) to 155 students enrolled in small discussion sections of "Introduction to Sociology." In total, 230 Ames, Iowa, students participated.

Data collection for the Grand Rapids sample took place the first week of September 1992. Students from six sections of "Introduction to Sociology" were asked to participate. In all classes, the procedure was the same (and similar to that used in the collection of data in the Ames
sample): The researcher introduced herself, asked for assistance in completing a voluntary and anonymous survey, distributed surveys, collected them after fifteen minutes, and made a few closing comments. A total of 307 students comprise the Grand Rapids sample.

The Ames sample surveys were mailed to the researcher in Grand Rapids within days after their completion. When data collection was finished in Grand Rapids, all 537 questionnaires that had been distributed were examined. Incomplete surveys (N = 50) were set aside as well as those of subjects over the age of twenty-four (N = 39), yielding 448 surveys.

Subjects answered survey questions directly on the questionnaire. Nearly all questions were of a forced-choice format, except for two questions, occupation of female head of household and occupation of male head of household, which asked respondents to write in an answer. Answers to four specific questions (Questions 5-9) were needed in order to hand compute socioeconomic status. Precisely how this was done follows.

Respondents were asked (Question 5) to identify the principal wage earner in the family (e.g., father, mother, mother and father equally, etc.), the male head of household's occupation (Question 6), the male head of household's education (Question 7), the female head of household's occupation (Question 8), and the female head of household's education (Question 9). The principal wage earner's occupation was assigned an occupational status score ranging from ninety-nine to zero from Powers and Holmberg's (1982) list of 589 occupations. This
occupational status score was then translated into a score of one to seven from the Hollingshead (1957) occupational seven-step scale and multiplied by seven (the weighting factor for occupation). This new score, call it the occupational partial score, was then summed with the principal wage earner's educational partial score, computed by assigning a value of one to seven for the years of education of the principal wage earner (based upon the educational scale from Hollingshead's index) and then multiplied by four, the weighting factor for education. It is the two partial scores of occupation and education summed together that result in a two-digit socioeconomic score. According to Hollingshead (1957), scores can range from eleven to seventy-seven, eleven representing the highest possible SES and seventy-seven representing the lowest possible SES.

In the situation where subjects identified mother and father equally as the principal wage earner, separate socioeconomic status scores were computed for each, according to the procedure described above, and were then averaged.

After socioeconomic status had been computed for all completed surveys, information contained within the questionnaire was transferred to NCS answer sheets by student volunteers and paid assistants. Checks for accuracy were made by the researcher.
Data Analysis

Scoring

Metro/Non-metro

Researchers use the term "urban" (in more contemporary language, the terms "metro" and "non-metro" are preferred) to apply to areas of various population sizes. For examples, Clark and Wenninger (1964) believe a population of 40,000 or more establishes an urban area, Albrecht and Green (1977) define urban as a population of approximately 70,000, and, further, Zamble and Annesley (1987) set the cutting point for urban at 100,000. Because of these vast differences in defining precisely what population size constitutes "urban" in practical research, a more formal approach is utilized here. According to Judge (1979), a metropolitan area, a shortened term for standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA), is defined as having a central city with a population of 50,000 or more. This definition is consistent with that of the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1980) and is the one adopted here. Therefore, within this research, "metro" is a population of 50,000 or more and "non-metro" is a population of 49,999 or less.

Socioeconomic status

Kahl and Davis (1955) argue that occupation is the best single predictor of socioeconomic status, with education being the second best. It is these two measures that Hollingshead (1957) uses in his Two Factor Index of Social Position, a scoring system frequently used in
determining SES (e.g. Behavioral Research Institute 1975; Clausen 1991; Elliott 1980), and that which is used here.

A major criticism of the Hollingshead (1957) index is that it is outdated; the list of approximately 300 job titles has never been revised (Mueller and Parcel 1981). To address this problem, the Hollingshead (1957) approach to SES coupled with an updated occupational status score ranking system, one which includes women, put forth by Powers and Holmberg (1982) was used in this study. How this was done follows.

Powers and Holmberg (1982) rank ordered 589 occupations, yielding occupational status scores ranging from ninety-nine to zero, ninety-nine representing the highest position (e.g., judge) and zero representing the lowest position (e.g., laundress in a private household). The Hollingshead (1957) system identifies seven occupational categories, a one being the highest position (executives, owners of large businesses, and major professionals) and a seven being the lowest position (unskilled workers). Dividing the Powers and Holmberg (1982) classification system, a ninety-nine-point system, into seven equal occupational categories as outlined by Hollingshead (1957) not only yields a rather convenient range of approximately a fourteen-point value for each of the seven categories but also identifies occupational job titles that make intuitive sense within the Hollingshead (1957) framework. For example, step one on Hollingshead's occupational list consists of executives, owners of large businesses, and major professionals and would incorporate those scoring eighty-five to
ninety-nine on the Powers and Holmberg (1982) classification system, air
traffic controllers to judges. Table 3 indicates further examples and
illustrates the conversions between Powers and Holmberg (1982) and
Hollingshead (1957) as used in this research.

To conclude, computing SES involves a specific procedure. First,
the principal wage earner's job title or occupation is located on the
Powers and Holmberg (1982) hierarchial scale and the occupational status
score assigned to that occupation is identified. Second, the
occupational status score identified from Powers and Holmberg (1982) is
converted to the Hollingshead (1957) seven-step occupational scale, as
shown in Table 3. Third, the Hollingshead (1957) score is then
multiplied by seven, the weighting factor for occupation, yielding a
partial score for occupation which is then added to the partial score
for education (computed by assigning a value of one to seven for the
years of education multiplied by four, the weighting factor for
education), resulting in a final SES score ranging from eleven (the
highest SES) to seventy-seven (the lowest SES).

Delinquency

The Seattle Self-Report Instrument (Hindelang et al. 1981). This
delinquency measure contains sixty-nine items which was shortened for
this research to eleven items. As in the full-length scale, a "no"
response to a question is scored zero, a "yes" is scored one. Total
scores for this shortened version of the scale range from zero to
eleven; the higher the score, the more delinquent the individual.
Table 3. Equivalency between Hollingshead's (1957) Scale and Powers and Holmberg's (1982) Score, with occupational examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hollingshead's Seven-step Occupational Scale</th>
<th>Powers and Holmberg's Score</th>
<th>Occupational Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = executives, owners of large businesses, and major professionals</td>
<td>85-99</td>
<td>air traffic controller to judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = managers, owners of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals</td>
<td>71-84</td>
<td>radio/TV announcer to federal public administration inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = administrative personnel of large businesses, owners of small independent businesses, and semiprofessionals</td>
<td>57-70</td>
<td>self-employed manager of a gasoline service station to salaried manager of a food store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = owners of little businesses, clerical and sales workers, and technicians</td>
<td>43-56</td>
<td>automobile accessory installer to boilermaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = skilled workers</td>
<td>29-42</td>
<td>dyer to carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = semiskilled workers</td>
<td>14-28</td>
<td>laundry/dry cleaning operative to riveter/fastener metal working operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = unskilled workers</td>
<td>0-13</td>
<td>laundress in a private household to textile mill laborer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Police Contact

Scoring on this twelve-item scale is such that a "no" response to a question regarding contact with the police under a particular situation is scored zero, a "yes" is scored one. For questions with a "yes" response, the subject is asked how many times the specific event occurred. For these questions, one or two times is scored one, three or four times is scored two, and five or more times is scored three. Therefore, total scores on this scale range from zero to twenty-four, the higher the score, the more contact with the police.

Self-esteem

Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale. The Rosenberg scale consists of ten items regarding perceptions of oneself. Statements are written either in a positive way or a negative way. Strongly agreeing with a positive statement or strongly disagreeing with a negative statement is scored four, agreeing with a positive statement or disagreeing with a negative statement is scored three, disagreeing with a positive statement or agreeing with a negative statement is scored two, and strongly disagreeing with a positive statement or strongly agreeing with a negative statement is scored one. Scoring in an additive fashion (Robinson and Shaver 1973), a range of ten to forty is yielded. Higher scores indicate higher self-esteem.

Attitudes towards authority figures

Attitude towards police—Fortune's (1965) Attitude Towards Police Scale. Fortune's scale consists of twenty statements about police, ten
stated in a positive direction and ten stated in a negative direction. For this study, Fortune’s scale was shortened to fourteen items. Scoring is as follows: a four is given for strongly agreeing with a positive statement or strongly disagreeing with a negative statement, a three is given for agreeing with a positive statement or disagreeing with a negative statement, a two is given for undecided, a one is given for disagreeing with a positive statement or agreeing with a negative statement, and a zero is given for strongly disagreeing with a positive statement or strongly agreeing with a negative statement. Total scores range from zero to fifty-six with higher scores denoting more positive attitudes towards police.

**Attitude towards mother, father, teachers (and police)--Johnson et al. (1981) scale.** This scale consists of ten bipolar adjectives along a five-point semantic differential with each individual authority figure listed separately at the top of a page. To score, a four denotes the most positive evaluation in an adjective pair; a three, a slightly positive evaluation; a two, the neutral point; a one, a slightly negative evaluation; and a zero, the most negative evaluation. Scores for each authority figure range from zero to forty, with higher scores indicating more positive attitudes.

**Testing of Hypotheses**

Hypothesis 1 states that of the variables sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, police contact, and self-esteem, self-esteem will be the best predictor of adolescents’ attitudes
towards police. Sub Hypothesis 1a predicts that the rank ordering of these variables from best predictor to worst predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police will be: (1) self-esteem, (2) delinquency, (3) police contact, (4) race, (5) sex, (6) socioeconomic status, (7) age, (8) city size. These hypotheses were tested via multiple regression with sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, police contact, and self-esteem as independent variables and attitudes towards police as the dependent variable.

Hypothesis 2 predicts that there will be a positive correlation between youths' self-esteem scores and their authority figures' (mother, father, teachers, and police) scores. To test this hypothesis, correlational analyses were done between scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale, scores on Fortune's (1965) scale, and scores on Johnson et al.'s (1981) scale.

Hypothesis 3 consists of three parts. It states: (a) There will be a direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes towards parents, (b) there will be a direct effect of attitudes towards parents on attitudes towards teachers, and (c) there will be a direct effect of attitudes towards teachers on attitudes towards police. This hypothesis was tested using path analysis.

Hypothesis 4 predicts a positive correlation between male adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores. Correlational analyses between males' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale and their scores on Fortune's (1965) scale and scores on Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale were done to test Hypothesis 4.
Hypothesis 5 states that there will be a positive correlation between female adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores. Hypothesis 5 was tested via correlation between females' self-esteem scores on the Rosenberg (1965) scale and their scores on Fortune's (1965) scale and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale.

Hypothesis 6 predicts female adolescents' attitudes towards police scores will be more positive than male adolescents' attitudes towards police scores. This hypothesis was tested using t-tests between the means of scores for female adolescents and male adolescents on Fortune's (1965) scale and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale.

Hypothesis 7 predicts that there will be a positive correlation between younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores. This hypothesis was tested using a correlational analysis between younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) self-esteem scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale and their scores on Fortune's (1965) scale and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale.

Hypothesis 8 states that there will be a positive correlation between older adolescents' (22-24 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores. To test this hypothesis, correlational analyses were computed between older adolescents' (22-24 years old) self-esteem scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale and their scores on Fortune's (1965) scale and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale.
Hypothesis 9 predicts younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) attitudes towards police scores will be more positive than older adolescents' (22-24 years old) attitudes towards police scores. This hypothesis was tested using t-tests between the means of scores for younger adolescents (17-19 years old) and older adolescents (22-24 years old) on Fortune's (1965) scale and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale.

Hypothesis 10 states that there will be a negative correlation between delinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores. Correlational analyses between delinquent youths' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale and their scores on Fortune's (1965) scale and scores on Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale were done to test Hypothesis 10.

Hypothesis 11 predicts a positive correlation between nondelinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores. This hypothesis was tested by correlation between nondelinquent youths' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale and their scores on Fortune's (1965) scale and scores on Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale.

Content Analysis

From the review of the literature on attitudes towards authority figures, race was identified as a common variable when examining attitudes towards police. Some (e.g., Scaglion and Condon 1980; Thomas and Hyman 1977) have argued that it is, in fact, a strong predictor. Studies show that black youth are less favorable in attitude towards
police than are white youth (Bouma 1969; Fortune 1965, 1971; Gaskell and Smith 1985).

Originally, hypotheses were planned to test the relationship between race, self-esteem, and attitudes towards police. However, because this research contained very few black subjects (n = 10), a descriptive analysis of their answers on the college student questionnaire was done instead.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter will present the findings of this research. First, reliability will be discussed; then, the testing of hypotheses shall be presented and summarized; finally, the results of the content analysis will be examined.

Reliability

Reliability checks, based on the sample that was utilized in this research, were made on the scales that comprise the college student questionnaire. The internal consistency of the scales was tested using Cronbach's (1951) alpha, a popular reliability estimate (Carmines and Zeller 1979), computed by the following formula:

\[ a = \frac{N\bar{p}}{1 + \bar{p}(N - 1)} \]

where: \( N \) = the number of items comprising the scale

\( \bar{p} \) = the mean interitem correlation

(Carmines and Zeller 1979)

Table 4 presents these reliabilities. Mean interitem correlations were computed from the interitem correlation matrix for each scale (see Appendix B). A reliability check was made on the Fortune (1965) Attitude towards Police Scale and the attitude towards police scale...
Table 4. Reliabilities of scales on the College Student Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items on Scale</th>
<th>Mean Interitem Scale Correlation (p)</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach's alpha; α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Self-Report Instrument</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.1492</td>
<td>.6586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hindelang et al. 1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Contact Scale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.2265</td>
<td>.7785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3929</td>
<td>.8662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portune's (1965) Attitude towards Police Scale</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.3608</td>
<td>.8877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Mother Scale (Johnson et al. 1981)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3483</td>
<td>.8424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Father Scale (Johnson et al. 1981)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4712</td>
<td>.8991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Teachers Scale (Johnson et al. 1981)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3258</td>
<td>.8286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Police Scale (Johnson et al. 1981)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3996</td>
<td>.8694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portune's (1965) Attitude towards Police Scale and Attitude towards Police Scale (Johnson et al. 1981) combined</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.3389</td>
<td>.9248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Johnson et al. 1981) combined since this will be the measure referred to when Hypothesis 1 and Sub Hypothesis 1a, discussing attitudes towards police as a total, are presented. As Table 4 shows, reliability estimates range from .6586 (Seattle Self-Report Instrument) to .9248 (Fortune scale and Johnson et al. police scale combined). Carmines and Zeller (1979) argue that although a satisfactory level of reliability is difficult to state for all situations, generally, reliabilities should be at least .80 for widely used scales. Within this research, seven of the nine scales are over .80.

Testing of Hypotheses

H¹: Of the variables sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, police contact, and self-esteem, self-esteem will be the best predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police.

H¹a: It is predicted that the rank ordering of these variables from best predictor to worst predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police will be: (1) self-esteem, (2) delinquency, (3) police contact, (4) race, (5) sex, (6) socioeconomic status, (7) age, (8) city size.

This research consists of independent variables that are both quantitative and qualitative. In order to use qualitative variables in a regression analysis, it is first necessary to code such variables, of which dummy coding is the simplest method (Pedhazur 1982). With this procedure,

(a) the comparison group is assigned a value of 0 in all dummy variables, (b) the group being contrasted to the comparison group is assigned a 1 for that dummy variable only, and (c) groups not involved in the contrast are also assigned a value of 0 for that dummy variable. (Aiken and West 1991, 117)
Race and sex were dummy coded. For race, Caucasian was assigned a value of zero and minority groups (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Other) were assigned a value of one. For sex, males were assigned a zero, females were assigned a one. Although the variable city size was a quantitative one, it was also dummy coded because the groups were of unequal size (see Question 4 on survey; e.g., Answer 2 consists of a population size of 9,999 while Answer 5 consists of 99,999). Thus, greater than 200,000 was coded zero and all others were coded one. Similarly, though the variable age was not dummy coded, it was reorganized into two-year increments so each group would be equal in size; therefore, the groups became 17-18, 19-20, 21-22, and 23-24.

Table 5 shows the simple correlation among all of the variables. Except for the low correlation (as defined by Munro and Page 1993, p. 181) between delinquency and sex ($r = -.4724$) and between police contact and delinquency ($r = .3616$), the independent variables are relatively uncorrelated. Concerning the dependent variable attitudes towards police, there is a high correlation (as defined by Munro and Page 1993, p. 181) between the Fortune scale and the Johnson et al. scale ($r = .7046$).

Hypotheses 1 and 1a were tested utilizing multiple regression. Table 6 summarizes the results of this analysis. This table indicates that the best predictor in attitudes towards police of those stated is delinquency. The second best predictor is self-esteem, followed by age as the third best predictor. These variables are significant beyond the
Table 5. Simple correlation among all of the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Delinquency</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Police Contact</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>City Size</th>
<th>Attitudes Toward Police</th>
<th>Fortune Scale</th>
<th>Johnson et al. Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.1919</td>
<td>-.4724</td>
<td>.1393</td>
<td>-.2339</td>
<td>-.0309</td>
<td>.0828</td>
<td>-.0025</td>
<td>-.0173</td>
<td>.0542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.2489</td>
<td>.1330</td>
<td>.1445</td>
<td>-.0020</td>
<td>-.0456</td>
<td>.0110</td>
<td>.1324</td>
<td>.0674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.1573</td>
<td>.3616</td>
<td>.0422</td>
<td>-.0071</td>
<td>.0547</td>
<td>-.1803</td>
<td>-.2616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.0443</td>
<td>.0234</td>
<td>.0476</td>
<td>.1069</td>
<td>.1550</td>
<td>.1233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Contact</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.0663</td>
<td>-.0085</td>
<td>.0572</td>
<td>-.0936</td>
<td>.0924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.0722</td>
<td>-.1789</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.0668</td>
<td>-.0027</td>
<td>-.0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City size</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.0826</td>
<td>-.0406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards police:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune scale</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al. scale</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Summary of multiple regression of independent variables in rank order on dependent variable, attitudes towards police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.336</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.0773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City size</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.6202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police contact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.7910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.9063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .12874$
.001 level. Using a significance level cutoff at .10 and .15, sex and city size enter in at ranks four and five, respectively. All of the independent variables combined account for approximately 13% of the total variance in attitudes towards police. In view of these findings, Hypotheses 1 and 1a are not supported as precisely stated. However, even though self-esteem is not the best predictor of attitudes towards police of those stated, it is the second best predictor.

Hypotheses 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 all involve correlational analyses. When discussing correlations, it is important to consider not only the direction and the level of significance between the two variables but to also consider the strength of the relationship. As presented in Munro and Page (1993, 181), the strength of the correlation coefficients will be discussed according to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r Value</th>
<th>Interpretation of r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00 - .25</td>
<td>little if any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26 - .49</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 - .69</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 - .89</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.90 - 1.00</td>
<td>very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H2: There will be a positive correlation between youths' self-esteem scores and their authority figures' (mother, father, teachers, and police) scores.

Correlation coefficients were computed between scores on Rosenberg's (1965) Self-Esteem Scale, Fortune's (1965) police scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) scale (mother, father, teachers, and police) to test Hypothesis 2. Table 7 shows these results. The correlations between self-esteem and attitudes towards mother, teachers, and police
Table 7. Correlation coefficients between scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale, Fortune's (1965) scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) scale; n = 448

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale</th>
<th>Fortune's police scale</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R = 0.1550***</td>
<td>0.1278**</td>
<td>0.0878</td>
<td>0.2082***</td>
<td>0.1233**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p = .001)</td>
<td>(p = .007)</td>
<td>(p = .063)</td>
<td>(p = .0001)</td>
<td>(p = .009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001.
(on both the Fortune scale and the Johnson et al. scale) are, albeit weak, positive and significant at or beyond the .01 level. Although the correlation between self-esteem and attitude towards father is not significant at the .05 level, it is in the expected direction and is close to significance (p = .063). Thus, Hypothesis 2 is partially supported.

H3: There will be a relationship between self-esteem, attitudes towards parents, attitudes towards teachers, and attitudes towards police such that:

a. There will be a direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes towards parents.

b. There will be a direct effect of attitudes towards parents on attitudes towards teachers.

c. There will be a direct effect of attitudes towards teachers on attitudes towards police.

This hypothesis was tested by path analysis. In this procedure, correlations are broken down into their direct causal, indirect causal, and noncausal components. Path coefficients or beta weights isolate the effect of one variable on another variable (i.e., measure the direct effect), holding all other variables in the model constant. This is one of the main advantages of path analysis (Asher 1983).

Beta weights are calculated through multiple regression analysis "in which each endogenous variable is regressed on the variables that are prior to it in the model and assumed to have a causal effect on it, as indicated by the arrows in the model" (Munro and Page 1993, 280). Thus, in this hypothesis, three regressions were done to compute the path coefficients. Table 8 shows these results. All of the beta
Table 8. Regressions used to compute path coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>Dependent Variable (DV)</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s) (IV)</th>
<th>Beta Weight</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Percent of Variance Accounted for by IV</th>
<th>Total Percent of Variance Accounted for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attitudes towards Police</td>
<td>Attitudes towards Teachers</td>
<td>.370566</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>13.7319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes towards Parents</td>
<td>.248836</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>6.1919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.009069</td>
<td>.8295</td>
<td>.0082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attitudes towards Teachers</td>
<td>Attitudes towards Parents</td>
<td>.260152</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>6.7679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.169341</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>2.8676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Attitudes towards Parents</td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.149204</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>2.2262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


weights are significant at or beyond the .01 level, with the exception of self-esteem on attitudes toward police (p = .8295).

Also shown in Table 8 is the percent of variance in the three dependent variables accounted for by each independent variable. For example, attitudes towards teachers accounts for nearly 14% of the variance in attitudes toward police. Similarly, attitudes towards parents accounts for nearly 7% of the variance in attitudes towards teachers. These two specific independent variables (i.e., attitudes towards teachers and attitudes towards parents) are the ones that explain the most in their respective dependent variables (i.e., attitudes towards police and attitudes towards teachers).

Further indicated in Table 8 is the total percent of variance accounted for by the independent variables combined within each of the three dependent variables. Thus, nearly 20% of the variance in attitudes towards police is accounted for or explained by attitudes towards teachers, attitudes towards parents, and self-esteem combined. Likewise, approximately 10% of the variance in attitudes towards teachers is explained by attitudes towards parents and self-esteem combined. Only about 2% of the variance in attitudes towards parents is explained by self-esteem.

Table 9 shows the complete results of the path analysis. All of the paths are significant at or beyond the .01 level with the exception of Path C, the direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes towards police (p = .8295). In terms of the original hypothesis, therefore, there is a direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes towards parents (Path A;
Table 9. Path model of self-esteem, attitudes towards parents, attitudes toward teachers, and attitudes towards police

1 = Self-esteem
2 = Attitudes towards Parents
3 = Attitudes towards Teachers
4 = Attitudes towards Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Beta Weight</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total Causal</th>
<th>Noncausal</th>
<th>Total Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$r_{12} = 0.1492$</td>
<td>$P_{21} = 0.149204$</td>
<td>0.149204</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.149204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$r_{13} = 0.2082$</td>
<td>$P_{31} = 0.169341$</td>
<td>0.169341</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>0.033816</td>
<td>0.208157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$r_{14} = 0.1233$</td>
<td>$P_{41} = 0.009069$</td>
<td>0.009069</td>
<td>AE+BF+ADF</td>
<td>0.114263</td>
<td>0.123332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$r_{23} = 0.2054$</td>
<td>$P_{32} = 0.260132$</td>
<td>0.260132</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.260132</td>
<td></td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$r_{24} = 0.3560$</td>
<td>$P_{42} = 0.248836$</td>
<td>0.248836</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>0.096403</td>
<td>0.345239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$r_{34} = 0.4435$</td>
<td>$P_{43} = 0.370566$</td>
<td>0.370566</td>
<td>bD+BAE+DE+DAC</td>
<td>0.07291</td>
<td>0.443476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$. 

** $p \leq .01$.  
*** $p \leq .001$. 

Diagram:  
- Path A: $r_{12} = 0.1492$  
- Path B: $r_{13} = 0.2082$  
- Path C: $r_{14} = 0.1233$  
- Path D: $r_{23} = 0.2054$  
- Path E: $r_{24} = 0.3560$  
- Path F: $r_{34} = 0.4435$  

Correlation:  
- Path A: $r_{12} = 0.1492$  
- Path B: $r_{13} = 0.2082$  
- Path C: $r_{14} = 0.1233$  
- Path D: $r_{23} = 0.2054$  
- Path E: $r_{24} = 0.3560$  
- Path F: $r_{34} = 0.4435$
p ≤ .01); a direct effect of attitudes towards parents on attitudes
towards teachers (Path D; p ≤ .001); and a direct effect of attitudes
towards teachers on attitudes towards police (Path F; p ≤ .001). Thus,
Hypothesis 3 is supported. It is also true that there is a direct
effect of self-esteem on attitudes towards teachers (Path B; p ≤ .001)
and a direct effect of attitudes towards parents on attitudes towards
police (Path E; p ≤ .001). All of the correlations in this model are
small but positive.

H^4: There will be a positive correlation between male
adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards
police scores.

To test this hypothesis, correlation coefficients were computed
between males' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale, Fortune's
(1965) police scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale. Table 10
indicates that the correlation between adolescent males' self-esteem and
their attitudes towards police is in the predicted direction (i.e., it
is positive) but that only their attitudes towards police on the Fortune
(1965) scale is significant (p = .035). The correlation is also very
weak (r = .1567). Thus, Hypothesis 4 is partially supported.

H^5: There will be a positive correlation between female
adolescent's self-esteem scores and their attitudes toward
police scores.

Hypothesis 5 was tested by computing correlation coefficients for
females' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale, Fortune's
(1965) police scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale. The
results of these correlations are shown in Table 11. The correlation
between female adolescents' self-esteem and their attitudes towards police on both the Fortune (1965) scale and the Johnson et al. (1981) scale is positive and significant at or beyond the .05 level. Although the correlations are weak, Hypothesis 5 is supported.

Table 10. Correlation coefficients between males' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale, Fortune's (1965) scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale; n = 181

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosenberg's Self- esteem Scale</th>
<th>Fortune's Police Scale</th>
<th>Johnson et al.'s Police Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1567*</td>
<td>.0931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p = .035)</td>
<td>(p = .212)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p ≤ .05.

Table 11. Correlation coefficients between females' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale, Fortune's (1965) scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale; n = 267

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosenberg's Self- esteem Scale</th>
<th>Fortune's Police Scale</th>
<th>Johnson et al.'s Police Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1527*</td>
<td>.1650**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p = .013)</td>
<td>(p = .007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01.
H⁶: Female adolescents' attitudes towards police scores will be higher or more positive than male adolescents' attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 6 was tested by t-test between sample means for females and males on both the Fortune (1965) scale and the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale. Table 12 indicates these results. On both police measures, the mean for females is not significantly different than that for males and so this hypothesis is not supported.

Table 12. Comparison of females' (n = 267) and males' (n = 181) scores on the Fortune (1965) scale and the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>35.0562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>35.3370</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>26.5843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>25.9061</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H⁷: There will be a positive correlation between younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Correlation coefficients were compared between scores on Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale, Fortune's (1965) police scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale for adolescents 17-19 years old to test Hypothesis 7. Table 13 indicates the results. The correlation between 17-19 year olds' self-esteem and their attitudes towards police
Table 13. Correlation coefficients between younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale, Fortune's (1965) scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale; n = 238

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fortune's Police Scale</th>
<th>Johnson et al.'s Police Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg's Self- esteem Scale</td>
<td>.2444***</td>
<td>.2346***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p = .000)</td>
<td>(p = .000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** p ≤ .001.

on both police scales is positive and significant at or beyond the .001 level. Hypothesis 7 is supported, though the correlations are weak.

H₇: There will be a positive correlation between older adolescents' (22-24 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 8 was tested by computing correlation coefficients between scores on Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale, Fortune's (1965) police scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale for adolescents 22-24 years old. The results of these correlations are presented in Table 14. For adolescents 22-24 years old, the correlation between self-esteem and attitudes towards police on both police scales is in a negative direction and is not significant. Thus, Hypothesis 8 is not supported.
Table 14. Correlation coefficients between older adolescents' (22-24 years old) scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale, Fortune's (1965) scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale; n = 62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fortune's Police Scale</th>
<th>Johnson et al.'s Police Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale</td>
<td>-.0950 (p = .459)</td>
<td>-.2194 (p = .087)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H^9: Younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) attitudes towards police scores will be higher or more positive than older adolescents' (22-24 years old) attitudes towards police scores.

This hypothesis was tested by t-test comparing sample means for adolescents 17-19 years old to adolescents 22-24 years old on the Fortune (1965) scale and the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale. Table 15 presents the results. On both police measures, the mean for adolescents 17-19 years old is not significantly different than that for adolescents 22-24 years old. Thus, Hypothesis 9 is not supported.

In order to test Hypotheses 10 and 11, the categories of youth classified as delinquent and nondelinquent needed to be created. A shortened form of the Seattle Self-Report Instrument (Hindelang et al. 1981) was the delinquency measure used in this research. Scores can range from 0 to 11, with higher scores indicating greater delinquency. Within the total sample of 448 subjects, scores ranged from 0 to 11, with a mean of 3.50 and a standard deviation of 1.80. For this study, those that scored one standard deviation or greater above the mean
(5.3 - 11) were identified as delinquent (n = 56); similarly, those that scored one standard deviation or less below the mean (0 - 1.6) were identified as nondelinquent (n = 48). This procedure is consistent with that used by other researchers (e.g., Curtis, Billingslea, and Wilson 1988; Moyer and Motta 1982).

Table 15. Comparison of younger adolescents' (17-19 years old; n = 238) and older adolescents' (22-24 years old; n = 62) scores on the Fortune (1965) scale and the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortune</td>
<td>17-19 years old</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>34.4118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>22-24 years old</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35.0806</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al.</td>
<td>17-19 years old</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>26.1723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police scale</td>
<td>22-24 years old</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25.6452</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H10: There will be a negative correlation between delinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

This hypothesis was tested by computing correlation coefficients between scores on Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale, Fortune's (1965) police scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale for delinquents. Table 16 shows these correlations. Although neither correlation is significant, only the correlation between self-esteem and the police
Table 16. Correlation coefficients between delinquent youths' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale, Fortune's (1965) scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale; n = 56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fortune's Police Scale</th>
<th>Johnson et al.'s Police Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale</td>
<td>.0206 (p = .880)</td>
<td>-.1286 (p = .345)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scale of the Johnson measure is in the predicted negative direction. Hypothesis 10 is not supported.

H11: There will be a positive correlation between nondelinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Correlation coefficients were computed between nondelinquents' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) Self-esteem Scale, Fortune's (1965) police scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale to test Hypothesis 11. The results are shown in Table 17. For nondelinquents, there is a low positive correlation between self-esteem and attitudes towards police, significant at or beyond the .05 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 11 is supported.

Summary of Testing of Hypotheses

This section will briefly summarize the findings from the hypotheses tested in this research. Each individual hypothesis will be presented followed by its results, and, depending upon those results, if necessary a revision will be made.
Table 17. Correlation coefficients between nondelinquent youths' scores on Rosenberg's (1965) scale, Fortune's (1965) scale, and Johnson et al.'s (1981) police scale; n = 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fortune's Police Scale</th>
<th>Johnson et al.'s Police Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale</td>
<td>.3192* (p = .027)</td>
<td>.3653** (p = .011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01.

H¹: Of the variables sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, policy contact, and self-esteem, self-esteem will be the best predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police.

H¹a: It is predicted that the rank ordering of these variables from best predictor to worst predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police will be: (1) self-esteem, (2) delinquency, (3) police contact, (4) race, (5) sex, (6) socioeconomic status, (7) age, (8) city size.

Hypothesis 1 and 1a were not supported as stated. Delinquency was found to be the best predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police, while self-esteem was found to be the second best predictor. Also, the rank ordering of variables was not found to be as predicted. Therefore:

H¹ revised: Of the variables sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, police contact, and self-esteem, delinquency will be the best predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police.
H₁₈ revised: The rank ordering of these variables from best predictor to worst predictor of adolescents' attitudes towards police will be: (1) delinquency, (2) self-esteem, (3) age, (4) sex, (5) city size, (6) socioeconomic status, (7) police contact, (8) race.

H²: There will be a positive correlation between youths' self-esteem scores and their authority figures' (mother, father, teachers, and police) scores.

This hypothesis was partially supported. The correlation between youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards their fathers' scores was in the expected direction but was not significant (p = .063). Hence:

H² revised: There will be a positive correlation between youths' self-esteem scores and their authority figures' (mother, teachers, and police) scores.

H³: There will be a relationship between self-esteem, attitudes towards parents, attitudes towards teachers, and attitudes towards police such that:

a. There will be a direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes toward parents.

b. There will be a direct effect of attitudes towards parents on attitudes towards teachers.

c. There will be a direct effect of attitudes towards teachers on attitudes towards police.

Hypothesis 3 was supported. Results further showed: There is a direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes towards teachers; there is a direct effect of attitudes towards parents on attitudes towards police; and there is no direct effect of self-esteem on attitudes towards police.
H⁴: There will be a positive correlation between male adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

This hypothesis was partially supported. Results indicated a positive correlation between male adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores as measured by the Fortune (1965) police scale but not as measured by the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale. Hence:

H⁴ revised: There will be a positive correlation between male adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores when using some measures.

H⁵: There will be a positive correlation between female adolescents' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 5 was supported.

H⁶: Female adolescents' attitudes towards police scores will be higher or more positive than male adolescents' attitudes towards police scores.

This hypothesis was not supported; no significant difference was found. So:

H⁶ revised: There will be no significant difference between female adolescents' attitudes towards police scores and male adolescents' attitudes towards police scores.

H⁷: There will be a positive correlation between younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 7 was supported.
$H^8$: There will be a positive correlation between older adolescents' (22-24 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

This hypothesis was not supported. Therefore:

$H^8$ revised: There will be no correlation between older adolescents' (22-24 years old) self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

$H^9$: Younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) attitudes towards police scores will be higher or more positive than older adolescents' (22-24 years old) attitudes towards police scores.

No support was found for Hypothesis 9; hence:

$H^9$ revised: There will be no significant difference between younger adolescents' (17-19 years old) attitudes towards police scores and older adolescents' (22-24 years old) attitudes towards police scores.

$H^{10}$: There will be a negative correlation between delinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

No support was found for this hypothesis. Therefore:

$H^{10}$ revised: There will be no correlation between delinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

$H^{11}$: There will be a positive correlation between nondelinquent youths' self-esteem scores and their attitudes towards police scores.

Hypothesis 11 was supported.
Content Analysis

This research contained ten black subjects, six females and four males, with 90% being seventeen to twenty years old. In terms of background, 70% are from a metro area and 50% identify Mother as the principal wage earner. Socioeconomically, this group (n = 10) is not significantly different from the rest of the sample (n = 438; t = 1.71; p = .087). All subjects fall within the middle range (Black $\bar{X} = 39.25$, SD = 16.08; All Others $\bar{X} = 31.34$, SD = 14.39).

Past studies (e.g., Bouma 1969; Fortune 1965, 1971) have generally shown that black youth are less favorable in attitude towards police than white youth. This result is evident here as well. On both the Fortune (1965) scale and the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale, blacks scored significantly lower, or held less favorable attitudes towards police, than whites. Table 18 indicates these findings. Further, as others (e.g., Gaskell and Smith 1985) have found, unfavorable or less positive attitudes towards police by blacks does not seem to be just the result of negative experience with police. For this group, three individuals had no contact with police in the previous twelve months and of the remaining seven, who had a total of fourteen contacts in the last twelve months, 71% (n = 10) of their contacts were of a less serious nature (traffic violations, asking police for assistance, etc.), with the other 29% (n = 4) being of a more serious nature (being arrested, "picked up" for questioning). Said another way, of the ten people in this group, a total of fourteen contacts with
police have taken place in the past twelve months and only four of these contacts have been relatively serious.

Examining specific or individual responses on the Fortune (1965) scale and the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale provide valuable information regarding this group's perceptions of police. The Fortune (1965) scale will be discussed first. On the positive side, 70% of this group agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that police are brave. Similarly, 70% were undecided or took a neutral position with the statement concerning whether police give people a chance to explain. On the negative side, 100% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that police only use force when they have to (one person mentioned the Rodney King incident), 60% agreed with the statement that police accuse people of things they did not do, and 50% disagreed with the statement that people can rely on the police in times of distress.

Table 18. Comparison of Black youths' and Caucasian youths' scores on the Fortune (1965) scale and the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>35.4818</td>
<td>-3.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>26.5206</td>
<td>-2.66**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001.
On the Johnson et al. (1981) police scale, which consists of ten bipolar adjectives, some positive and neutral positions are seen. Seventy percent of the group see the police as important and valuable and 50% view them as good. On seven adjective pairs, however, 50-70% of the group are undecided or neutral. These adjective pairs are: optimistic/pessimistic, friendly/hostile, unselfish/selfish, honest/dishonest, kind/cruel, fair/unfair, and successful/unsuccessful.

To summarize, for this small black sample of ten adolescents, their opinions, overall, towards police are not as favorable as those of the white sample, even though they have not had a lot of contact with police, at least in the past year. They recognize the positive attributes of police as being brave, important, valuable, and good, and yet these are tempered by their beliefs that police use force unnecessarily, they accuse people of things they did not do, and they cannot be relied on in times of distress. Further, these subjects are noncommittal regarding whether police give people a chance to explain and whether police are optimistic, friendly, unselfish, honest, kind, fair, and successful or the opposite.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Using late adolescent college students as subjects, this research addressed two specific issues. It focused on discovering important predictors in attitudes towards police and investigated the relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards parents, teachers, and police. The previous chapter presented detailed results of eleven hypotheses plus a content analysis centered around these two areas. The following discussion will focus on what was generally learned from this investigation, what limitations must be placed on what was learned, and what some future implications might be.

Review of the Findings

Many previous studies (e.g., Amoroso and Ware 1981; Bouma 1969; Fortune 1965, 1971; Reicher and Emler 1985; Torney 1971) have found females to be more favorable in attitudes towards police than males. In this particular research, this was not found to be the case. Here no significant differences between the sexes emerged. This finding does not stand completely alone in the literature, however. Rigby et al. (1987) found similarity in attitudes towards police for their Australian
sample of boys and girls. Upon examining the aforementioned studies, it was found that only two studies (Amoroso and Ware 1981; Emler and Reicher 1987) contained older adolescents. Specifically, the oldest adolescents in the Amoroso and Ware (1981) study were seventeen. In Emler and Reicher's (1987) study there was a small sample of college students who averaged age nineteen. In this research, about 70% of the students were seventeen to twenty years old, and the remaining 30% were twenty-one to twenty-four years old. Clearly, then, students in this study were older than those studied previously. Further, the Amoroso and Ware (1981) study is a Canadian one, while the Emler and Reicher (1987) study is Scottish. In essence, perhaps age of adolescents and/or culture explain past findings of differences in attitudes towards police between females and males.

Another interesting departure in this research from past studies is in reference to age and its effect upon attitudes towards police. Studies by Amoroso and Ware (1981), Bouma (1969), Ferguson and Kennelly (1974), Lapsley et al. (1984), Fortune (1966), and Rigby et al. (1987) found older adolescents to be less favorable in attitude towards police than younger adolescents. This difference was not found here. Previous studies, though, focused on younger adolescents, generally spanning the ages twelve to eighteen. The one exception is the study by Lapsley et al. (1984) which contained twenty-three undergraduates but did not specify the age range. Hence, a possible reason for deviation from past studies might be the utilization of older adolescents in this research.
The results of the content analysis found black adolescents less favorable in attitude towards police than white adolescents. This is entirely consistent with past studies, particularly those by Bouma (1969), Gaskell and Smith (1985), and Fortune (1965 1971). Caution must be exercised, however, regarding these findings because they are based on a small sample of only ten black subjects. Nevertheless, it was found that negative attitudes towards police did not seem to be merely the result of recent bad experiences with police. Rather, as Gaskell and Smith (1985) have suggested, it appears negative opinions about police filter into the minds of black youth independent of negative contact.

Sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, and police contact are typical predictors examined when investigating attitudes towards police. Given this, however, no study was found within the past twenty years that utilized all of these variables together to explain attitudes towards police. Studies by Amoroso and Ware (1981) and Winfree and Griffiths (1977) specifically focused on adolescents as subjects. Amoroso and Ware (1981) found that each of the following variables contributed 12 or less of the variance in adolescents' attitudes towards police: sex, age, city size, socioeconomic status, and type of school (public or private). Winfree and Griffiths (1977) found that sex, race, city size, and socioeconomic status had very little effect upon adolescents' attitudes towards police. However, they found that contacts with police and prestige
ratings of the officer's job taken together accounted for approximately 20% of the variance in attitudes towards police.

What was learned in this research is that delinquency is the best predictor, of the typical predictors, in attitudes towards police for late adolescents. This is a clear departure from the aforementioned two studies (i.e., Amoroso and Ware 1981; Winfree and Griffiths 1977) which failed to include delinquency as a possible meaningful predictor. What is even more significant, however, is that self-esteem emerged as the second best predictor in late adolescents' attitudes towards police. This is a variable which, until now, has never been considered. Age was the third best predictor. All of the variables in the model (sex, race, age, city size, socioeconomic status, delinquency, police contact, and self-esteem) together accounted for nearly 13% of the variance, although delinquency, self-esteem, and race were the only variables significant at or beyond the .05 level. Of course, this still leaves approximately 87% of the variance in attitudes towards police unexplained.

This research provided additional information regarding the relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards police. Specifically, it was found that how one feels about oneself influences how one feels about police. Sullivan (1940) was one of the early theorists to argue that attitudes towards the self are manifested towards others. Rogers (1951) and Fromm (1956) furthered this idea later by suggesting that the more one accepts oneself, the more likely one is to accept others. This is what was found here: The more positive one feels towards the self, the more positive one feels towards
police; by the same token, the more negative one feels about the self, the more negative one feels about police. This statement was found to be true for those seventeen to nineteen years old, for nondelinquents, and for females. There was some indication it may also be true for males, but this was not definitive. For those twenty-two to twenty-four years old, an indication was found that the higher their self-esteem, the lower their attitudes towards police. For delinquents, no connection was found between self-esteem and attitudes towards police. This particular finding contrasts with the work of Rathus and Siegel (1973); they found a negative relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards authority for their delinquent sample of males aged twelve to sixteen. Of course, this research contained older adolescents and male and female delinquents.

Another important aspect of this research was to study the relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards parents, teachers, and police. A general finding concerning the late adolescents in this investigation was that how they feel about themselves influences how they feel about authority figures. This coincides with expectations, given what was discussed previously in the work of Sullivan (1940), Rogers (1951), and Fromm (1956). It was particularly found that the more one likes one’s self, the more one likes one’s mother, one’s teachers, and police. The counter also holds true: The more one dislikes one’s self, the more one dislikes one’s mother, one’s teachers, and police. There was some support that this relationship may also hold true regarding attitudes towards one’s father. Studies by
Ferguson and Kennelly (1974), Heaven (1988), and Paul and Fischer (1980) support these findings.

Through path analysis, it was found: (1) late adolescents' self-feelings influence how they feel about their parents and their teachers; either one of these (i.e., their attitudes towards their parents or their attitudes towards their teachers) influences how they feel about police; (2) late adolescents' self-feelings influence how they feel about their parents, which influence how they feel about their teachers, which influence how they feel about police; (3) late adolescents' self-feelings do not directly influence how they feel about police. The relationship between self-esteem, attitudes toward parents, attitudes towards teachers, and attitudes towards police was found to be positive. This means that if an individual is high on one variable, she or he is high on another variable; conversely, low on one variable means low on another variable. For example: A late adolescent positive (or high) in self-esteem will feel positive towards parents and teachers; in turn, he or she will feel positive towards police.

The findings from the path analysis are consistent with work from the early theorists. Sullivan's (1953) concept of personification in which characteristics seen in one are applied to similar others fits well here. Freud (1939) and Coopersmith (1967) believed that attitudes towards parental authority generalize to other authority. In a more contemporary vein, Clark and Wenninger (1964), Jones and Ray (1984), Lapsley et al. (1984), and Rigby and Rump (1981) all found support that attitudes towards parents are important to consider in predicting
attitudes towards police. The only study that runs counter to this theme is Marsten and Coleman's (1961) research which found that attitudes towards father did not generalize to other authority figures. Studies by Kutnick (1980), Amoroso and Ware (1983), and Reicher and Emler (1985) particularly support the connection between parents and teachers (Kutnick 1980) and teachers and police (Amoroso and Ware 1983; Reicher and Emlers 1985). The finding that self-esteem does not directly influence attitudes towards police is noteworthy because it further shows that self-esteem generalizes out to larger (parents) and larger (teachers) and larger (police) authority groups. This idea was originally suggested through Kutnick's (1980) work.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of this study was using college students for subjects, a common practice. In the literature review for this research, four investigations (i.e., Buri et al. 1988; Curtis et al. 1988; Johnson et al. 1981; Marsten and Coleman 1961) exclusively used college students, although none of these studies was specifically about college students. Three other studies (i.e., Lapsley et al. 1984; Munn and Renner 1978; Weinberg 1972) used college students as representatives of a particular age group, as this study. About twenty years ago, Borgatta and Bohnstedt (1974) addressed the heavy use of college students as subjects and the limitations inherent in doing so. They argued that college students differ from the general population on such variables as intelligence, values, and experiences. It is interesting
to note that nothing more contemporary was located concerning this issue. Although it can be argued that many late adolescents attend college these days, it is by no means universal and so using college students as subjects is still sampling from a unique group of people. Further, using college students from a particular location compounds the drawbacks of a college sample. In this study, subjects were drawn from two universities but both schools are roughly located in the Midwest. External validity or the generalizability of the results is thus called into question (Campbell and Stanley 1963). In this investigation, the objective was to sample late adolescents’ attitudes, not late adolescent Midwest college students’ attitudes. Therefore, criticisms leveled against the use of college students as subjects apply here, as well as any regarding sampling from a particular geographical location.

A second limitation of this investigation was the small number of black subjects, only ten. Again, generalizability becomes limited not only in terms of reflecting black opinions but also in terms of the overall findings of the research representing adolescent attitudes, not just white adolescent attitudes. Due to the small number of blacks, it was impossible to formally test hypotheses, which would have been more desirable than a content analysis. An ideal situation would have been the representation of several minority groups, including Hispanics and Asians, to allow many comparisons between majority viewpoints and minority viewpoints.

A third limitation of this research concerns the percentage of the variance in attitudes towards police that was accounted for, that being
only 13%. Using college students as subjects may partially explain this outcome. In any event, generalizations drawn from this study regarding attitudes towards police must be conservative.

A fourth possible limitation of this study was that data were collected approximately seventeen months after the Rodney King incident, which occurred in March of 1991. Given the significance of the King event, this time span may not have been long enough for possible effects to have worn off. Lasley (1994) explored the effects of the King incident on Los Angeles citizens' attitudes towards police and found that regardless of sex, age (30 or under, over 30), or race (African-American, Hispanic, Caucasian), citizen attitudes towards police were significantly lowered after the King event. It was further found that negative perceptions of police fairness held by African-Americans were significantly lower and of longer duration than those of the other two groups. It seems plausible that the Rodney King incident may have influenced attitudes towards police in this research (one subject specifically mentioned Rodney King), although to what degree is not known.

Implications and Conclusions

There are two important findings that emerged from this research. One is that self-esteem is a predictor in attitudes towards police. The second is that late adolescents' self-feelings influence their attitudes towards authority figures such that if they feel positive towards themselves, they feel positive towards authority figures, and if they
feel negative towards themselves, they feel negative towards authority figures. These findings suggest some possible directions for future research and indicate some policy recommendations.

Self-esteem is a variable that should be considered in future studies concerned with investigating attitudes towards police. It is important to remember, however, that only 13% of the variance in attitudes towards police was explained in this research and that self-esteem was just one of the variables, though the second best predictor. This research was the first to consider self-esteem as relevant in attitudes towards police but certainly much more work must be done to validate and extend this finding. With this in mind, some possible research questions worthy of investigation are as follows: Is self-esteem an important predictor in attitudes towards police for ten-year-old children? Does the relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards police hold true for Hispanics, Native Americans, or Asians? Are there any differences between Southerners and Northerners in terms of self-esteem and attitudes towards police? Will the same relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards police be found in five years, ten years, or even twenty years? What about measurement issues? Would a different self-esteem measure (e.g., Coopersmith 1967) yield different results? In short, areas of investigation are numerous. Future studies should focus on various age groups, several minority groups, and sample from different geographical locations. Longitudinal research should be begun. Different measurement devices of self-esteem and attitudes towards police should be investigated and perhaps additional ones
developed. Another less obvious area of inquiry that comes to mind is in terms of recruitment. Specifically, is the relationship between self-esteem and attitudes towards police important in the recruitment of officers? If so, how? More advanced statistical computer programs should also be considered. Programs such as LISREL (Joreskog and Sorbon 1978) could investigate the possibility of a reciprocal feedback loop between self-esteem, attitudes towards parents, attitudes towards teachers, and attitudes towards police.

Years ago, Mead (1956) identified the self as being a social product. He argued that one is not born with a self but rather that the self develops over time through experiences with others. The process works as follows: One observes how one is regarded and valued by significant others, internalizes this, and comes to respond to oneself in kind. Baumrind (1978a) put forth the idea that parents are the primary socializing agents of children. In short, they are very important significant others. Sullivan (1940) believed that attitudes towards the self are manifested towards others. Through the process of personification, characteristics seen in one person tend to be applied to similar others. Kutnick's (1980) work provides further clarification as to how the process of attitudes towards authority may be generalized. It begins with a positive or negative attitude towards the parents, which gets transferred to the teacher and eventually other authority figures. This research supports these ideas of Mead (1956), Baumrind (1978a), Sullivan (1940), and Kutnick (1980). It is also supportive of the vast literature on self-esteem which argues that self-esteem is
important in human development and it ties self-esteem to an area it previously has not been associated with—attitudes towards authority figures. In this study it was specifically found that the more late adolescents liked themselves, the more they liked their parents, their teachers, and the police, in that order. Why this is significant will be examined in greater detail.

Children develop their self-esteem through their interaction with significant others, especially their parents (Baumrind 1978a; Mead 1956). By the age of five, children already have a firm belief about their self-worth (Nagaraja 1981). If children feel valued, respected, and loved by their parents, they will develop high self-esteem (Chubb and Fertman 1992). Many studies have identified the benefits of children having high self-esteem. Consider just these two as examples: Children with high self-esteem experience less interpersonal loneliness and depression (Battle 1987b) and they are less attracted to gangs (Wang 1994). But the benefits of developing high self-esteem in youth are much more far reaching than previously considered.

Children with high self-esteem view their parents and their relationship with them in a positive manner (Chubb and Fertman 1992). These attitudes transfer to the next similar authority figure (Sullivan 1940), the elementary school teacher (Kutnick 1980). Children who like their teachers learn more in school, get better grades, and are less likely to drop out of school (Battle 1987a; Fine 1985). As this research shows, adolescents who feel positive towards teachers tend to feel positive towards police. Positive attitudes towards police by
adolescents become important when one considers that adolescents, as a group, are over represented in committing crime (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics 1993). If adolescents feel positive towards police, they are less likely to be involved in criminal activity (Fortune 1971). What becomes clear is that, ultimately, the key to decreasing crime and maintaining a lawful society is to have children respect authority. The way to accomplish this is to teach children respect for themselves or, in other words, to develop high self-esteem.

It becomes our goal, then, to develop, implement, and allocate resources for high self-esteem building programs. There are some programs already in existence that work on enhancing children's self-esteem. Head Start, the Montessori method, and High/Scope come to mind. These programs, however, target specific populations. Head Start is for disadvantaged children and the Montessori method and High/Scope tend to serve those from more privileged backgrounds due to their high cost. What is needed, therefore, are programs centered around high self-esteem building that are available to all children. Educational programs focused on the importance of high self-esteem and how to encourage it in children could be offered to new parents through the local community hospital. Day care facilities could be offered incentives for hiring specially trained personnel or establishing their own training programs. As children attend school, further enhancement of self-esteem could be built into curriculum planning and through after school activities. In
short, the development of high self-esteem in children is so important that it needs to become part of our government policy.

In conclusion, this research unmistakably sets forth a new and exciting area of endeavor within the field of criminology: self-esteem. It suggests that the way to attack our ever-increasing crime problem is to develop high self-esteem in children. Self-esteem does more than influence our attitudes towards others. It may be, as Coopersmith (1959) once indicated, a major factor in determining behavior.
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Cover Letter--Iowa State University Students

Hello. The Department of Sociology is conducting a survey of college students' perceptions of themselves and of authority roles in our society. We are interested in your opinion; this is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. This survey takes about 20 to 25 minutes to complete. The data that are gathered will be used for a dissertation. Results from the survey will better serve the needs of college students in the future.

Participation in this survey is strictly voluntary. Your name will not appear anywhere on this questionnaire, and there will no way we can identify you personally. Your anonymity is insured, and your answers will be held in the strictest confidence. In order for this survey to be of any value, it is important that you be honest in answering the questions. Remember: the only "RIGHT" answer is what YOU believe to be true.

Circle your response to each question directly on the questionnaire. Try to work quickly, without spending too much time on any one question. Answer the questions in order, and please answer all of them. If you have any questions, please ask.

We appreciate your willingness to participate in this survey.

Thank you.
Hello. My name is Kathy Smith, and I am an instructor in the Department of Sociology. I am working on a project with Iowa State University, and we are interested in having Grand Valley State University students participate in this project, as part of a larger sample.

We are conducting a survey of college students' perceptions of themselves and of authority roles in our society. We are interested in your opinion; this is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. The survey takes about 20 to 25 minutes to complete. The data that are gathered will be used for a dissertation. Results from the survey will better serve the needs of college students in the future.

Participation in this survey is strictly voluntary. Your name will not appear anywhere on this questionnaire, and there will no way we can identify you personally. Your anonymity is insured, and your answers will be held in the strictest confidence. In order for this survey to be of any value, it is important that you be honest in answering the questions. Remember: the only "RIGHT" answer is what YOU believe to be true.

Circle your response to each question directly on the questionnaire. Try to work quickly, without spending too much time on any one question. Answer the questions in order, and please answer all of them. If you have any questions, please ask.

We appreciate your willingness to participate in this survey.

Thank you.
College Student Questionnaire

Directions: For each question, please circle the number that represents your answer.

1. What is your sex?
   1. Female
   2. Male

2. To which ethnic group do you belong?
   1. Asian
   2. Black
   3. Caucasian
   4. Hispanic
   5. Other than those listed

3. How old are you?
   1. 17-18
   2. 19
   3. 20
   4. 21
   5. 22
   6. 23
   7. 24
   8. 25
   9. 26 or older

4. What is the approximate size of your home town?
   1. less than 10,000
   2. 10,000-19,999
   3. 20,000-49,999
   4. 50,000-99,999
   5. 100,000-199,999
   6. more than 200,000
5. When you were growing up, who was the principal wage earner in the family?

1. father
2. mother
3. father & mother equally
4. stepfather
5. foster father
6. stepmother
7. foster mother
8. other relative or relatives
9. other person or persons than those listed

IN QUESTION 6, please be as specific as possible. FOR EXAMPLE, write "public high school teacher" rather than "teacher." If this person is deceased, please write "deceased" and then his occupation. If this question does not apply to you, please leave blank.

6. What is or was your father's (stepfather's, foster father's, or male guardian's) occupation?

(Write in) __________________________________________

7. What is or was your father's (stepfather's, foster father's, or male guardian's) education?

1. graduate school or professional training (Ph.D., physician, lawyer, etc.)
2. four year college graduate
3. 1-3 years of college
4. high school graduate
5. 10-11 years of school
6. 7-9 years of school
7. less than 7 years of school
8. This question does not apply to me.
IN QUESTION 8, PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE. for example, write "public high school teacher" rather than "teacher." If this person is deceased, please write "deceased" and then her occupation. If this question does not apply to you, please leave blank.

8. What is or was your mother's (stepmother's, foster mother's, or female guardian's) occupation?

(Write in) ____________________________

9. What is or was your mother's (stepmother's, foster mother's, or female guardian's) education?

1. graduate school or professional training (Ph.D., physician, lawyer, etc.)

2. four year college graduate

3. 1-3 years of college

4. high school graduate

5. 10-11 years of school

6. 7-9 years of school

7. less than 7 years of school

8. This question does not apply to me.
Recent research indicates that nearly everyone has broken some rules or regulations during her or his lifetime. This next series of questions addresses this. Please circle the number that represents your answer. Begin each question with: Have you ever . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. broken into a house, store, school, or other building and taken money, stereo equipment, guns, or something else you wanted?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. taken things worth between $10 and $50 that didn't belong to you?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. beat someone up so badly they probably needed a doctor?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. taken things of large value (worth more than $50) that didn't belong to you?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. taken little things (worth less than $2) that didn't belong to you?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. broken the windows of an empty house or other unoccupied building?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. used a slug or fake money in a candy, coke, coin, or stamp machine?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. broken or helped break up chairs, tables, desks, or other furniture in a school, church, or other public building?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. bought or drunk beer, wine, or hard liquor while being underage?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. used hard drugs such as amphetamines, cocaine, LDS, heroin, etc.?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. skipped school without a legitimate excuse?</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These questions deal with your contact with the police under a variety of situations. Please circle the number that represents your answer. Begin the odd-number questions with in the past 12 months have you . . .

21. been stopped by the police for a traffic violation? ................................. 1. yes 2. no

22. If the answer to Q. 21 is yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times
   2. 3-4 times
   3. 5 or more times
   If the answer to Q. 21 is no, skip this question.

23. been "picked-up" by the police for questioning? 1. yes 2. no

24. If the answer to Q. 23 is yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times
   2. 3-4 times
   3. 5 or more times
   If the answer to Q. 23 is no, skip this question.

25. been arrested by the police? ................. 1. yes 2. no

26. If the answer to Q. 25 is yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times
   2. 3-4 times
   3. 5 or more times
   If the answer to Q. 25 is no, skip this question.
In the past 12 months, have you . . .

27. called the police as a result of being a victim of a crime? ................................. 1. yes 2. no

28. If the answer to Q. 27 is yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times
   2. 3-4 times
   3. 5 or more times
   If the answer to Q. 27 is no, skip this question.

29. called the police to report suspicious activity or as being a witness of a crime? ............ 1. yes 2. no

30. If the answer to Q. 29 is yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times
   2. 3-4 times
   3. 5 or more times
   If the answer to Q. 29 is no, skip this question.

31. called the police to ask assistance? ............ 1. yes 2. no

32. If the answer to Q. 31 is yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times
   2. 3-4 times
   3. 5 or more times
   If the answer to Q. 31 is no, skip this question.
These next statements concern your perceptions of yourself. Please circle the number that indicates your response to each statement.

1 means Strongly Agree  
2 means Agree  
3 means Disagree  
4 means Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least equal with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 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>35. 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>36. I am able to do things as well as most other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. 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>38. I take a positive attitude toward myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. 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>41. I certainly feel useless at times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. 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>
Everyone has beliefs or opinions about the police, and we are interested in yours. Please circle the number that best represents your opinion.

1 means Strongly Agree
2 means Agree
3 means Undecided
4 means Disagree
5 means Strongly Disagree

43. Police are generally concerned with protecting people and their property .................. 1 2 3 4 5
44. Police accuse people of things they didn't do ... 1 2 3 4 5
45. The police are stupid .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
46. The police really try to help people when they're in trouble .................. 1 2 3 4 5
47. Police only use force when they have to .......... 1 2 3 4 5
48. Without the police, there would be crime everywhere .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
49. The police are mean .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
50. People can rely on the police in times of distress .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
51. Police try to act like big shots ............... 1 2 3 4 5
52. The police enjoy picking on young people ..... 1 2 3 4 5
53. The police tend to create more problems than they solve .................. 1 2 3 4 5
54. Police are interested in doing their job well ... 1 2 3 4 5
55. Police are brave .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
56. Police don't give people a chance to explain .... 1 2 3 4 5
Now we would like to have you rate some authority roles according to how you see each of them. You will rate your mother, your father, teachers, and police on pairs of words that are opposite in meaning from one another. Please circle the number that best represents your opinion.

FOR EXAMPLE, IN QUESTION 57, if you see your mother as very good you would circle number 1; as slightly good, number 2; as neutral, number 3; as slightly bad, number 4; and as very bad, number 5.

**MY MOTHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>good</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>unselfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>selfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>unselfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>good</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>unselfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>successful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you very much for participating in this survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X10</th>
<th>X11</th>
<th>X12</th>
<th>X13</th>
<th>X14</th>
<th>X15</th>
<th>X16</th>
<th>X17</th>
<th>X18</th>
<th>X19</th>
<th>X20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>.0980</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>.3033</td>
<td>.3816</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>.1194</td>
<td>.3794</td>
<td>.0534</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X14</td>
<td>.2628</td>
<td>.3025</td>
<td>.2112</td>
<td>.2563</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15</td>
<td>.1353</td>
<td>.1755</td>
<td>.1176</td>
<td>.2005</td>
<td>.0716</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X16</td>
<td>.1495</td>
<td>.0763</td>
<td>.0880</td>
<td>.1904</td>
<td>.0308</td>
<td>.2618</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X17</td>
<td>-.0380</td>
<td>.1828</td>
<td>.0905</td>
<td>.0773</td>
<td>.1485</td>
<td>.1250</td>
<td>.1365</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X18</td>
<td>.1116</td>
<td>.2179</td>
<td>.1739</td>
<td>.2764</td>
<td>.1366</td>
<td>.0878</td>
<td>.1053</td>
<td>.0139</td>
<td>.1112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X19</td>
<td>.0027</td>
<td>.1495</td>
<td>.0498</td>
<td>.0993</td>
<td>.1148</td>
<td>.0867</td>
<td>.1454</td>
<td>.1097</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.1701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Intercorrelation Matrix for the Police Contact Scale; Questions 21-32 on Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X21</th>
<th>X22</th>
<th>X23</th>
<th>X24</th>
<th>X25</th>
<th>X26</th>
<th>X27</th>
<th>X28</th>
<th>X29</th>
<th>X30</th>
<th>X31</th>
<th>X32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8030</td>
<td>.1226</td>
<td>.1130</td>
<td>.1775</td>
<td>.1845</td>
<td>.0144</td>
<td>.0145</td>
<td>.0307</td>
<td>.0435</td>
<td>.1204</td>
<td>.1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X22</td>
<td>.8030</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2115</td>
<td>.2541</td>
<td>.3014</td>
<td>.3206</td>
<td>.0765</td>
<td>.0879</td>
<td>.0921</td>
<td>.1169</td>
<td>.1651</td>
<td>.1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X23</td>
<td>.1226</td>
<td>.2115</td>
<td></td>
<td>.7766</td>
<td>.2191</td>
<td>.2173</td>
<td>.1111</td>
<td>.1044</td>
<td>.1996</td>
<td>.1757</td>
<td>.1395</td>
<td>.1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X24</td>
<td>.1130</td>
<td>.2541</td>
<td>.7766</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2177</td>
<td>.2926</td>
<td>.0959</td>
<td>.1196</td>
<td>.1518</td>
<td>.1285</td>
<td>.0967</td>
<td>.1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X25</td>
<td>.1775</td>
<td>.3014</td>
<td>.2191</td>
<td>.2177</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8795</td>
<td>.0617</td>
<td>.0569</td>
<td>.0194</td>
<td>.0249</td>
<td>.0916</td>
<td>.0804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X26</td>
<td>.1845</td>
<td>.3206</td>
<td>.2173</td>
<td>.2926</td>
<td>.8795</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0595</td>
<td>.0550</td>
<td>.0026</td>
<td>.0050</td>
<td>.0780</td>
<td>.0700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X27</td>
<td>.0144</td>
<td>.0765</td>
<td>.1111</td>
<td>.0959</td>
<td>.0617</td>
<td>.0595</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3409</td>
<td>.3006</td>
<td>.3250</td>
<td>.3199</td>
<td>.3104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X28</td>
<td>.0145</td>
<td>.0879</td>
<td>.1044</td>
<td>.1196</td>
<td>.0569</td>
<td>.0550</td>
<td>.3409</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3550</td>
<td>.3250</td>
<td>.3170</td>
<td>.3145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X29</td>
<td>.0307</td>
<td>.0921</td>
<td>.1996</td>
<td>.1518</td>
<td>.0194</td>
<td>.0026</td>
<td>.3006</td>
<td>.3550</td>
<td></td>
<td>.9233</td>
<td>.3077</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X30</td>
<td>.0435</td>
<td>.1169</td>
<td>.1757</td>
<td>.1285</td>
<td>.0249</td>
<td>.0050</td>
<td>.3250</td>
<td>.3170</td>
<td>.9233</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3077</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X31</td>
<td>.1204</td>
<td>.1651</td>
<td>.1395</td>
<td>.0967</td>
<td>.0916</td>
<td>.0780</td>
<td>.3170</td>
<td>.3174</td>
<td>.3077</td>
<td>.3077</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X32</td>
<td>.1562</td>
<td>.1971</td>
<td>.1433</td>
<td>.1025</td>
<td>.0804</td>
<td>.0700</td>
<td>.3104</td>
<td>.3145</td>
<td>.3060</td>
<td>.3214</td>
<td>.8260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intercorrelation Matrix for Rosenberg's (1965) Self-Esteem Scale; Questions 33-42 on Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X33</th>
<th>X34</th>
<th>X35</th>
<th>X36</th>
<th>X37</th>
<th>X38</th>
<th>X39</th>
<th>X40</th>
<th>X41</th>
<th>X42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.7210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X34</td>
<td>.3795</td>
<td>.3948</td>
<td>.3795</td>
<td>.3548</td>
<td>.3615</td>
<td>.4353</td>
<td>.3800</td>
<td>.3160</td>
<td>.2933</td>
<td>.3275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X35</td>
<td>.4028</td>
<td>.2566</td>
<td>.3865</td>
<td>.2566</td>
<td>.2472</td>
<td>.3610</td>
<td>.3814</td>
<td>.2865</td>
<td>.2944</td>
<td>.3661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X36</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4177</td>
<td>.4309</td>
<td>.4029</td>
<td>.2943</td>
<td>.3715</td>
<td>.3254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2472</td>
<td>.2472</td>
<td>.2472</td>
<td>.2472</td>
<td>.2472</td>
<td>.2472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3610</td>
<td>.3814</td>
<td>.2865</td>
<td>.3715</td>
<td>.4254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4210</td>
<td>.4210</td>
<td>.4210</td>
<td>.4210</td>
<td>.4210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3610</td>
<td>.2865</td>
<td>.3715</td>
<td>.3254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3610</td>
<td>.2865</td>
<td>.3254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3254</td>
<td>.3661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intercorrelation Matrix for Fortune's (1965) Attitude Towards Police Scale; Questions 43-56 on Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X43</th>
<th>X44</th>
<th>X45</th>
<th>X46</th>
<th>X47</th>
<th>X48</th>
<th>X49</th>
<th>X50</th>
<th>X51</th>
<th>X52</th>
<th>X53</th>
<th>X54</th>
<th>X55</th>
<th>X56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X43</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X44</td>
<td>.3644</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X45</td>
<td>.5079</td>
<td>.3724</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X46</td>
<td>.4657</td>
<td>.3357</td>
<td>.4131</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X47</td>
<td>.3408</td>
<td>.3878</td>
<td>.3039</td>
<td>.3760</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X48</td>
<td>.2463</td>
<td>.1822</td>
<td>.2488</td>
<td>.2611</td>
<td>.1807</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X49</td>
<td>.4283</td>
<td>.3116</td>
<td>.2171</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X50</td>
<td>.4837</td>
<td>.5402</td>
<td>.3116</td>
<td>.2171</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X51</td>
<td>.3593</td>
<td>.4114</td>
<td>.3572</td>
<td>.2926</td>
<td>.4263</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X52</td>
<td>.4016</td>
<td>.3014</td>
<td>.3290</td>
<td>.1656</td>
<td>.4650</td>
<td>.2862</td>
<td>.5154</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X53</td>
<td>.4042</td>
<td>.4909</td>
<td>.3700</td>
<td>.3347</td>
<td>.3241</td>
<td>.4329</td>
<td>.3830</td>
<td>.4728</td>
<td>.5483</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X54</td>
<td>.4709</td>
<td>.4453</td>
<td>.5147</td>
<td>.2934</td>
<td>.2340</td>
<td>.3854</td>
<td>.4536</td>
<td>.3388</td>
<td>.3210</td>
<td>.4202</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X55</td>
<td>.3354</td>
<td>.2329</td>
<td>.3842</td>
<td>.3645</td>
<td>.1994</td>
<td>.2340</td>
<td>.2627</td>
<td>.3226</td>
<td>.2156</td>
<td>.2323</td>
<td>.2798</td>
<td>.4774</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X56</td>
<td>.3302</td>
<td>.4150</td>
<td>.4144</td>
<td>.3522</td>
<td>.3608</td>
<td>.1485</td>
<td>.3574</td>
<td>.3435</td>
<td>.3972</td>
<td>.4631</td>
<td>.4788</td>
<td>.4156</td>
<td>.3288</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intercorrelation Matrix for Attitude towards Mother Scale (Johnson et al., 1981);
Questions 57-66 on Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X57</th>
<th>X58</th>
<th>X59</th>
<th>X60</th>
<th>X61</th>
<th>X62</th>
<th>X63</th>
<th>X64</th>
<th>X65</th>
<th>X66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X57</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X58</td>
<td>.3200</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X59</td>
<td>.5315</td>
<td>.3660</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X60</td>
<td>.4457</td>
<td>.3544</td>
<td>.3729</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X61</td>
<td>.2909</td>
<td>.1629</td>
<td>.2967</td>
<td>.2304</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X62</td>
<td>.4430</td>
<td>.1629</td>
<td>.3665</td>
<td>.3718</td>
<td>.6039</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X63</td>
<td>.3900</td>
<td>.3856</td>
<td>.3761</td>
<td>.3922</td>
<td>.2589</td>
<td>.3471</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X64</td>
<td>.4479</td>
<td>.1992</td>
<td>.2560</td>
<td>.2926</td>
<td>.1071</td>
<td>.2805</td>
<td>.3606</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X65</td>
<td>.5675</td>
<td>.2241</td>
<td>.4212</td>
<td>.3857</td>
<td>.1682</td>
<td>.3917</td>
<td>.3821</td>
<td>.7330</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X66</td>
<td>.3013</td>
<td>.2077</td>
<td>.2600</td>
<td>.2795</td>
<td>.4232</td>
<td>.5301</td>
<td>.2729</td>
<td>.3361</td>
<td>.3766</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intercorrelation Matrix for Attitude towards Father Scale (Johnson et al., 1981);
Questions 67-76 on Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X67</th>
<th>X68</th>
<th>X69</th>
<th>X70</th>
<th>X71</th>
<th>X72</th>
<th>X73</th>
<th>X74</th>
<th>X75</th>
<th>X76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X67</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X68</td>
<td>.4976</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X69</td>
<td>.5674</td>
<td>.4223</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X70</td>
<td>.5011</td>
<td>.3253</td>
<td>.4526</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X71</td>
<td>.5426</td>
<td>.2835</td>
<td>.5038</td>
<td>.5560</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X72</td>
<td>.6101</td>
<td>.4296</td>
<td>.5468</td>
<td>.4014</td>
<td>.3616</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X73</td>
<td>.6150</td>
<td>.4404</td>
<td>.5698</td>
<td>.5026</td>
<td>.5765</td>
<td>.4809</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X74</td>
<td>.6454</td>
<td>.4247</td>
<td>.3448</td>
<td>.3861</td>
<td>.3921</td>
<td>.5230</td>
<td>.4710</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X75</td>
<td>.6429</td>
<td>.3751</td>
<td>.3360</td>
<td>.4092</td>
<td>.4315</td>
<td>.5081</td>
<td>.5083</td>
<td>.8416</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X76</td>
<td>.4463</td>
<td>.2999</td>
<td>.3868</td>
<td>.4305</td>
<td>.5723</td>
<td>.3012</td>
<td>.5063</td>
<td>.4187</td>
<td>.4149</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intercorrelation Matrix for Attitude towards Teachers Scale (Johnson et al., 1981); Questions 77-86 on Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X77</th>
<th>X78</th>
<th>X79</th>
<th>X80</th>
<th>X81</th>
<th>X82</th>
<th>X83</th>
<th>X84</th>
<th>X85</th>
<th>X86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X77</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X78</td>
<td>.4885</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X79</td>
<td>.4282</td>
<td>.4510</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X80</td>
<td>.1875</td>
<td>.1791</td>
<td>.2715</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X81</td>
<td>.2260</td>
<td>.2137</td>
<td>.2901</td>
<td>.4141</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X82</td>
<td>.3608</td>
<td>.3066</td>
<td>.4750</td>
<td>.4169</td>
<td>.5704</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X83</td>
<td>.2656</td>
<td>.2149</td>
<td>.3042</td>
<td>.3491</td>
<td>.4332</td>
<td>.5283</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X84</td>
<td>.3446</td>
<td>.2141</td>
<td>.2204</td>
<td>.2159</td>
<td>.3008</td>
<td>.3203</td>
<td>.2602</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X85</td>
<td>.4376</td>
<td>.3033</td>
<td>.2914</td>
<td>.1970</td>
<td>.2968</td>
<td>.3711</td>
<td>.2583</td>
<td>.6701</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X86</td>
<td>.3225</td>
<td>.2111</td>
<td>.2605</td>
<td>.1695</td>
<td>.2927</td>
<td>.2922</td>
<td>.2794</td>
<td>.3149</td>
<td>.4429</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intercorrelation Matrix for Attitude towards Police Scale (Johnson et al., 1981); Questions 87-96 on Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X87</th>
<th>X88</th>
<th>X89</th>
<th>X90</th>
<th>X91</th>
<th>X92</th>
<th>X93</th>
<th>X94</th>
<th>X95</th>
<th>X96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X87</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X88</td>
<td>.3222</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X89</td>
<td>.5400</td>
<td>.3159</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X90</td>
<td>.5056</td>
<td>.2920</td>
<td>.4555</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X91</td>
<td>.3848</td>
<td>.3204</td>
<td>.3497</td>
<td>.3477</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X92</td>
<td>.5242</td>
<td>.3243</td>
<td>.6337</td>
<td>.4724</td>
<td>.4049</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X93</td>
<td>.3900</td>
<td>.3396</td>
<td>.4941</td>
<td>.3798</td>
<td>.5212</td>
<td>.4637</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X94</td>
<td>.3818</td>
<td>.2895</td>
<td>.2933</td>
<td>.2652</td>
<td>.4121</td>
<td>.3036</td>
<td>.3709</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X95</td>
<td>.5835</td>
<td>.2080</td>
<td>.3758</td>
<td>.3934</td>
<td>.3005</td>
<td>.3893</td>
<td>.2825</td>
<td>.5311</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X96</td>
<td>.5635</td>
<td>.2933</td>
<td>.4024</td>
<td>.4061</td>
<td>.3350</td>
<td>.4537</td>
<td>.3162</td>
<td>.3933</td>
<td>.6571</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Intercorrelation Matrix for Fortune's (1965) Attitude towards Police Scale (Questions 43-56 on Survey) and Attitude towards Police Scale [(Johnson et al., 1981) Questions 87-96 on Survey] Combined

#### Johnson et al. Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X87</th>
<th>X88</th>
<th>X89</th>
<th>X90</th>
<th>X91</th>
<th>X92</th>
<th>X93</th>
<th>X94</th>
<th>X95</th>
<th>X96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fortune Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X43</td>
<td>.3869</td>
<td>.3043</td>
<td>.3694</td>
<td>.3313</td>
<td>.3382</td>
<td>.3866</td>
<td>.4466</td>
<td>.3589</td>
<td>.2379</td>
<td>.3038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X44</td>
<td>.2877</td>
<td>.2519</td>
<td>.2805</td>
<td>.2401</td>
<td>.2972</td>
<td>.3055</td>
<td>.3555</td>
<td>.2523</td>
<td>.1832</td>
<td>.2104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X45</td>
<td>.3654</td>
<td>.2630</td>
<td>.4173</td>
<td>.3065</td>
<td>.3179</td>
<td>.3787</td>
<td>.4591</td>
<td>.3782</td>
<td>.2573</td>
<td>.2652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X46</td>
<td>.3430</td>
<td>.2632</td>
<td>.2918</td>
<td>.1896</td>
<td>.3559</td>
<td>.2890</td>
<td>.3798</td>
<td>.3117</td>
<td>.2793</td>
<td>.3140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X47</td>
<td>.3276</td>
<td>.3314</td>
<td>.3568</td>
<td>.2056</td>
<td>.3442</td>
<td>.3546</td>
<td>.3486</td>
<td>.1887</td>
<td>.1932</td>
<td>.3067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X48</td>
<td>.1690</td>
<td>.1948</td>
<td>.1843</td>
<td>.0971</td>
<td>.2015</td>
<td>.1439</td>
<td>.1673</td>
<td>.3405</td>
<td>.2575</td>
<td>.2366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X49</td>
<td>.4031</td>
<td>.3135</td>
<td>.4695</td>
<td>.3688</td>
<td>.3533</td>
<td>.5141</td>
<td>.4412</td>
<td>.3089</td>
<td>.2737</td>
<td>.2737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X50</td>
<td>.3633</td>
<td>.2761</td>
<td>.3803</td>
<td>.3057</td>
<td>.3072</td>
<td>.3835</td>
<td>.3742</td>
<td>.2969</td>
<td>.2861</td>
<td>.3002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X51</td>
<td>.3807</td>
<td>.3215</td>
<td>.4107</td>
<td>.3655</td>
<td>.3476</td>
<td>.4045</td>
<td>.4125</td>
<td>.2617</td>
<td>.2168</td>
<td>.2566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X52</td>
<td>.3087</td>
<td>.2644</td>
<td>.3678</td>
<td>.2820</td>
<td>.3285</td>
<td>.3996</td>
<td>.3853</td>
<td>.2520</td>
<td>.1816</td>
<td>.1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X53</td>
<td>.3523</td>
<td>.2581</td>
<td>.3594</td>
<td>.3275</td>
<td>.3425</td>
<td>.3320</td>
<td>.3518</td>
<td>.3797</td>
<td>.2924</td>
<td>.2725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X54</td>
<td>.2989</td>
<td>.2520</td>
<td>.3375</td>
<td>.2279</td>
<td>.3774</td>
<td>.3196</td>
<td>.4152</td>
<td>.3234</td>
<td>.2555</td>
<td>.2967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X56</td>
<td>.2958</td>
<td>.2900</td>
<td>.3823</td>
<td>.2534</td>
<td>.3113</td>
<td>.3831</td>
<td>.4571</td>
<td>.2691</td>
<td>.2260</td>
<td>.2881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: MEASUREMENT SCALES

Self-Report Delinquency Scale (Shortened)
(Hindelang et al. 1981)

Have you ever ...

Serious Crime Index

1. broken into a house, store, school or other building and taken money, stereo equipment, guns, or something else you wanted?
   1. yes 2. no

2. taken things worth between $10 and $50 that didn't belong to you?
   1. yes 2. no

3. beat someone up so badly they probably needed a doctor?
   1. yes 2. no

4. taken things of large value (worth more than $50) that didn't belong to you?
   1. yes 2. no

Delinquency Index

5. taken little things (worth less than $2) that didn't belong to you?
   1. yes 2. no

6. broken the windows of an empty house or other unoccupied building?
   1. yes 2. no

7. used a slug or fake money in a candy, coke, coin, or stamp machine?
   1. yes 2. no

8. broken or helped break up chairs, tables, desks, or other furniture in a school, church, or other public building?
   1. yes 2. no
Drug Index

9. bought or drunk beer, wine, or hard liquor while being underage?
   1. yes 2. no

10. used hard drugs such as amphetamines, cocaine, LSD, heroin, etc.?
    1. yes 2. no

School and Family Index

11. skipped school without a legitimate excuse?
    1. yes 2. no

Wording stated exactly as in the original on items 1, 3, 6, and 7.
Wording modified from the original on items 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11.
Police Contact Scale

Police-Initiated Contact

1. In the past 12 months, have you been stopped by the police for a traffic violation?
   1. yes 2. no

   If yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times 2. 3-4 times 3. 5 or more times

2. In the past 12 months, have you been "picked-up" by the police for questioning?
   1. yes 2. no

   If yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times 2. 3-4 times 3. 5 or more times

3. In the past 12 months, have you been arrested by the police?
   1. yes 2. no

   If yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times 2. 3-4 times 3. 5 or more times

Citizen-Initiated Contact

4. In the past 12 months, have you called the police as a result of being a victim of a crime?
   1. yes 2. no

   If yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times 2. 3-4 times 3. 5 or more times

5. In the past 12 months, have you called the police to report suspicious activity or as being a witness of a crime?
   1. yes 2. no

   If yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times 2. 3-4 times 3. 5 or more times

6. In the past 12 months, have you called the police to ask for assistance?
   1. yes 2. no

   If yes, how many times?
   1. 1-2 times 2. 3-4 times 3. 5 or more times
Self-esteem Scale
(Rosenberg 1965)

1 means Strongly Agree
2 means Agree
3 means Disagree
4 means Strongly Disagree

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least equal with others.
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. At times I think I am no good at all.
Attitude Towards Police Scale—Revised
(Fortune 1965)

1 means Strongly Agree
2 means Agree
3 means Undecided
4 means Disagree
5 means Strongly Disagree

1. Police are generally concerned with protecting people and their property. (Amoroso & Ware 1981)
2. Police accuse you of things you didn't do.
3. The police are stupid.
4. The police really try to help you when you're in trouble.
5. Police only use force when they have to. (Murray & Thompson 1985)
6. Without the police, there would be crime everywhere.
7. The police are mean.
8. You can rely on the police in times of distress.
9. Police try to act like big shots.
10. The police enjoy picking on young people. (similar to Amoroso & Ware 1981)
11. The police tend to create more problems than they solve. (similar to Amoroso & Ware 1981)
12. Police are interested in doing their job well. (Amoroso & Ware 1981)
13. Police are brave.
14. Police don't give you a chance to explain.

Wording stated exactly as in the original on items 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9.
Wording slightly changed from the original on items 6, 13, and 14.
Wording changed from the original on items 1, 5, 10, 11, and 12.
### Attitude Towards Authority Figures
(Johnson et al. 1981)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altruistic</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimistic</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egoistic</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>