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CHAPTER ONE  INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The long range goal of this research is to develop more efficient models for the prediction of delinquency, school dropout and underachievement in school performance. The perspective from which this problem will be approached is social-psychological, rather than strictly sociological, in that our emphasis is not simply upon the conditions of social organization which affect the actions of individuals but, in addition, our research data will focus upon the patterned responses of individuals which are produced through the impact of social organization. In short, we are interested in "those predictable regularities in human behavior which have social connotations" (Ullman, 1965, p. 2).

The features of social organization under theoretical investigation in this research are primarily those of goal aspirations and socio-economic opportunities as these are established by social organizations such as families, junior high schools, places of employment, labor unions and the media of mass communication. We are not so much interested in the causes of particular kinds of goal aspiration, as we are in their measurement and consequences.
The Character of the Social-Psychological Approach

The sociological and the social-psychological approaches may now be illustrated in a way pertinent to our research problem. From the standpoint of social organization we might find that the character of "mass society" in the United States is such that every socio-economic class is subjected to a common form of mass communication. Since in the United States these stimuli are thought to induce high material aspirations in the recipients, the problem arises that lower class persons, in general, aspire to the same levels of material affluence as do their more privileged counterparts in the middle and upper classes. These organizational conditions are thought by some to generate high levels of frustration in the lower strata of U.S. society. The study of the impact which these pressures of social organization have upon individuals and their actions may be thought of as a study of social psychology.

From the standpoint of social psychology it might be valuable to focus upon those characteristics of the agents to which the stimuli are directed in an effort to discover why some persons receive the stimulus and develop high aspirations while others do not. Furthermore, the social psychological inquiry might continue on to try to determine why frustration generates pressures in some persons to engage in anti-social behavior while in others the behavioral
response is one of significant achievement through conventional channels. In attempting to explain some of the differences in individual response patterns to common stimuli it is helpful to investigate the qualities of individuals. All of these emphases employ the social-psychological approach.

Objectives

The general goal of this research, then, is to utilize the social-psychological approach to develop more efficient models for the prediction of adolescent anti-social behavior, and in particular, those behavioral forms associated with delinquency, school dropout and school underachievement. More specifically, the theoretical objectives for this study are: (a) to test a series of hypotheses concerning the relationship between anomie (discrepancies between goal aspirations and socio-economic opportunities) and adolescent anti-social behavior, (b) to ascertain whether goal blockage, as perceived by the adolescent respondent, is significantly associated with anti-social behavior and (c) to discover whether alienative feelings toward law-enforcement institutions are significantly associated with the dependent variables of anti-social behavior.

The methodological objectives are: (a) to see whether the independent variables operate singly or in combination
to produce a high association with the dependent variables, (b) to discover whether information about goal aspirations can be elicited from very young adolescents through a closed questionnaire format in such a way as to provide accurate predictions for future behavior, (c) to see whether under-achievement in school work, normally measured by means of standardized tests, can also be validly measured by means of grades which have been given in classes which have been divided into ability tracks.

Outline of Presentation

Our research report will take the following form. Following this chapter of introduction, the author will define, in Chapter Two, the concepts to be used in the study beginning with the dependent variables followed by the independent variables. Each of these concepts will be developed at two levels of abstraction, the general and the sub-general. Throughout this discussion of concepts an attempt will be made to cite the research pertinent to each concept.

Once the concepts have been defined nominally at the two levels of abstraction it will be necessary to organize the concepts into hypotheses or statements as to the character of the relationship between two or more variables. These hypotheses will also be developed at both the general and sub-general levels of abstraction.
Once the hypotheses have been formulated at the general and sub-general levels an attempt will be made to link together the various hypotheses in an attempt to develop a multifaceted theory. A theory consists of a set of logically related hypotheses, or statements about the relationships between variables, which are thought to occur in certain specified contexts. The theory of the development of anti-social behavior in adolescents will be expressed in three stages. Stage One will examine the relationship between aspiration-opportunity discrepancies and the several types of anti-social behavior, Stage Two will focus upon the relationship between perceived blockage and anti-social behavior and Stage Three will attempt to discern the relationship of law-enforcement-alienation and anti-social behavior.

While Chapter Two is concerned with the development of theoretical tools, Chapter Three deals with the problem of measurement and the subject of methods in general. The discussion of measurement will begin with the empirical or "operational" definitions of the theoretical variables discussed earlier followed by a statement as to the distribution of the variables among our sample respondents. These empirical definitions will then be joined into hypotheses in a manner parallel to the more abstract hypotheses discussed earlier. The result will be that the theoretical statements about relationships will be stated in operational
or observable form and thus will be ready for empirical testing procedures. The empirical hypothesis is the statement of the relationship of those aspects of reality which are thought to be lower level illustrations of the general and sub-general hypothesis.

Before proceeding to the empirical test of the hypothesis it will be necessary to state the statistical character of the relationship which is anticipated. It is necessary to specify, at that point, the kind of statistical differences which will serve to validate or invalidate the hypothesized relationship. At appropriate times we will specify the statistical test which is being used and the level of significance which will enable us to reach conclusions about the existence of or strength of the hypothesized relationship.

When the theory and measurement portions of this document are taken together it will be seen that the hypothesized relationships between variables have been discussed at four levels: the general, the sub-general, the empirical and the statistical.

At the completion of the measurement considerations the discussion will center upon the questions of sampling and of the populations from which the study samples have been taken. An attempt will be made to specify the sub-groups in the total population of which the samples are
thought to be reasonably representative.

In Chapter Four the findings of the research will be presented in terms of the three stages of the research plan. Within each stage the hypothesis will be presented in summary fashion in terms of the four levels discussed above. Following the statement of the hypotheses the findings will be presented. The distribution of the data will be found in Appendix A.

Chapter Five will be given over to a statement of the conclusions generated by the findings. In the context of the discussion of the conclusions it will be necessary to specify the theoretical and methodological limitations which will limit the validity and reliability of the findings. For those findings which seem sustained an attempt will be made to envision their broadest implications, that is, to place the findings in their most generalizable form. Finally, avenues for further research will be discussed.

Chapter Six will consist entirely of a summary of what has been done in earlier chapters. No new information will be introduced at that point.
CHAPTER TWO THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the concepts utilized in the theoretical development of the research problem. As indicated earlier it is necessary to specify two levels of conceptual development, the general and the sub-general. We will begin with an examination of the dependent variables followed by an assessment of the independent variables. Before proceeding, however, it seems valuable to give a brief overview of the theoretical framework which guides the research task.

Concept Development

(General and Sub-General Levels)

In the most general sense, the author is interested in explaining the occurrence of anti-social behavior in adolescents. Thus, anti-social behavior, in the forms of delinquency, dropout and underachievement will be cast as the dependent variable.¹ The first independent variable will be that of anomie as developed by Robert Merton. By anomie I mean those feelings of normlessness induced in an actor

¹Technically, the data does not lend itself readily to a discussion of causality and the use of independent (causing) and dependent (caused) variables. On the basis of associational measures and partialling tactics I will attempt to move toward causal inferences.
by the discrepancies between the goal aspirations and socio-economic opportunities with which he is confronted.¹ The focus is futuristic in that we are asking young adolescents to think about the kinds of goals they eventually desire and then to assess subjectively the likelihood that those goal aspirations can be realized. In addition the author will make an objective assessment regarding the respondents likelihood of success in their aspirations.

Dependent variables

Anti-social behavior At the most general level, the dependent variable under consideration in this research project is that of anti-social behavior. Anti-social behavior is that which violates the legal and moral norms of a society or specified sub-groups within it. Societies have a strong interest in the anti-social behavior of their adolescents in that anti-social behavior, if not condemned, (a) raises questions as to the legitimacy of established patterns, (b) may prevent other persons from a normal realization of their goals and (c) raises questions as to whether the following generation of adult citizens can be counted

¹At a more general level Merton described an "anomic" society as a society which did not maintain a high degree of integration between cultural goals and socially structured means (Merton, 1957, p. 134-135).
upon to continue the dominant societal emphases of the preceding generation.

It seems clear that a sociological concern with anti-social behavior can serve to illuminate possible solutions to this problem both in terms of how adolescents can be more effectively socialized and perhaps controlled and in terms of how the cultural themes and organizational patterns can be more flexibly related to the needs of youth. That is, the study of adolescent behavior of an anti-social character does not presuppose that the sociologist is exclusively preoccupied either with the maintenance of established societal patterns or the introduction of new ones.

**Juvenile delinquency** Of the three sub-general concepts examined in this discussion of anti-social behavior (delinquency, dropout and underachievement), sociologists have been most actively engaged in the study of juvenile delinquency. Despite the widespread use of this concept there remains a good deal of disagreement as to the most helpful definition of the delinquent. The goal would be to define the term in such a way so as to make meaningful sociological distinctions and yet maintain a closeness to the public understanding of the term. Legally a delinquent is one who habitually behaves in such a way so as to be a danger to himself or others (State of California, Welfare and Institutions Code, 1965, p. 35). This view is under
attack by those who would claim that adolescents are branded as deviant for performing acts for which an adult would not be charged. Many criticisms become muted when it can be established that the delinquency label is intended to be a diagnostic device rather than an intentionally punitive response by society. Much agreement exists, then, for the idea that potentially troublesome cases ought to be identified and treated.

The difficulty arises when it becomes clear that many adolescents engage in a wide variety of troublesome anti-social acts and are not apprehended by police and juvenile court authorities. A growing literature on "reported delinquency" suggests that delinquent acts known to the court constitute only a small proportion of those in the total delinquent act population (Short and Nye, 1957, p. 207-213). However, as I shall argue later this fact does not mean that juvenile court records are without meaning as a measure of juvenile delinquency.

School dropout Matters of definition are equally complex when we turn to the dependent variable of school dropout. While a recent publication has named the school dropout problem as "America's Major Educational Problem" (Schreiber, 1967, p. 1), an investigation into the dropout literature reveals a wide range of opinion as to how the concept should be defined.
How one defines the dropout depends a good deal on what one thinks can and should be done about the problem. If one views the problem in its broadest sense and expects that every child ought to be enabled to complete high school at about age 17 or 18 then it is useful to employ the definition which suggests that dropouts consist of all those young people in a given age, say 17, who fail to graduate from high school. The following figures (Table 1) from the Digest of Educational Statistics (Greene, 1966) illustrate this approach to the definitional problem.

Table 1. Percentage of students graduating from high school—1940 through 1964 (for four year intervals computed from the base of all youth at age 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Greene states that percentages of high school completion as shown here must be regarded as abnormally low since many youth who graduate at 18 would be regarded herein a dropout. This table is shown here as an illustration of an approach to the defining of the dropout and these estimates, while probably the best available, are not presented as being completely accurate (Greene, 1966, p. 4).
While such figures as these show graduation rates increasing and thus dropout rates decreasing, the most recent figures do reveal that almost one-fourth of those adolescents potentially "graduateable" do not graduate. Such a figure would include all dropouts—those who are mentally incapable of learning, those forced out by unfortunate family circumstance and school repression, as well as those dropping out by volition. When one uses such figures as those given above to illustrate the problem, the assumption is made that society can and should find the means to graduate all students "on time." More realistically, it seems likely that mental incapability, necessary school regulations and to some extent family pressures will continue to be operative as causal factors in school dropout for the foreseeable future. A more manageable problem and a more homogenous population would result from a more circumscribed definition of the school dropout as the "capable dropout;" the student who leaves school for reasons other than low ability, school disciplinary measures, family pressures or other non-volitional forces.

Elliott, Voss and Wendling describe the adolescent "capable dropout" in the following way.

The key to identifying the capable dropout is his adequate reading ability and I.Q. His grades may, in fact, be primarily D's and F's. In such cases, the capable dropout is "flunking" for reasons connected with citizenship, lack of
attendance or truancy, or the fact that he is a behavioral problem in school. His response to the school situation may indicate a lack of motivation, but he is not failing because he lacks ability for academic pursuits. When he does his work it is not F work, his major difficulty is that he does not do his required work (Elliott et al., 1966, p. 810).

While the dropout rate has substantially declined (though the total number of dropouts has remained fairly stable), there seems to be general agreement on the fact that the dropouts which do exist do constitute far more of a social problem today than ever before.

Greene argues that dropouts are more of a problem today for the following reasons:

1. Although the proportion of dropouts is decreasing the number of dropouts has slightly increased.
2. Our present and developing economy requires a greater degree of skill than was previously required of our labor force.
3. The age at which a person enters the labor force today is rising.
4. Too great an experience of frustration and failure deprives the student of the incentive to succeed.
5. The dropout may become a candidate for every program of social welfare throughout his life.
6. There are few places in our society for the dropout.
7. The dropout represents a major educational and social failure (Greene, 1966, p. 2).

A few of these factors warrant further consideration at this time.

Because of the slight increase in the dropout number in recent years Greene points out that the cumulative dropout
total for the 1960-70 decade is likely to number 7.5 million (Greene, 1966, p. 5).

Substantial agreement exists in the literature that the most critical problem of the dropouts is that there are increasingly fewer jobs available to them. Our expanding technology enables us, each year, to produce more goods with fewer workers and it is particularly the unskilled or semi-skilled positions which are declining. It is estimated that between 1965 and 1970 the number of unskilled jobs has been cut in half. During the decade between 1950 and 1960 we experienced a 50 percent increase in manufactured goods with no increase in the production force of workers (Greene, 1966, p. 8).

Finally, the frustration and failure mentioned in Greene's list are, of course, the main problems under investigation in this entire work. This study hopes to test the hypothesis that experiences of failure and frustration in school constitute a prime reason for school underachievement and dropout.

Dentler and Warshauer, who attempt to minimize the importance of the dropout problem per se, argue that it is simply one aspect of the larger and more significant problem of how to assimilate school graduates into meaningful occupational positions. They point out that it is the positions requiring college training which are opening up for which
most young high school graduates, not to mention dropouts, do not qualify. Particularly bothersome is the minority group question. Dentier and Warshauer point out that while 12 percent of Caucasian dropouts are unemployed, the comparable figure of Negro graduates is 18 percent (Dentier and Warshauer, 1965, pp. 8-9).

Finally, a good deal of the public alarm about school dropouts rests in the fear that not only will they fail to find constructive economic activity, but that they very likely will become involved in destructive, anti-social activity. It is not uncommon for the public to view the dropout as synonomous with the delinquent. It is commonly thought that there is a close connection between the two, given the fact that both dropout and delinquent represent adolescent failure to adjust to conventional expectations. However, the problem of correlating the two behaviors suffers from the fact that known delinquents presumably constitute only a small percentage of the total delinquent population. The fact that many delinquents are also dropouts may mean little more than that children unaffiliated with a school are handled more harshly by police officials than are adolescents who have stable school records.

Greene is probably right when he suggests that delinquency does not characterize more than 10 percent of the dropout population—a delinquency figure about twice as high
as that of the normal adolescent population (Greene, 1966, p. 9). Delbert Elliott suggests that delinquency and school dropout constitute largely independent solutions to a situation of perceived goal blockage (Elliott, 1966). This theory will be discussed in detail in the section dealing with hypotheses of school dropout behavior.

School underachievement The final sub-concept under the general classification of anti-social behavior is that of underachievement in school work. Of the three types of anti-social behavior being investigated in this study, underachievement is easily the least developed concept. Underachievement is normally discussed as a pupil's level of performance which is substantially beneath the performance level of which the child is capable. In this sense underachievement is the wasted potential of the pupil. There is no common agreement as to how consistently a child must achieve beneath his potential in order to warrant the term "underachiever," nor is there a consensus on how much a child's performance must be at variance with his potential to warrant such a classification. It is clear, however, that society should encourage pupils to maximize their abilities if society is to maximize the return for its educational expenditures and develop leadership for the future.

Whether we focus upon students with the greatest disparity between I.Q. tests and achievement or upon the
students who make the lowest grades in identifiable school tracks, it is clear that we are using the same kind of relativistic criteria as that which was stated in our definition of the capable dropout. Both with respect to the dropout and the underachiever we are interested in behavior in relation to potential. Just as our discussion of the school dropout focuses upon the capable dropout, so also our investigation of the underachiever ought also focus upon the relationship of the achievement level to the level of potential.

Independent variables

The independent variables under consideration in this research are anomie, perceived goal blockage and alienation toward the institutions of law enforcement.

Anomie The prime independent variable in this research plan is "anomie." Originally developed by Emile Durkheim (Durkheim, 1933), the term referred to the breakdown of the body of common rules which regulated the relationships among the elements of the social system. Durkheim believed that rapid social change, particularly changes brought on by an expanding division of labor, caused a growing uncertainty among the people of a society as to the appropriate rules by which to govern their social action.

Durkheim applied the concept of anomie to his studies
of suicide and concluded that rapid changes in social aspirations, such as in goal aspirations, were instrumental in causing a type of suicide which he called "anomic."

It would seem that Robert Merton borrowed more heavily from the conception of anomie in *Suicide* (Durkheim, 1951) than that found in Durkheim's earlier work in *The Division of Labor* (Durkheim, 1933). In *Suicide*, Durkheim indicated that anomie was caused by rapid change which substantially lowered or raised one's level of aspiration, while Merton views the anomic situation of the lower classes as having been generated out of a combination of high aspirations and limited socio-economic opportunities. Regarding this Cohen has stated:

> This disjunction between goals and means, and the consequent strain, leads to a weakening of men's commitment to the culturally prescribed goals or institutionalized means—that is, to a state of anomie (Cohen, 1966, p. 76).

Sub-general concepts, then, include culturally-prescribed goals and institutionalized means. By culturally-prescribed goals I mean those goals which society specifies as being important to attain. In our own society the acquisition and display of material goods would be one such goal as would a college education for most persons. By institutionalized means is meant those channels of opportunity that society regards as legitimate methods by which goal attainment can be brought about.
**Goal aspirations**

Within the conceptual category of "culturally-prescribed goals" we may delineate the lower level concept "goal aspirations." By this we mean that one class of goals concerns future aspirations held by an actor. Presumably other goals are more immediate and less future-oriented. Generally speaking, adolescent aspirations may be placed on a continuum ranging from responses which are highly "success" oriented to those which reflect adolescent contentment with modest goals.

The basic assumption which guides this entire research project is that adolescents generally, and lower class adolescents in particular, are taught to place high evaluations on material success (i.e. high incomes) which generally means that they "ought" also place high value on educational and occupational success. If this is the case, and if it is also true as research suggests that lower class youth do not achieve at the levels of the more advantaged youth, it would seem likely that a good deal of frustration is generated in this population. I turn now to an investigation of the assumption that high levels of aspiration exist among adolescents generally.

**Educational goal aspirations**

In 1953 Professor Hyman published his important work dealing with the value systems of the different social classes in the United States. His general conclusion was that lower class
youth, on every class differentiation scheme, value a college education less than do youth from higher classes. Even so, 42 percent of the lower class youth recommended college training in response to the question "How much schooling do you think most young men need these days to get along well in the world?" It is reasonable to assume that the increased proliferation of middle class goal orientations through mass media since that time has served to increase this percentage. Miller (1957), Cohen and Hodges (1963) and Deutsch (1963) have all documented the fact that lower class youth tend to have unrealistically high aspirations but lower expectations for success than their middle class counterparts.

Clearly, the seminal work in this field is Equality of Educational Opportunity by Coleman et al. (1965). In this monumental study, a cross section of youth in the United States was examined with the main emphasis on the various levels of achievement and their causal factors. Negroes, Indians, Orientals and Puerto Ricans were given special consideration, each being contrasted with equivalent findings from a survey of Caucasian youth. This national survey, conducted in September and October of 1965, involved 645,000 pupils from 4,000 schools. All teachers, principals, and district superintendents in these schools participated as did all pupils in the 3rd, 6th, 9th and 12th grades. The responses made by the youth to questions concerning
educational opportunity (pp. 275-290) are the materials most pertinent to our problem here, although the material on school dropouts (pp. 446-460) is also helpful.

When asked, "If something happened and you had to stop school now, how would you feel?", nearly half (45 percent) of the twelfth grade students answered that they would do almost anything to stay in school. All groups were similar in this, but Negroes and Caucasians were slightly higher than the others, and only Puerto Ricans indicated in any number (15.9 percent) that they would like to quit school. There is little regional variation, except that for Negroes and Caucasians (both in and outside metropolitan areas) the motivation to stay in school is slightly higher in the South and Southwest than in the North and West.

In answering whether they wanted to be good students, a higher proportion of Negroes than any other group--over half--said they wanted to be one of the best in the class. In every region a considerably higher proportion of Negroes than Caucasians gave this answer. As before, both Negroes and Caucasians showed this high level of motivation more often in the South and Southwest (15 to 20 percent more among Negroes and 10 to 15 percent more among Caucasians). Puerto Ricans again had a large number (13 percent) who answered that they didn't care and were satisfied just to get by.
Considering college plans and aspirations, a smaller proportion of Negroes than Caucasians in each region reported wanting to go no further than high school, though a slightly smaller proportion reported wanting to go to technical, nursing, or business school after college. The Orientals showed the highest aspirations toward college of any group, with 65 percent reporting a desire to finish college or go beyond.

In making concrete plans for college, fewer Negroes had definite plans for college, but fewer had definite plans not to attend. Also, a lower proportion of Negroes than Caucasians had seen a college catalog or had written for one.

**Occupational goal aspirations**   According to the *Coleman Report* all groups demonstrated high occupational aspirations. For every group the largest category of occupation indicated as the one they "think they will have" was professional. Overall, 35 percent of twelfth graders reported planning to have a professional occupation—though only Caucasians and Orientals were above this overall average. For each group, the proportion with this aspiration was unrealistically high, since professionals constitute only 13 percent of the total labor force.

Altogether, the responses showed generally high levels of aspiration for all groups, but Negro students reported an especially high level of aspirations. Despite lower
rates of school completion and lower college attendance, Negroes seemed especially strong in orientation toward the school as a path for mobility. The results suggest a considerable lack of realism in aspirations, particularly among Negroes whose responses deviate most from actual rates of college attendance and high school completion.

Attributes of students account for much more variation in achievement of minority group children than do any attributes of staff. As the educational aspirations and backgrounds of fellow students increase, the achievement of minority children increases. The highest achieving groups (Caucasians and Orientals) generally showed least dependence of achievement on characteristics of fellow students. The achievement of Negroes in the South seems to be associated most greatly with variations in the characteristics of their fellow students. If high aspirations for Negroes were to be viewed positively, then a strong case could be made for integrated schools in which Negroes would raise their aspirations to the level of their classmates.

Socio-economic opportunities By institutionalized means we refer to those channels of opportunity, authorized by society, by which individuals attempt to achieve goals. Within the general category of institutionalized means, our focus is upon socio-economic opportunities. These consist in this research problem of (a) parental occupational
level, (b) race, (c) family head and (d) family size. A brief explanation is now in order to substantiate the assertion that each of these factors play a part in affecting the opportunities adolescents have for the attainment of their goal aspirations.

**Parental occupational level** Probably the single most powerful determinant in affecting the career opportunities of young persons is that of parental occupational level, notably that of the father. The predominant finding from studies of intergenerational mobility is that, most commonly, the son will find work either at the occupational level of the father or at a level immediately adjacent to that of his father. Thus a son of a semi-skilled worker would, in all likelihood, go no further than that of skilled worker.

It is also clear that the most fundamental barrier to occupational mobility is that which exists between "blue collar" and "white collar" tasks. When occupational mobility occurs it is much more likely to be within the manual working strata or the white collar categories rather than between the two. As related to our study it means that young persons from families in which the father is a manual worker will find it very difficult to move into white collar occupation. Such mobility is nearly impossible if the father is either a semi-skilled or unskilled worker.
Race    A second factor likely to limit one's opportunities toward success goal attainment is that of race. In general it is clear that while ethnic minorities have been increasingly assimilated and, in the process, have been increasingly able to win equal opportunities, this pattern has not held for our racial minorities. Raymond Mack poses the problem in the following way:

Over the years, the American melting pot has assimilated millions of people of diverse national and cultural backgrounds who came to our shores as immigrants. But we have not successfully assimilated our racial minorities. Negroes, Orientals, and American Indians are not accepted by many Americans as citizens with equal rights. This situation places a severe strain upon the American ethic of equality of opportunity. Racial discrimination pinches our pride in democracy, taints our dedication to the brotherhood of man, and maims a motivational system based on fair play for every citizen striving for success (Mack, 1967, p. 142).

A Negro boy in America today has about half the chance to complete high school that a white boy has; one-third the chance to complete college or become a professional man; one-seventh the chance of earning $10,000 a year; twice the chance of being unemployed. The average Negro college graduate will earn less in his lifetime than will the average white who never went beyond the eighth grade. A Negro American's life expectancy is seven years shorter than a white American's. In 1960, the median money wage was $3,058 for Negroes and $5,425 for whites. Only 39 percent of white families earned less than $5,000. And the relative gap between Negro and white family income has been increasing since the mid-Fifties (Mack, 1967, pp. 148-149).

In summary, then, it is clear that racial character is an active force in influencing one's opportunities for
material success.

Head of household A third factor influencing opportunities for success is that of family head. The well-known Moynihan Report shows convincingly that the absence of the father from the home poses serious barriers for the success aspirations of the child. Although Negroes, due to factors associated with slavery, are particularly handicapped by this problem it is clear that the absence of the father constitutes a liability for families of all racial types.

The designation "broken home" is tantamount to saying that the father is absent from the home. Studies cited in the Moynihan Report strongly indicate that children from broken homes have lower I.Q.s, fall behind in school more often, drop out of school more readily and commit more crimes than those who grow up with both parents (Rainwater and Yancey, 1967, pp. 51-75).

The link between the broken home and these pathological characteristics of the young is probably the absence of a strong male role model to serve as an example to the children. In the absence of such a model the child is less likely to see himself eventually as the principle breadwinner in a family. He is less likely to be motivated to develop the job skills which make occupational mobility or even regular employment a possibility.
Family size  Probably the factor least well understood of the four for its effect upon socio-economic opportunity is that of family size. While family size is attracting a good deal of attention from ecologists today with their focus upon pollution and diminishing natural resources, very little is known about the impact of family size upon opportunities for the individuals. Phillip Hauser has written:

The tremendous range of problems we face in our central cities, furthermore, is being increasingly compounded by the persistence of fertility differentials based primarily on income and educational status. Low income and minority families continue to have more children than they say they want, in large part because of the discriminatory medical services we make available to them so that they are virtually denied access to modern fertility control. The children, in turn, receive inferior and discriminatory educations, and the combination of high fertility and inadequate training is a major deterrent to the economic and social advance of families in the culture of poverty (Hauser, 1965, pp. 198-199).

In general, then, it seems clear that highest fertility rates occur in those families least able to care for additional children. The result is reduced opportunities for all members of the family and an inescapable cycle of poverty is produced.

Now that the concepts dealing with aspiration and opportunity have been explicated, we have completed the conceptual apparatus for Stage One: an examination of the
impact of anomie upon anti-social behavior.¹ We now turn to a discussion of the concepts utilized in Stage Two, the examination of the impact of perceived goal blockage upon anti-social behavior.

**Perceived goal blockage** The second of our independent variables which is thought to affect adolescent anti-social behavior is that of perceived goal blockage. By perceived goal blockage we mean that the adolescent respondent indicates that he perceived a limitation of opportunity which makes goal realization unlikely. Perceived goal blockage is a subjective variable and may have little correspondence to the objective state of affairs governing the reality of the means-ends relationship. It is conceivable that adolescents may think of themselves as blocked, when in fact their chances of goal aspiration attainment are good. Similarly, an adolescent who may be considered blocked from aspirational realization by an objective assessment may not recognize the problem and continue to behave as if his goals were within his grasp. This concept of perceived

¹In the measurement chapter the reader will find that the four measures of socio-economic opportunity have been joined into a single index which, in turn, has been systematically related to goal aspirations. The result is that I have generated four aspirational-opportunity categories each for educational aspiration respondents and occupational aspiration respondents. See page 109.
blockage is considered important in our research plan in that a child who does not conceive of himself as blocked, regardless of the objective character of his circumstances, will continue to behave according to the legitimized standards which appear to him to be operable.

W. I. Thomas, with his concept "definition of the situation," is generally credited with underscoring the importance of psychological perception as a basis for individual action.

Preliminary to any self-determined act of behavior there is always a stage of examination and deliberation which we may call the definition of the situation. And actually not only concrete acts are dependent on the definition of the situation, but gradually a whole life-policy and the personality of the individual himself follow from a series of such definitions (Parsons, 1961, p. 743).

**Educational and occupational goal blockage** Within the general concept of perceived goal (aspirational) blockage two sub-concepts have been delineated: perceived occupational blockage and perceived educational blockage. These two types of perceived blockage correspond to the two kinds of goal aspirations which were discussed earlier. From these two sets of concepts we are able to tell not only the level to which the adolescent aspires in these two areas but also the degree to which he feels that he is blocked from his aspirational attainment.
Institutional alienation A final independent variable is alienation. While some usages of this concept have closely paralleled that of anomie (in the sense of "normlessness"), for my purposes alienation has been conceptualized as a lessening of confidence, on the part of individual persons, that social institutions are capable of attaining the ideal standards expected of them. Alienation refers to a kind of cynicism generated, particularly among the young, when it appears to them that institutions, or the persons who function within institutions, fail to live up to the ideal patterns expected of them. The "fault" of such a state of affairs may rest more with the observers of the institution rather than with the institutional personnel, in that the ideals may be so extreme as to not constitute reasonable expectations. However, a society which induces its youth to hold ideals which are not realized must be thought of as maintaining a degree of disorganization.

Alienation, then, is the resultant cynicism which arises in individuals when their expectations for institutional performance are not satisfied by what they perceive to be the actual level of institutional performance. For example, an ideal of police activity is that police are careful not to arrest innocent persons. If a respondent indicates his belief that police do not act that way, his response is indicative of his cynical belief that the institution of law
enforcement fails to measure up to one of its ideals.

Alienation, as the general concept, has been analyzed in terms of various sub-conceptual schemes. One of the most important in sociological research is that which specifies that alienation consists of powerlessness, normlessness and isolation (Dean, 1961). From this point of view alienation is a personality trait such that if one feels powerless he is likely to feel powerless in general rather than in particular situations and circumstances.

Dean's analysis of this alienation index in correlations with five background factors of occupation, education, income, age and community standing produced coefficients of such low magnitude that it was not feasible to predict the degree of alienation from the score of any of the five social correlates measured. This finding prompted Dean to suggest that alienation might not be a personality trait but a situation-relevant variable (Dean, 1960, p. 188). In this sense alienation is understood to be highly variable, depending upon the character of specific external conditions perceived by the respondent.

Law-enforcement alienation Such an assessment as this paves the way for thinking about alienation as being "institutionally specific" in that alienative feelings may be generated by what the actor considers to be the inadequacies of a particular institution. For example there
exists today considerable cynicism toward police activity as particularly falling short of time honored traditions of fairness and justice for all citizens. Such a state of mind the author has chosen to call "law-enforcement alienation."

If our emphasis upon the "institutionally specific" character of alienation is correctly placed it follows that a strong case can be made for the view that alienation research ought to be carried out in the context of cause and effect relations. It is suggested here that alienation indices could be developed more effectively if there were greater precision in our theory as to the particular causes and particular effects of specific kinds of alienation. It will be hypothesized later that law-enforcement alienation will serve to increase youthful anti-social behavior not simply in delinquency but in respect to dropout and underachievement behavior as well. Should this hypothesis find support it would tend to show that alienation felt toward police has a general impact for the child going beyond delinquency to anti-social behavior in school.

A second conceptual problem for which this study may make a contribution concerns what the respondent takes to be the source of his difficulty. That is, how is the frustrated individual likely to envision the source of his failure? Will he tend to blame persons, e.g. "police are more loyal to each other than they are to the citizens"?
Or would the hostility be directed toward rules, e.g. "a person should not be expected to report a friend to the police."

Since theory in this area is not sufficiently refined to provide answers to such a question, our approach has been to utilize an approach which will elicit information both with respect to alienation against law-enforcement personnel as well as against rules.

School authority alienation. Second type of alienation to be investigated in this research concerns youthful alienation toward school authorities. As stated above, this concept will not be used in the stage three hypotheses since the research intends to investigate the impact of law-enforcement alienation upon the four types of adolescent anti-social behavior. In Chapter Five, however, it will be necessary to consider the results of school authority alienation before reaching final conclusion with respect to the impact of alienation upon adolescent anti-social behavior.

Hypothesis Development

In this section the concepts discussed earlier will be organized into hypotheses. The function of an hypothesis is to state the character of a relationship between two or more variables. These hypotheses will be stated in the
form "If A then B" or "If blockage is perceived then delinquency will result." The hypothesis will first be stated in its most general form and then will be followed by sub-hypotheses, grouped by type of anti-social behavior. Later in the report these variables will be operationalized and tested to see if hypotheses at these varying levels can be sustained.

The purpose of this chapter, then, is to state expected relationships between variables. Our expectation for the hypothesis is based on two kinds of "inputs." There is initially the theoretical input or the expected relationship which would be derived from theoretical studies alone. In addition, there is the contribution made to hypothesis development by research programs which have put previous hypotheses to test. Presumably such studies give an indication as to whether previous hypotheses ought to be sustained, modified or rejected. In the main the expected relationships generated in this study will be traced back to theoretical rather than research contributions. The reasons for this are as follows: (a) Merton's conception of anomie has been subjected to a massive amount of theoretical controversy with remarkably few attempts to test directly Merton's key hypotheses. (b) The research work directed at the Merton formulation has been of uneven quality and has not produced, to this date, a meaningful set
of alternative hypotheses capable of being tested.

Stage 1 - anomie and anti-social behavior

Juvenile delinquency

Theoretical conclusions In the preceding section the writer spelled out in detail the development of the concepts anomie and juvenile delinquency. It is now necessary to see how Merton and others have linked these concepts into hypotheses.

In 1938 Robert Merton offered a proposition that was to have a very important impact upon modern sociology. More fully developed in his 1957 edition of Social Theory and Social Structure (Merton, 1957) the proposition states that the greater the disjunction between cultural goals and socially structured means (for particular positions in society) the greater the strain (for the position incumbents).

At less abstract levels, the proposition has been applied to a wide range of deviant behaviors which are said to issue from the strain, such as plagiarism, crime and delinquency, and school dropout. The application of Merton's general proposition to delinquency studies has been particularly pronounced. The interest in Merton's formulation probably reached its highest point with the publication of Anomie and Deviant Behavior in 1964. In this publication
Marshall B. Clinard gathered a series of essays dealing with a wide variety of the applications, both theoretical and research oriented, toward which anomie theory has been directed.

With respect to delinquency, Merton's hypothesis seems to suggest that an adolescent with high aspirations and limited opportunities will come to feel that he cannot work effectively in legitimate activity in such a way as to satisfy his (largely material) needs. The child, then, turns to delinquency as a substitute mechanism with which to fulfill his needs. A. K. Cohen has suggested that a lower class child in such a position would feel ambivalent toward middle-class success goals. On the one hand such goals are desirable to the child, but with his failure to reach them he tends to reject their worth. It is in rejecting them that Cohen introduces the concept of reaction-formation. The child, it is suggested, is driven to the malicious destruction of valued objects so as to express to others and to himself that the objects are of little worth and their influence is not binding upon him (Cohen, 1955).

Cloward and Ohlin accept the fundamental argument put forth by Merton, but feel that a child's choice of deviant means will not be automatic but is contingent upon the availability of a deviant subculture with which he can associate himself. This is particularly necessary if the child is to be successful at his delinquency in such a way as to
use his deviance to accumulate desired material goods (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960).

Finally, James Short has argued that the entire theoretical model seems too mechanical, and he chooses to emphasize the interaction which the youth will have with his "near group" over such questions as goals and means (Short, 1964).

**Research findings** Most research projects designed to test hypotheses with regard to anomie and delinquency give it only slight support. Landis et al. (1963) found little support for the anomie thesis. When a strong association was shown to exist between limited opportunities and a rejection of middle-class goals, there was also a good likelihood that the child would have somewhat greater delinquency proneness (Gough Socialization scale) and a more delinquent self conception.

Haskell (1961) claimed limited support for the anomie theory in a series of case histories which he undertook. He found that the joining of delinquent groups provided a source of satisfaction for boys unable to attain legitimate success goals. His work extended Merton's approach in that he attempted to show the process, through the use of reference groups, by which one moves from the tension of status frustration to the actuality of criminal deviation. Haskell seemed to feel, however, that the typical gang member can
better be explained by rebellion, the active alienation toward means and ends, rather than by "innovation" or the rejection of legitimated means. In this sense, Haskell seemed closer to Cohen's understanding of the conflict gang than to Merton's theory of anomie.

Reiss and Rhodes (1959a) found that a sizeable minority of lower class high school students felt that the use of illegitimate means was an acceptable way of attaining their occupational goals. In a separate study (1959b) these same authors found that high educational aspirations were not associated with anti-social behavior. Kleiner (1964) reported that the discrepancy between educational aspirations and actual achievement was greater for non-delinquents than for delinquents.

Short (1964) found a direct relationship between occupational means-ends discrepancies and delinquency, but among those youth perceiving limited educational opportunities it was the youth with low levels of educational aspiration who were most delinquent. Delinquency, then, was viewed by Short as one of a number of consequences which result when lower class status systems are created as alternatives to the middle class systems which have been repudiated.

Cohen (1955) approached the anomie thesis with a great emphasis on psychological factors. When a boy experiences the status frustration brought about by the ends-
legitimate means discrepancy, instead of simply turning to illicit means by which to attain his success goal, he joins with other boys, similarly frustrated, in an effort to negate the importance of middle class goals. Cohen speaks of lower class children "inverting" middle class values through the psycho-dynamic mechanism of reaction-formation. Their sense of anomie or status frustration, reflected in their delinquent conduct, is characterized by Cohen as malicious, negativistic and non-utilitarian.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960), on the basis of their study of gang types, support the Merton hypothesis with important modifications. Instead of employing psychoanalytic theory as Cohen did, Cloward and Ohlin speak of the proliferation of gang types (criminal, conflict and retreatist) in accordance with the kind of adult subculture which is dominant in the child's residential area. In general, the child becomes delinquency-prone because of status frustration; but the direction which his deviation takes is not so much traced to his own psychodynamic functioning as to the particular social milieu of which he is a part.

Finally, Spergel (1964) reported from his study of delinquent gangs that high aspirations and the absence of legitimate means leads to delinquency, even though the child at the time of the act may not reveal an affinity for the values of persons better off than he.
Overall, then the research data do not give strong support for the idea that high aspirations are an immediate corollary of delinquent behavior. It may be the case, however, that status frustration may have existed earlier and constituted a significant motivation for delinquency. If that were true, low aspirations may have replaced high aspirations as a result of failure experienced by the child. If this is so then the time dimension is a critical factor.

Having examined both theoretical and research assessments of the anomie hypothesis we find, in general, a lack of support for the hypothesis. We have chosen, nevertheless, to state our study's hypotheses in terms of Merton's formulation. This is done primarily because the evidence concerning the time factor is as yet inconclusive. The youthful age of our respondents may enable us to examine this critical time dimension in the theory.

Hypothesis If youth have more anomie (high goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth who have less.

1. Sub-hypothesis: juvenile delinquency

If youth have high educational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency than youth who do not.
2. Sub-hypothesis: juvenile delinquency

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have higher incidence of juvenile delinquency than youth who do not.

School dropout

Theoretical conclusions In the main the theoretical formulation remains the same as in the case of delinquency. Dropout behavior rather than delinquency may be the result of anomie however, in so far as the school represents to the child the continuing reality of his failure. In attempting to reduce those feelings of failure the child might drop out of school. In one sense, dropping out of school might be seen as entirely compatible with delinquency: i.e. dropping out represents moving away from failure, while delinquency represents a movement toward material goal realization. Elliott (1966), however, has argued that in so far as school dropout eliminates the source of strain in the frustrated student, dropping should be seen as an alternative to delinquency which is essentially an in-school response to status frustration.

Research findings A search of the literature reveals that only two teams of researchers have attempted a direct test of the anomie or "status deprivation" hypothesis to the area of school dropout. In 1962 Lichter
and his associates concluded that school dropout is a response made by a youth to a school situation in which he increasingly fails to reach goals. It represents running away from a disagreeable situation rather than a positive movement toward a new goal. The authors report that the youth discussions of employment were vague, aimless or unrealistic, indicating that a kind of retreatist adaptation had replaced their earlier goal orientations (Lichter et al., 1962).

A team of investigators headed by Delbert S. Elliott have been engaged in a series of research projects in which the "status deprivation" hypothesis is a central theme. Focusing on the capable dropout, they hypothesized that "dropout by capable students is a response to status deprivation which lower class youth experience when they compete with middle class adolescents under circumstances favoring those with middle class backgrounds." While their work is not yet completed they find modest support for the hypothesis (Elliott et al., 1966).

Elliott elsewhere presents evidence to support an hypothesis that delinquency and dropout are alternative responses to the anomie problem and that leaving school substantially lessens the adolescent's necessity to rebel (through delinquent activity) against a school system which places him at a competitive disadvantage. His results show further that while leaving school constitutes an escape
mechanism for the lower class child, it has somewhat the opposite effect of increasing the frustration of the middle class dropout. Presumably the middle class dropout still functions in a community in which high expectations for his success still exist, serving to further aggravate his feelings of failure (Elliott, 1966).

At this point one is able to see a high degree of consistency in the theoretical formulation and the scarce amount of research done on the anomie-dropout hypothesis. This convergence of theory and research simplifies the task of stating the hypothesis of this study.

Hypothesis

3. Sub-hypothesis: school dropout

If youth have high educational aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout than will youth who do not.

4. Sub-hypothesis: school dropout

If youth have high occupational aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout than will youth who do not.
School underachievement

Theoretical conclusions In the main the theoretical formulation remains the same as in the case of delinquency and school dropout. Underachieving behavior, however, may result from circumstances in which family or community pressure requires that a youth stay in school. While an adolescent may be forced to attend school, he cannot be forced to work to the level of his ability. Should he experience feelings of frustration due to failure, he may retreat from the situation by psychologically disclaiming the value of the educational experience. He may convey such feelings by not applying himself to daily classwork and to the taking of standardized tests. In so doing he will accumulate grades and achievement test scores well beneath his level of ability.

Research findings The author knows of no empirical tests of the hypothesis that underachievement is caused by adolescent's failure to achieve success goals. This being the case, there is no recourse except to formulate the hypothesis in terms of the direction suggested by theory.

Hypothesis

5. Sub-hypothesis: anomie and school underachievement

If youth have high educational aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a
higher incidence of school underachievement than youth who do not.

6. Sub-hypothesis: anomie and school underachievement

If youth have occupational aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than youth who do not.

Stage II - perceived goal blockage and anti-social behavior

Juvenile delinquency

Theoretical conclusions The theoretical basis for believing that perceived goal blockage affects delinquency rests upon the work alluded to earlier by W. I. Thomas and subsequent scholars whose interest is in the area of human perception. Since Thomas, many sociologists have taken seriously the premise that individuals act upon how they perceive situations and not necessarily in terms of the reality of the situation. For our purposes, then, if a youth perceives that he is blocked (regardless of the reality of such a perception) he will tend to act as if he were blocked. In this case the perception of blockage is thought to move the actor toward the committing of anti-social acts, particularly delinquent acts.
Research findings  This hypothesis is not totally devoid of experimental evidence. A few studies have focused on the question of the adolescent's perception of goal blockage and its consequences. Karacki and Toby in their 1962 study failed to find delinquency associated with subjective feelings of deprivation in adolescent youth (Karacki and Toby, 1962). Liu and Fahey in their 1963 study found an association between perceived blockage and delinquency, but found that the blockage was more likely the result of the delinquency rather than the cause (Liu and Fahey, 1963). Mizruchi in 1964, while not directly testing its relation to delinquency, found that perceived blockage was much more common among middle class youth than among lower class youth, given the fact that goals appear much more nebulous to middle class youth than to lower class youth. Short in 1964 found support for the hypothesis that among youth perceiving educational opportunities to be closed, those with low educational aspirations are likely to be most delinquent (Short, 1964). Finally Reiss and Rhodes (1963) found delinquents feeling more deprived than nondelinquents.

It would seem that tests of the perceived blockage hypothesis have been few in number and far from convincing in the amount of support or rejection which they supply for the hypothesis. For these reasons the hypothesis concerning perceived goal blockage and delinquency will be
formulated on the basis of the direction suggested by theory.

**Hypothesis**  
If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than those not perceiving goal blockage.

1. **Sub-hypothesis: juvenile delinquency**  
If youth perceive that their educational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency than those who do not perceive educational goal blockage.

2. **Sub-hypothesis: juvenile delinquency**  
If youth perceive that their occupational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency than those who do not perceive occupational goal blockage.

**School dropout**

**Theoretical conclusions**  
The theoretical conclusions concerning perceived goal blockage and school dropout are not different from those discussed above with respect to delinquency except to say that the classroom setting is a constant reminder to a child that he is a failure. It would seem possible to establish, theoretically, a closer link between perceived goal blockage and school dropout than in the case of delinquency.
Research findings  Cervantes has concluded that the school dropout is very likely to have been held back one year and occasionally two years behind his classmates (Cervantes, 1965, p. 198). From this one can infer that the child has perceived goal blockage and may well choose to retreat from the source of his failure. Stinchcombe (1964) found that among the school failures which he studied, those youth who were most subjected to "success pressure" were most alienated and most rebellious. Reiss and Rhodes (1959b), using school dropout as one of their dependent variables, found that a large number of such youth perceived blockage to their goals and defended the use of illegitimate means to obtain their occupational goals. This study suggests that delinquency and dropout may not exist independently, as was suggested earlier by Elliott. Finally, Elliott found support for the hypothesis that school dropouts were much more likely to have failed in the achievement of success goals than had non dropouts (Elliott, 1966).

Given the high degree of support for the hypothesis by the limited amount of research done to date there is little difficulty in developing the hypothesis.

Hypothesis

3. Sub-hypothesis: school dropout

If youth perceive that their educational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher
incidence of school dropout than those who do not perceive educational goal blockage.

4. Sub-hypothesis: school dropout

If youth perceive that their occupational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout than will those who do not perceive educational goal blockage.

**School underachievement**

**Theoretical conclusions** While it might be expected that a child would drop from school to show his rejection of school success goals which he cannot reach, it is possible that forces of social control from the family, the school or the community might serve to keep the child in school. Under such a condition, it might be expected that the child would engage in a half-hearted response to school disciplines. In this fashion school underachievement, in either grades or standardized tests, might become the way in which the child would deal with his feelings of failure.

**Research findings** The author knows of no research findings which purport to have tested this hypothesis. This being the case there is no recourse but to formulate the hypothesis in terms of the direction suggested by theory.
Hypothesis

5. Sub-hypothesis: school underachievement

If youth perceive that their educational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not perceive educational goal blockage.

6. Sub-hypothesis: school underachievement

If youth perceive that their occupational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not perceive occupational goal blockage.

Stage III - institutional alienation and anti-social behavior

Juvenile delinquency

Theoretical conclusions

Since the writer has not found previous theoretical studies relative to institutional alienation and juvenile delinquency, the theoretical case must rest solely on what logic and intuition might suggest.

It would seem that youth will continue to have confidence in existing structures and their ability to gain satisfaction from them as long as they have confidence that institutional personnel try to live up to the ideals of such institutions. For example, even if a youth feels personally frustrated by his lack of opportunity, he will
nevertheless continue to abide by the law as long as he continues to believe that law enforcement officials strive to be fair and just in their dealings with people. Conversely, when a child loses confidence in such institutional personnel he may feel that he has no recourse but to violate the mores of the institution. In short, confidence in institutional personnel may be an additional factor in keeping the adolescents working within established institutions to achieve their goals.

Research findings The writer has been unable to find research materials bearing directly on this hypothesis. Data has not been found to suggest that a child either is or is not stimulated to commit delinquent acts because of a lack of confidence in institutional personnel. This being the case it is necessary to state the hypothesis in terms of the theoretical rationale developed directly above.

Hypothesis If youth exhibit high institutional alienation then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than youth who do not exhibit institutional alienation.

1. Sub-hypothesis: juvenile delinquency

If youth exhibit high law enforcement alienation then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency than will youth who do not exhibit high
law enforcement alienation.

School dropout

Theoretical conclusions Once again it has not been possible to borrow from theoretical studies of earlier writers, since no one seems to have examined the relationship between the student's confidence in the fairness of law enforcement personnel and his likelihood of dropping out of school. The rationale used here, then, follows closely that developed immediately above for juvenile delinquency.

While a child may be frustrated by repeated failure if he nevertheless has confidence in the fairness of law-enforcement officials he will harbor some hope for the improvement of societal institutions such that he might ultimately be able to work within them to attain his goals.

Research findings Since the writer has been unable to uncover research findings which have examined the relationship between alienation from law enforcement personnel and dropout behavior, it is necessary to state the proposition on the basis of the theoretical statement developed immediately above.

Hypothesis

2. Sub-hypothesis: school dropout

If youth exhibit high law enforcement alienation then they will have a higher incidence of school
dropout than will youth who do not exhibit high law enforcement alienation.

**School underachievement**

**Theoretical conclusions** Since it has not been possible to find previous studies which have examined the relationship between law-enforcement alienation and school underachievement it is necessary to proceed on the basis of logic and intuition.

The reasoning invoked here is identical to that discussed immediately above with respect to the matter of school dropout. While a child may be frustrated by repeated school failure if he nevertheless has confidence in the fairness of law enforcement officials he will harbor some hope for the improvement of societal institutions such that he might ultimately be able to work within them.

**Research findings** Since the writer has not been able to find empirical studies dealing with the variables of law-enforcement alienation and school underachievement it is necessary to formulate the hypothesis on the basis of the theoretical rationale developed immediately above.

**Hypothesis**

3. **Sub-hypothesis: school underachievement**

If youth exhibit high law-enforcement alienation then they will have a higher incidence of school
underachievement than will youth who do not exhibit high law-enforcement alienation.

Theoretical integration of the research plan

The different kinds of variables discussed above may now be brought together in such a way as to demonstrate the integration of the three stages through which this research project will be conducted. The emphasis here is upon the sequential ordering which characterizes the approach.

No attempt has been made to theorize about the background variables which might shape the level of aspirations within the respondents. There is no literature which would guide us in the matter of developing hypotheses about why some adolescents aspire more highly than others. The arguments of Merton and Cohen from which our major hypotheses have been generated do not deal with the question of differential aspirational levels, but rather seem simply to assume that all adolescents, in response to cultural stimuli, aspire to material rewards and the high levels of educational and occupational success needed to attain them.

In stage one of this research an attempt will be made to discover the extent to which anomie is a meaningful predictor of anti-social behavior. The theory as formulated by Merton fails to specify why some high aspiring youth with low opportunities engage in anti-social behavior while others
do not. For this reason stages two and three have been developed.

The research plan in stage one calls for determining the degree of anti-social behavior in the four different aspiration-opportunity categories. In stage two these same aspiration-opportunity categories will be maintained as we assess the impact of perceived blockage in each of the four categories. In addition to assessing the independent impact of blockage on the dependent variables we are in a position to see the degree to which perceived blockage may work in association with one or more of the aspiration-categories to produce anti-social behavior.

It would be meaningful to discover, for example, that it is only in the presence of perceived blockage that anomie becomes an effective predictor of anti-social behavior. It may be, then, the combination of the variables anomie, blockage and even alienation which might serve to predict anti-social behavior. The theoretical explanation for such an eventuality might take the following form.

An adolescent with high aspirations and low opportunities comes, sooner or later, to realize that he is, in fact, blocked from meaningful goal attainment. Thus, it might be argued that the two factors will be needed in order for there to be sufficient psychological pressure upon the child to engage in anti-social behavior. In this sense, blockage
might be viewed as a "differential response" variable. It helps explain why some anomic youth make a different response to their situation than do others in the same position.

Finally, it might be argued the youth will withstand the pressures of anomie and perceived blockage if they continue to have confidence that institutional ideals are still being pursued by institutional personnel. In effect, while he senses the present futility of his own activity, the child may feel that pressures are at work to remove the limitations under which he and presumably others have been restricted. It is when he becomes convinced that the ideals are not being pursued (he is alienated) that he finally gives up hope in achieving goals through legitimate activity. In the sense both blockage and alienation may serve as "differential response" mechanisms conditioning the impact of anomie on the behavior of the youth.
CHAPTER THREE  SPECIFIC RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter is designed to deal with the various research methods utilized in testing the hypotheses under investigation. The discussion will deal first with the general categories of population and sample characteristics and then with measurement considerations.

Population and Sample Considerations

It is now the intent of the writer to specify the character of the population needed to test the hypotheses and then to specify the procedures by which samples of the population were taken.

Population

In order to test the three general hypotheses and the fifteen sub-general hypotheses discussed in Chapter Two it is necessary to relate the hypotheses to a population with the following characteristics; (1) youth in their early adolescence, (2) adequate numbers of both Black and White respondents, (3) large numbers of middle class and lower class respondents, (4) adequate representation from both rural and urban areas and (5) youth of both races who have established connection to community organizations.

It was considered particularly important to include in the population young adolescents since our discussion
of the anti-social literature concluded that the time dimension has been neglected in previous research. That is, while youth may have held low aspirations at the time of their anti-social behavior it is by no means clear that high aspirations held at an earlier time had not been repressed because of experiences of failure.

While this present research effort has not focused particularly on the problem of distinguishing Black from White responses to anomie it is the long-range plan of the author to accomplish such an analysis. For this reason a particular effort has been made to focus on a population which included a large number of Black youth.

In as much as class variations have played a major role in the development of anomie theory a strong effort has been made to focus upon a population with adequate numbers of cases of white collar workers, blue collar workers and workers from the lowest class of semi-skilled and unskilled workers.

Since there is no evidence that anomie theory is uniquely applicable to either rural or urban respondents an effort was made to focus upon a county population which would include both kinds of residential types.

Finally, in so far as programs aimed at reducing anti-social behavior in youth will be run by local community organizations it seemed wise to utilize a population base
which was already known to be affiliated with such organizations. Presumably, then, generalizations which will be made about youth will be appropriate to youth with whom these agencies customarily deal.

All of these population considerations were met in Polk County, Iowa. The total county population, according to the 1960 census was about 266,315 of which 208,982 persons lived within the city of Des Moines.

Two populations were systematically investigated for this research effort. First, in an attempt to include large numbers of Blacks as well as youth from the lowest economic classes, the focus was placed upon all youth affiliated with settlement houses and opportunity centers in Polk County, Iowa. A second population to which generalizations will be made is that of youth affiliated with Protestant churches in Polk County, Iowa. In this population it was expected that youth would be overwhelmingly white and middle class in character. The use of these two populations also satisfies our need for respondents of both sexes who are related to community organizations.

An attempt, then was made to focus, not upon the general population of Polk County, Iowa, but upon particular sub-
components of it. In this sense we might speak of this technique as that of developing a set of "purposive populations." By this we mean that a strong effort has been made to focus upon those population groups with characteristics of theoretical importance. It is interesting to note that while we have engaged in a sampling procedure which was intended to elicit responses from these various sub-groups in the population the result has been that, with exception of a large number of Blacks, our respondents appear to be highly representative of the Polk County population.\(^1\) In effect, the total number of survey responses has been large enough to elicit the kind of representation of sub-groups which we desired as well as others whose inclusion gave our sample a highly representative character.

After examining the two samples, some generalizations will be made about the combined TOTAL sample and an attempt will be made to assess systematically the degree to which the TOTAL sample approximates the characteristics of the general population. The basis for our understanding of the

\(^1\)Technically it is only the generalizations about delinquency which will be made for the county as a whole, the other dependent variables being pertinent only to the city of Des Moines. Elaborate comparisons of city and county populations will not be undertaken since the portion of the county, not including the city of Des Moines constitutes only 21.6% and thus would not contribute significantly to differences in population composition.
characteristics of the Polk County population lies in the report of the 1960 census.¹

**Samplings**

The SHOC sample (Settlement-House Opportunity Center)
The Council of Social Agencies (CSA) of Des Moines, Iowa, in 1965 was a conglomeration of traditional settlement houses and fledgling OEO centers. Mrs. Margarite Cothorn, the Director of the CSA program at the time, expressed her willingness to cooperate in the research project, should a sampling procedure agreeable to her be utilized in the research, and adequate compensation be given to the CSA for the services of its staff members.

The pretesting for the questionnaire was done on a sample of junior and senior high school youth in Pella, Iowa. They offered many helpful suggestions as to how questions could be clarified and simplified. This was done in advance of a final meeting with the CSA center directors. At the time of the CSA directors meeting, many other suggestions were made for questionnaire improvement.

¹It is regrettable that this study nears completion well before the time that the data from the 1970 census becomes available. An analysis of the 1970 data, in connection with the 1960 data, would give a better indication as to the character of the county and city populations in the years 1965–67, the years in which the samples were elicited.
Mrs. Cothorn estimated that about 800 adolescents between the ages of 13 and 17 would be involved in the CSA program in the year 1965. Since most of these young people would have a casual "come and go" relationship with their community centers, it was deemed important to have the questionnaires available in the centers over a long period of time. It was decided that the directors of the centers would keep the questionnaires for a period of six weeks and periodically give the questionnaires to groups of students under supervision, when both the numbers of youngsters and the course of activities seemed to permit it. A sum of $100 was paid to the CSA by the researcher in payment for the services rendered by the members of the CSA staff. The settlement house opportunity centers sample, for the purposes of simplicity, will be hereafter referred to as SHOC.

While there was a strong advantage in having the questionnaire given by the staff members of the various centers in that the youthful respondents would be more willing to participate under the direction of familiar faces, a serious liability would be incurred if the supervisors were unable or unwilling to discharge their responsibility correctly. For this reason, great care was taken to insure that the center personnel understood both the general purposes of the research and the specific instructions for the questionnaire responses. (See Appendix B for a code of the questionnaire
and Appendix C for a copy of the specific instructions ac-
companying its use.)

This problem was dealt with in two ways. Initially, a
meeting was held with the intent of involving the research
director and all the center directors whose responsibility
it would be to supervise the giving of the questionnaires.
All centers were represented at this meeting, although it
was not clear in each case whether it would be possible for
the representative always to be the one who would be superv¬
ising the administration of the questionnaire. In addition,
a detailed coding manual was constructed for use by center
personnel. In this manual an attempt was made to so specify
the intent of each question, that the supervisor could aid
the respondents in properly interpreting and responding to
the question.

The questionnaires were distributed to the participat¬
ing agencies in the middle of October, 1965. The completed
questionnaires were received from the centers during the last
week of November, 1965. While it had been estimated that
800 adolescents between the ages of 13 and 17 would be af¬
iliated with the various centers during the year 1965, we
made no estimate of the number likely to appear in our six
week sample. Two hundred nineteen questionnaires were re¬
turned, although not all of these were complete in essential
information. While center staff had been instructed to keep
a count of those youth refusing to take the questionnaire, no record of such refusals was accumulated. Discussion with center staff indicated that there simply were no refusals. Though this seems unlikely there is no basis upon which to refute such statements. It is possible that since there was variation in the degree of supervision of the questionnaire there was, very likely, variation in the amount of attention given to such details as refusal. The CSA supervisors report that an average of thirty minutes was used in filling out the questionnaire.

How representative are the 219 respondents sampled of the approximately 800 youth who affiliated with the various centers in the year 1965? First, there is no reason to assume that the kind of young people who affiliate with opportunity centers in October and November are different from the kinds of young people who affiliate with them throughout the year. Second, in view of the statements of members of the center staff, there is no reason to believe that sizeable numbers of young people refused to take the questionnaire during these months. Finally, while a large number of the questionnaires were incomplete, enough background information in most cases was included so that we have an opportunity to assess the character of the incompletions to see if it is a random as opposed to systematic kind of incompleteness. One hundred sixty-five questionnaires were
retained for use, although on some items the total will be considerably less. There was no reason to believe that the 54 eliminated were different from the 165 retained; on age, sex, race, and father's occupation, they appeared to be a cross section of the total.

As expected, the respondents tended to be black and from poor families. In order to have a more representative sample of the Des Moines area population, it was decided to elicit another group of respondents which would include a larger proportion of white, middle class youth. A description as to the procedures used in compiling that sample now follows.

The CHURCH sample It was initially felt that the school population afforded the best grouping out of which to draw a sample of largely white, middle class youth. It would not have been a difficult task to draw a random sample and then separate out those middle class youth of particular interest. Such a sample would, of course, have given us a valuable, broader view of middle and working class life, which also could have been used for comparative purposes.

When Dr. Merle Wilson of the Des Moines Pupil Services Division was asked to cooperate in this fashion, he brought the matter to the attention of his administrative staff. The resulting decision was that recent community reaction to
CARDPAC made additional surveying at this time a particularly hazardous venture. He did volunteer the use of the permanent records which are kept on each child in the Des Moines school system. While school dropout, grades, and achievement data were available, it was obvious that the independent variables of interest in this research could not be assessed from such data.

Given this limitation in available school data, the decision was then made to approach the churches in the city of Des Moines in the hope that the questionnaire could be distributed under their auspices. Utilizing letters of support from Dr. Donald McKenzie, Director of the Polk County Community Action Council, and the Rev. John Donovan, the Executive Director of the Des Moines Council of Churches, a mailing was directed to all the churches listed in the Des Moines phone book. In that letter, an offer of the following nature was made. Students from Central College, trained by the researcher both in delinquency prevention and questionnaire supervision, would appear in the churches to conduct discussions on delinquency prevention and then

\[1\]CARDPAC was a short answer test given in various classes of the junior and senior high schools. While it covered many attitude areas of the child's life, those questions dealing with child-parental relations were felt by Dr. Wilson to be most controversial.
gather questionnaire responses of the youth who were present. The questionnaire was, of course, identical to the one used 16 months earlier in the sample of SHOC respondents. While this offer was extended to all 227 churches and synagogues in the city, it was deemed particularly important to have a successful return from Protestant middle class churches. It was for this reason that the letter from Rev. Donovan was elicited. Under his direction, 88 Protestant churches (comprising the City Council of Churches or CCC) most of which reflect strongly middle class orientations, have developed an ecumenical program. Thus, while only 19 churches responded affirmatively to our invitation, 17 of these were among those affiliated with the CCC, constituting nearly 20% of the city CCC membership.

The nineteen churches brought a total of 338 responses by adolescents to our questionnaire. The groups ranged in size from five to forty-two. The average size of the groups visited was seventeen.

Our expectation that largely middle class churches would respond affirmatively proved to be correct, this being the case in all but four largely working class churches. No Catholic of Jewish groups responded positively to the invitation.

The six students from Central College were thoroughly trained in the general intent of the research and in its
specific coding instructions for the questionnaire. The result was that over 90% of the questionnaires were returned completely filled out. In addition the college students reported that no one refused to participate in the survey. We received a number of letters from the participating churches commenting on the excellence of the program.

The question might arise as to why a more systematic, perhaps random, sample of the churches was not taken. Our reasoning was that a random 20% sample of 227 churches would probably have meant, assuming a 20% response, that we would have a sample of about 9 churches. Still, there would have been no easy way to determine whether the responding 20% were a biased segment of all those contacted. In all likelihood, we would not have the large number of middle class respondents had we followed that procedure.

Our research decision was, then, to try to attract as large a number of participating churches as possible and then, afterward, to try to draw conclusions particularly for white, Protestant middle class adolescents. In fact, there is strong reason to believe that conclusions reached from this sample will be widely applicable to Caucasian, middle class, Protestant, church-affiliated youth in the city of Des Moines. Our confidence in this matter rests on the fact that the City Council of Churches is representative of three-fourths of the Protestant church affiliated
people of the Des Moines metropolitan area. Those excluded are largely the highly evangelical churches which stand in lower socio-economic status than those in the CCC organization. For this reason there is justification in speaking of the CCC membership as Protestant and largely middle class.

But what of the representativeness of the 20 percent of the CCC membership churches who chose to participate in the survey? Three reasons for optimism exist on this point.

1) It is reasonable to assume that the participation by these few churches is most likely a function of the program interest of the youth leader and of the scheduling possibilities at the time. Neither of these factors seems likely to be contributing to a biased sample of respondents.

2) The Rev. Donovan appraised the characteristics of the membership in the seventeen responding churches as representing a cross section of the middle class and working class churches in the CCC.

3) Descriptive data comparing the seventeen participating churches with all the other member churches shows that while participating churches were substantially larger in membership and budgets, the per capita giving of members in these churches very closely approximated the per capita
giving in the CCC churches as a whole.\(^1\)

While hardly defensible from a purist standpoint, it nevertheless does seem clear that such a grouping provides a meaningful contrast to the lower class sample discussed earlier. Given the limitations of time and money this is perhaps all that can be hoped for.

The TOTAL sample The research decision was, then, to try to attract as large a number of participating churches as possible and then, in conjunction with the SHOC sample, to try to establish the degree to which the TOTAL sample was similar to a cross section of Des Moines area youth ages 12 to 17.

Population-TOTAL sample comparisons

In a number of respects it is possible to compare the characteristics of the TOTAL sample with known characteristics of the general population. A demonstration that the qualities found in the sample also appear in roughly the same percentages in the Des Moines area population constitutes presumptive evidence that the sample is not

\(^1\)Of the nineteen churches participating in the survey, seventeen were affiliated with the CCC organization. These seventeen churches averaged 922.4 active members and a total budget of $59,169. All eighty-eight active members of CCC averaged 634.6 members and a budget of $39,169. The per capita figure for the seventeen participating church was $64.2 while the corresponding figure for all other affiliated churches was $62. All these figures refer to the year 1967.
substantially biased. On a number of common indicators there appears to be strong support for the claim that the sample of 475 youths is not an unduly biased segment of the Des Moines area general population.

Because the author desired at a later time to make a detailed assessment of Negro respondents, it was important to have a number of Negro cases which would far exceed their normal percentage of the population. Thus, while Negroes constitute only 5 percent of the Des Moines area population, they are 26.3 percent of the TOTAL sample of 475 cases. Because of this complication, much of the following assessment of sample-population comparisons will be done separately for Negroes and whites in the sample.

A strong case can be made for the contention that the 350 Caucasians in the TOTAL sample constitute a rough cross section of the Caucasian population in the Des Moines area. The 1950 census report for the Des Moines Metropolitan Area shows that 52.7 percent of the white work force was in white collar occupations. The comparable figure for all Caucasians in our sample is 53.9 percent. The 1960 census lists the percentage of white manufacturing employees at 21.2 percent. The comparable figure for our white respondents in the TOTAL sample is 18 percent. Finally, 14.7 percent of the experienced white civilian labor force was found to be in occupational categories of service workers, non-farm laborers,
and unemployed. That comparable figure for our white sample is 6.5 percent. When one takes into account the rising levels of income in the period 1960-1967, it may be, in actuality, that these final two percentages may not be very far apart. However, it seems wise to specify that, in all likelihood, the white portion of our TOTAL sample slightly underrepresents the lowest economic segment of white society in the Des Moines Metropolitan Area population.¹

Figures on Negro employment show some variance between 1960 census figures and our own occupational classification. These are differences, however, which can in some measure at least, be explained by the rise of Negro employment between the years 1960 and 1965, when SHOC survey information was received.

In 1960, for members of the Des Moines Negro work force in the ages from 35-64, 67.8 percent were semi- and unskilled laborers, while 32.8 percent were skilled workers and above. Our figures, gathered in 1965, shows 52.7 percent in the semi- and unskilled categories with 47.3 percent at the level of skilled workers and above. The gap of 15 percentage points in the two sets of figure reduces to ten

¹The Des Moines Metropolitan Area is a term used in the 1960 census report of Iowa. It is identical in its scope to the reference in our study to the population of Polk County.
percentage points difference when we narrow the census age range down to that of ages 35-44, the parental age range most likely represented in our survey.

While it is plausible that much of the difference between the census rates and our rates may be attributed to a five year interval (1960-65), it may also be true that the Negroes in our sample come from a slightly higher socio-economic level than do Des Moines Negroes in general.

A third factor which shows the degree of comparability of the samples and the Des Moines area population is that of the employment status of the mother. The census data for women in the age category 35-49 (suitable for youth in the sample who have ages from 10-17) shows that 48 percent of the women were working. The comparable figures for Caucasian mothers of survey respondents was 51.6 percent. The slight difference might be traced to the absence of Negroes in our white sample calculation.

A fourth factor pertains to the comparability of sex proportions. In the Des Moines Area Census, Caucasian females in age range 10-19 in the 1960 census held a slight lead over Caucasian males (50.2 percent of 49.8 percent). It seems clear the females are somewhat overrepresented in our survey, since they are more represented than males by 56.3 percent to 43.7 percent. For Negroes, females lead in the 1960 census in the 10-19 age range by 53 percent to 47
percent. The sample of Negroes shows that females are less represented than males by 48 percent to 52 percent. Thus it is clear that Negro males are overrepresented in our sample.

A final basis for comparison between census and survey data lies in an analysis of the broken family problem. The 1960 census data for Caucasians show that 12 percent of Caucasian family heads were married but not living with their spouse. This presumably includes such eventualities as desertion, divorce, separation, and death. For Caucasians in our sample, the number of families headed by mother or guardian is 10 percent. The figure for Negroes in the sample is 41 percent, considerably higher than the rate of Negro families in the State of Iowa, which is 26 percent. However, it is reasonable to assume that urban rates of marital breakup will be higher than rates for the entire state.

The discussion of comparisons between census data and descriptive data from our survey seems to suggest that while our samples are hardly crossovers of the Des Moines area population, they do possess characteristics which are not greatly at variance with the qualities of the population.

In anticipation of the ensuing discussion of measurement, it is well to make clear that the SHOC-CHURCH distinction made earlier does not involve major analytic distinctions and thus is not used hereafter as a major
organizational device in the paper. It is clear that while there are important differences in the two samples the key independent variables of aspirations, opportunities and blockages cut across both samples.

Sample parameters

The sample parameter around which the research data is organized is that of the aspiration-opportunity categories. Only respondents codeable into these categories are included in the hypothesis testing. It is important to note that these are of two types; educational aspirations-opportunity categories and occupational aspirations-opportunity categories.

The first set of categories is generated from a base which includes all youth in the samples who answered Question 22 dealing with educational aspirations and for whom a score on opportunity limitations could be obtained. The second category is somewhat smaller since a number of responses to the question concerning occupational aspirations (Question 18) could not be coded. The total number of cases in the former is 475 while in the latter it is 399. In each case the total number of respondents is broken down into four aspiration-opportunity categories. These categories constitute the basis for all subsequent analysis for stages I, II and III. These matters will be discussed in
greater detail in the following chapter.

The value of using these two separate designations is made clear when we note that the association between educational occupations and occupational aspirations is not unusually great. These variables produced a Phi of only .42.

Measurement Considerations

This section will discuss the way in which the concepts used in the research have been measured. In order to be tested concepts need to be related to their real world counterparts so that experimental outcomes can be counted and analyzed. Initially, the focus will be upon those measures of the dependent variables. Following that, the measures for the independent variables will be discussed. Following the discussion of each concept the distribution of the data by coded response categories will be given. These operational definitions will be repeated in the findings chapter (Chapter Four) at which time the measurement of the hypothesis will be stated in parsimonious form and in testable fashion through the development of empirical and statistical hypotheses.

Dependent variables

Anti-social behavior The dependent variable for this research is anti-social behavior. Anti-social behavior has been divided into three sub-general concepts: those of
juvenile delinquency, school dropout and school under-achievement.

Juvenile delinquency Juvenile court records constitute the measurement used to indicate the existence of juvenile delinquency for the adolescent respondents. Records from Polk County, Iowa, from the period 1965-69 were utilized. Since it is a county-wide measure, all 475 of our respondents may be scored as either delinquent or non-delinquent. On other measures, such as that dealing with school dropout, the measure covers simply the city of Des Moines, rather than the county, and thus the number of responses capable of being analyzed is substantially reduced.

The single most authoritative work dealing with the measurement of juvenile delinquency is The Measurement of Delinquency by T. Sellin and M. Wolfgang (1964). Their discussion shows in great detail the strengths and weaknesses of the two most widely used approaches to the problem, official statistics and adolescent self-report (Sellin and Wolfgang, 1964, chapters 2-5).

The principle difficulty with official statistics is that they are invariably incomplete. It is axiomatic that the further away the measurement is from the committed act, the less reliable the measurement. Thus, delinquency as measured by institutionalized populations is less adequate as a measure than that population of youthful offenders
adjudicated, in one way or another, by the juvenile court. The juvenile court, in turn, is likely to see only about one-half of all those youth with whom police are likely to make contact as the result of some sort of punishable act being investigated.

In Des Moines, Iowa, contacts made with youth which the police officer feels may warrant official action are referred to the juvenile aid bureau of the city police department. Should the case appear serious enough, the case is then referred to the Polk County Juvenile Court. Police contacts made in rural Polk County by rural police officials are likely to sidestep the intervening step comparable to the juvenile aid bureau and the investigating officer will make the judgment as to whether the case warrants the attention of the Polk County Juvenile Court.

It seems clear, then, that arrest figures constitute the most accurate available index as to who has committed illegal activity and who has not, and youthful referrals to the juvenile aid bureau constitute the best single index to juvenile delinquency. However, for both cases, two limitations must be recognized. Certainly not all adults or adolescents committing law violations are referred to authorities, since many crimes go unsolved. For this reason, official statistics for adult arrest and the juvenile delinquency equivalent are incomplete. Studies of adolescent
self-report reveals that many adolescents who have never been in trouble with police report that they have committed any number of acts punishable by law.

A second defect in arrest statistics is that it is certain that some persons suspected of committing crimes have not committed the crimes, thus inflating somewhat the official statistics. Aside from those innocent persons released from legal responsibility by the verdicts of judges and juries, there is, in addition, the occasional instance of the person whose arrest is followed by an incorrect determination of guilt with a resulting jail sentence.

In conclusion, then, statistics of arrests, or in the case of juveniles the referrals to the juvenile aid bureau of the police department, are undoubtedly incorrect as an indication of total criminality, both because they leave out a large number of persons who have committed acts but who have not been apprehended and because these indices include persons who have been accused unjustly.

It might be argued, however, that in the case of juveniles, while records of the juvenile aid bureau may not accurately differentiate the delinquent from the non-delinquent population, there is a strong likelihood that the seriously delinquent child will come into contact with the juvenile aid bureau and will be referred to the County Juvenile Court. Serious acts of delinquency have a high
reportability by the public and subsequent police investigation insures that a high percentage of serious delinquents will be apprehended at least once. Very few serious delinquents completely escape the net of police investigation. These serious delinquents are likely to be referred from the juvenile aid bureau to the juvenile court. Juvenile Court statistics may be thought, then, to be a reasonably accurate differentiator between the seriously delinquent child who appears in court records, and the combined category of the nondelinquent and nonseriously delinquent child.

The juvenile code statutes in most states are set up in such a way as to grant law enforcement authorities maximum latitude in the regulation of youthful violations. Children may be taken into custody, not simply when they have broken a law or when their behavior constitutes a danger to the welfare of others, but also "when they act in such a way as to be a danger to themselves." These extremely broad powers are intended to give law enforcement officials the capability of dealing in a therapeutic fashion with the less serious acts while dealing more stringently with the more serious violator.

This writer's discussions with the juvenile court judge of Polk County leads him to believe that a youth is referred to his office by police or school officials when: (a) a serious act has been committed and (b) when there is a
strong likelihood that the accused youth did commit the crime. It is important to underscore, however, that the main concern of the juvenile court is not in the determination of guilt or innocence, but in the adjudication of the case. By adjudication is meant that kind of outcome which is best able to serve the interests of the child. These outcomes range from "counseled and released" to institutionalization. Only in those cases when it appears that a referral to an institution may be forthcoming does the juvenile court operate "officially" to include in its adjudicatory task the determination of guilt or innocence.

In conclusion, then, it may be argued that juvenile court records, while not distinguishing accurately between populations of delinquents and nondelinquents, may be characterized as distinguishing between the seriously delinquent children included in the court records and the nondelinquents or nonserious delinquents whose cases are not found in the records.

From the total number of returned questionnaires there were 51 delinquents and 506 nondelinquents. Because of incompletions in the data our analysis of Stage I hypotheses was limited to 41 delinquents and 434 nondelinquents. The number of cases varies slightly in Stages II and III in accordance with incompletions in the independent variables involved.
School dropout  The official records of school dropouts by the Des Moines School System have been selected as the measure of school dropout in this research program. While such a measurement is far removed from the ideal appropriate to the complex character of the concept of school dropout, the school records constitute, nevertheless, the best measurement alternative available to the researcher. The strengths and limitations of this measure are discussed below.

When a child decides to drop from school, he or she must visit with a school counselor and fill out a form specifying the reasons for the drop. It is commonly recognized by school personnel that neither the interview nor the form necessarily provides an accurate indication of the "real" reasons for the departure from school. The person dropping may choose to hide the real reasons for his act, such as those tied in with poor school performance, family tension, and pre-marital pregnancy. This resultant confusion over the reasons for the dropout renders inconsequential our earlier distinctions between the voluntary and the involuntary dropout. While it makes a great deal of sense theoretically to make such a distinction (see our earlier discussion of page 13), it is not possible to find an available measure which will take such a distinction into account. Thus, what is perhaps the most critical theoretical
consideration with respect to the dropout literature escapes an examination in this research.

A second limitation arises from the fact that the Des Moines school system has no records on dropouts for schools outside of Des Moines, so our investigation of school dropout is limited to the approximately 320 respondents from the city of Des Moines proper.

Finally, the school system keeps no records of school dropouts who subsequently return to school. It is possible that those youth listed as dropout returned to school almost immediately, after a few years, or perhaps not at all. Thus, no distinction can be made between temporary and permanent dropouts.

Despite these limitations, some value may be gleaned from the analysis of school dropout records. We have recorded that approximately 10 percent of the students from the city proper did drop out of school. This is a number large enough for subsequent partialing techniques. It is a figure comparable to what school administrations have led us to believe is accurate, given the age, sex, and class distribution of our respondents. In addition, we are also able to place the date of the dropout, and so, eventually, we can develop case histories on such youth documenting not simply possible dates of delinquency and school dropout, but also the kinds of grades received at particular periods of
the school experience.

From the total number of returned questionnaires there were 41 school dropouts and 359 nondropouts. Because of incompletions in the data our analysis of Stage I hypotheses was limited to 34 dropout and 287 nondropouts. The number of cases varies slightly in Stages II and III in accordance with incompletions in the independent variables involved.

**School underachievement**

**Standardized test achievement** Two measures of underachievement are used in this research project: performance in a standardized achievement test and classroom grades earned by students. A fairly conventional measure having widespread usage is that of the standardized underachievement test, normed by varying I.Q. levels. Dr. A. N. Hieronymus of the Iowa Testing Center, University of Iowa, has been a leader in this approach (Hieronymus, 1951). Over the past two decades, he has developed the Iowa Test of Educational Development, which attempts to measure pupil achievement in both grammar school and junior high school children. Much of his effort has been aimed at norming the test scores for varying I.Q. levels, so that whatever a child's I.Q. level is, we are able to have his achievement scores placed on a scale of from 1 percent to 100 percent.

While there is no commonly-agreed-upon standard of underachievement, Dr. Hieronymus has found that for research
purposes the lowest 20th percentile for any particular I.Q. category may be safely used as the criteria for underachievement. Such scores are herein thought of as low STA scores (Standardized Test Achievement).

In as much as the Des Moines school system administers the Iowa Test of Educational Development to all of its students in the 3rd, 6th and 9th grades, almost all of the Des Moines students in our survey had scores recorded from the 6th grade and a great many also had scores recorded from their 9th year. For research purposes, we used the most recent test results available in any particular case. The result was that approximately one-half of the I.T.E.D. scores used were from the 6th grade while the other half were from the 9th grade.

The availability of this test for underachievement in the Des Moines school system was an important consideration for use in this research. In addition, however, it is widely used in varying parts of the country and must be considered a leading test for achievement measurement.

The use of this measure is not without its drawbacks. School personnel have indicated to me that students do not seem highly motivated in the taking of the test and that scores for bright students, particularly, may be misleading. In addition, a test such as this which is given so seldom must be considered less reliable than would some measure
which would take into account the day to day performance of the child. Certainly physical or mental fatigue or illness during the testing period would undermine the reliability of the instrument. For these reasons it was decided to use, in addition, an underachievement measure based on the grades received from pupils' work in class.

A total of 74 youth had STA scores in the lowest 20 percentile and thus were considered to be STA underachievers. A total of 214 youth had STA scores higher than the 20th percentile.

**Grades in school** A second measure for underachievement in school is that of grades. Grades normally are not a measurement of underachievement since no stipulation is normally made for the level at which the student is capable of achieving. In our Des Moines records of grades, however, we have found that youngsters in their junior high school years were "tracked" into three classes according to what the teacher perceived to be the level of ability. The tracks ranging from low to high are: basic, general, and advanced. Grades ranging from A to F were given in each of the three tracks and thus such grades would seem to be a measure of the adolescent's ability to achieve in terms of his ability level. A grade of "C" in any of the tracks means that an individual is performing acceptably in terms of his or her ability. A "B" would mean that a student
was doing well regardless of the track level and a "D" would mean that a student was not meeting the demands which may normally be placed upon students having the certain level of ability identified by that track. Some research effort has gone into an analysis of how the tracks of the Des Moines school system have been established and what the consequences have been.

The literature of these two measures (normed I.T.E.D. scores and "tracked" grades) relevant to the question of underachievement is scanty, presumably because each of these measures is relatively recent in origin and has not been systematically related to the question of identifying and helping the underachiever.

Since most of the adolescent respondents were young and since we wanted to accumulate information which would be comparable to the I.T.E.D. scores of the 6th and 9th grades, it was decided to focus upon the grade point average which the child had made during the entire period of the junior high years. Since tracking is done only for the courses in social studies and English, it was decided to utilize only these subjects in the establishment of the grade point average. A few students did not yet have an accumulated record for junior high school, and in those instances the 6th grade scores for English and social studies were averaged.
The coding for grades raised an interesting problem. Normally, one would think of "C" grades as average and satisfactory for the completion of high school. However, in this study, we are particularly interested in analyzing that class of students who aspire either to some portion of a college education, or the white collar positions or better for which college training tends to be a prerequisite. This being the case, the critical question was whether an average of "C" would be sufficient to attain the "high" level of occupational or educational aspirations as just defined.

Letter grades were assigned to numerical averages on the basis of the following scale.

- 3.50 to 4.00 = A
- 2.75 to 3.49 = B
- 1.75 to 2.74 = C
- .76 to 1.74 = D
- below .74 = F

While it is clear that scores in the D and F range would not be conducive to college enrollment, a score of C was difficult to code either as school success or failure. The decision was made to code it as success since, in most cases, grades in that range would neither deny high school graduation nor college enrollment.

A total of 33 youth had G.P.A.'s of less than 1.75
while 260 youth had G.P.A.'s of 1.75 or better.

The number of respondents from our sample for whom we can do an analysis of underachievement, both for grades and achievement score, is diminished for a number of reasons. Initially, as in the case of school dropout, the measures are limited to the Des Moines School system. The accumulated records for all Des Moines schools are found at Tech High School, which expedited their use considerably. Should it have been necessary to get this information for the entire county, I would have had to elicit the necessary information about dropouts, I.Q.'s, achievement tests, grades, and tracking levels from each of the individual schools from the remainder of the county. While all schools with the city system employ the tracking mechanism, it is unlikely that many schools in the remainder of the county would also use it.

In addition to the elimination of rural and suburban respondents, our sample suffers from additional attrition for reasons not entirely clear. The records of a large number of students were missing information needed in making the calculations. Particularly noticeable by their absence were I.Q. scores and I.T.E.D. scores. These deletions may be the result of spotty school attendance during the times when the tests were given or an indication that some students who appeared in our survey may have
recently moved to the city and thus such records were not available for them. Most of the missing information was from the records of students from working class or lower class families (SHOC sample), which underscores the premise that it is poor classroom attendance and illness rather than family mobility which lies behind most of the omissions.

Independent variables

Anomie As indicated in the theory chapter, the independent variable used in Stage I of this research is anomie. It was defined as "the breakdown in the body of common rules which regulated the relationships among the elements of the social system." In particular our focus is upon the relationship between goal aspirations and legitimated socio-economic opportunities. One of the major hypotheses of the research is that when high aspirations are held by a person who suffers from a handicapped environment in which his opportunities for success are limited, he will be prevented from making progress toward his goal aspirations. Such a condition is thought to generate feelings of frustration over his failure, such that the person is increasingly pressured to utilize deviant means to attain his goals or to otherwise make anti-social adjustments such as withdrawal.
Goal aspirations

The problem for measurement is, then, how to measure the two components of anomie: the level of goal aspiration and the level of socio-economic opportunity. As indicated earlier, the general concept of goal aspirations has been broken down into educational goal aspirations and occupational goal aspirations. We turn, now, to the question as to how these sub-general concepts are to be measured.

Educational goal aspirations

In so far as the distinction between high and low occupational aspirations rests on differences in desired educational attainment, it seemed valuable to ask a question which would elicit that kind of information. Question 22 asks, "About how much schooling do you think you ought to have to get the kind of job that you want?" The closed format included five response categories ranging from "completion of the ninth grade" to "completion of college." Once again the particularly valued distinction was between those who acknowledged the importance of college and those who did not.

A number of criticisms have been raised against the type of aspirations measurement employed in this research.

Corwin urges the use of the word "ambition" to refer to the desire to achieve at a high level of performance. Operationally, says Corwin, ambition refers to the sacrifices which a person is willing to make in order to increase
his status, either in comparison to his present status, or that of his parents. He suggests, further, that one can measure ambition either in terms of the degree of status change desired, or in terms of the amount of proposed sacrifice which the actor seems willing to undertake (Corwin, 1965, p. 207). This final emphasis seems to this writer to be an important contribution. It may be that a lack of realism permeates adolescent claims for ambition, and that a more accurate assessment of the adolescent's ambitions could be captured if the adolescent were to face up to the sacrifices necessitated by his choice. For example, an adolescent may aspire to be a doctor and yet, when confronted with some inkling of the time and money required to attain such a goal, may quite willingly discard the ambition. In this context it seems clear that critics of the United States educational system have scored a telling point when they remark that societal manpower concerns seems to dictate that highly unrealistic ambitions are flaunted before adolescents, generally without the corresponding sensitive assessment of the particular child's skills and limitations. In short, the needs of the social system have had a strong predominance over the needs of individual adolescents.

Having separated the highly aspiring youngsters from those with modest ends, it is then important to distinguish
various types of ambitiousness in the high-aspiring group. First of all, there is the question as to whether the actor seeks the rewards of the high position or a chance to perform important functions associated with the position. One study shows that highly able students desire positions with responsibilities commensurate with the rewards, while less able students seems concerned with the rewards apart from commensurate responsibilities (Burnstein et al., 1963, pp. 212-218). Corwin suggests that it is the latter group which draws disproportionately from families which are status-deprived, but materialistically oriented (Corwin, 1965, p. 209). (For questions relating to this dimension, see items 30-32 of the research questionnaire in Appendix B.)

The second dimension of ambitiousness raises the question as to whether the adolescent is responding to an idealized occupational image or, in fact, he has a good understanding of the type of work involved. This is, of course, a different dimension than the one raised above concerning the kind of sacrifices required in pursuit of the occupation (Corwin, 1965, p. 210).

A final dimension concerns the means which are to be used in the attainment of the position. It would seem that social skills linked to middle class background might be necessary to obtain certain positions, whereas the mastery of technical skills would be adequate for the performance
of the positional requirements. In short, the willingness on the part of an actor to acquire the technical skills prerequisite to the position is hardly a guarantee that the position will be attained (Corwin, 1965, p. 210).

Corwin combines these three types of ambitiousness (he calls them motivational types) with another set of types dealing with the degree to which an actor is "involved" (i.e. personally committed) to the ambition as opposed to the degree to which he is "committed" by force of external controls from family or community reference groups. The following four types of vocational commitment are generated from a convergence of the factors mentioned above.

The types are: (1) the dedicated, who is both personally involved and formally committed to the vocation; (2) the creative, who is personally immersed in his work but without formal commitment to do it (and who will potentially contribute most to the field); (3) the transient, who is personally uninvolved but temporarily or marginally committed to the field; and (4) the disillusioned, who has lost interest in the vocation (has become uninvolved) and will drop out (become uncommitted) (Corwin, 1965, p. 211).

Super argues that the total life pattern, which he describes in terms of such dominant stages as marginality, regression, and security, must be taken into account in the measurement of aspirational levels, particularly when they are taken in combination with the person's current socio-economic status and the degree to which he is sensitive to group norms (Super, 1954).
Corwin argues that motivation is more a consequence of "self-fulfillment" and that career aspirations are influenced by: (1) the kind of occupational "role conception" (a component of the total self-conception), (2) the certainty with which the occupational "role conception" is held, and (3) the degree to which the actor experiences deprivation (frustration) as he moves toward the actualization of the goals (Corwin, 1965, p. 206).

This final conclusion seems also to be a guiding hypothesis behind the work of some motivational theorists in psychology who participate in what is called the "expectancy-value" tradition. Atkinson and Vroom have argued that motivation depends upon the anticipated value of some outcome and also upon the expectancy that one's motive-relevant behavior can succeed in obtaining the outcome. Bachman states this principle in the following way.

The distinction between expectancy and outcome is particularly important in the analysis of the motivation of disadvantaged groups. It is often assumed that motivational problems in these groups comes from a lack of desire for the achievement goals and incentives in our society—"they don't have middle class values." It is possible, however, that the problems of lack of desire for the goals that our society offers and more from a feeling that they have little chance of obtaining these goals (Bachman, 1967, p. 114).

Turner's research suggests that the usual differences found between middle and working class attitudes are not
obtained when the questions focus on what is valued and admired, but are obtained when the questions focus on the student's expectancies for his own life (Bachman, 1967, p. 114). Gurin and Bradford argue that this expectancy dimension, in contrast to the value dimension, is highly susceptible to environmental and educational influences (Bachman, 1967, p. 114). A team of researchers at the Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, have begun a series of studies of adolescents in which they expect to find "that different school environments, and also different work environments, will show important motivational effects and that these effects will operate primarily through a modification in expectancies" (Bachman, 1967, p. 114). For example, in the area of occupational aspirations, the most effective schools are expected to be those which succeed in establishing expectancies realistically based on an awareness of effective paths to occupational attainment. It seems to this writer that such realistic programs are likely to have the greatest benefit for those who are relatively disadvantaged, i.e., those who would be most likely to start out with unrealistic perceptions toward education, job or income. (For Questionnaire items dealing with aspirations and expectancies, see items 18-23.)

S. M. Miller, on the basis of studies at the Syracuse University Youth Development Center and at the Higher
Horizons Program in Harlem concludes that Negroes "seem" particularly interested in education and "seem" to have higher levels of educational aspiration than do Caucasians at each class level. Miller, however, is distrustful of such findings.

A large percentage now said that they wanted to be physicians, lawyers, and the like (following Higher Horizons program). What does this mean? Awareness of only a limited number of middle-class occupations which are well known because of their high prestige? Or an indication of a rise in hopes, but not a specific dedication to the particular occupation mentioned? Or the translation of middle-class occupations, so that they become the equivalence of the common high-prestige occupations of lower-class children? Or is the high professional aspiration a specific desire for the specific occupation? We lack the knowledge to clarify the significance of aspirations (Rose, 1967, p. 413).

Miller confesses that he approaches such findings from the standpoint of the skeptic, preferring to question methodology rather than to analyze the implications of serendipitous results. It may well be that the findings of a large number of studies, the Coleman report included, which find high levels of Negro aspiration, may have failed to ask the deeper measurement questions which lie behind the data, or it may be that American Negroes have finally come to take seriously the promise of educational opportunity and material success which seems so basic to the American Dream. If these are, in fact, aspirations seriously held, the vast
differences in school achievement between rich and poor, black and white, seem destined to foster higher levels of frustration and anger among the disadvantaged peoples of our society. It is for the reason that subsequent research by the writer will emphasize the black and white distinction within the present set of materials.

**Occupational goal aspirations**

Occupational goal aspirations were measured by an unstructured question, number 18 in the questionnaire. Since it seemed not feasible to prepare a checklist of occupations to which adolescents might possibly aspire, it was decided, instead, to simply ask the respondent "What kind of work would you like to do for a living?" While the instructions for the questionnaire administrator urged that he encourage the respondent to provide a description of the kind of work desired, in most cases only the barest of information was communicated, such as in the responses of "test pilot", "engineer", or "counselor". Many respondents gave more than one occupational preference, but they were almost always at the same general occupational level. The responses were coded into three major categories: (a) white collar or higher, (b) skilled worker, and (c) semi-skilled or unskilled worker. For most of our analysis categories, b and c were joined to form the category of "low" occupational goal aspirations, with category a constituting "high"
occupational goal aspirations. The resulting response breakdown consisted of 258 responses favoring high occupational goal aspirations, while 100 held low occupational goal aspirations. Slightly over 100 responses to question 18 were either completely omitted or so incomplete as to prevent adequate coding. The occupational listing of the United States Census Bureau served as the guide for making the occupational distinctions into three and eventually two classes.

It was thought desirable to keep the number of goal aspirations categories as small as possible, since the research design calls for partialling these categories into sub-categories later in the analysis. The existence of small numbers of classes, each with large numbers of responses serves to facilitate the partialling process.

The question as to where to draw the line separating low aspirers from high is a very important one and deserves detailed consideration here. The writer was most interested in separating out those occupations which normally require at least some college training. The pursuit of the wide range of positions from white collar jobs through business and professional positions demand that the potential job incumbent be able to delay his desire for immediate gratification long enough to serve a period of from one year to ten years training beyond high school completion. Such a
requirement places lower class youth at a disadvantage. In addition to this motivational factor, suitable role models occupying such positions are presumably necessary in order to elicit a favorable response to the job by the youth. Youth from lower class families commonly lack such role models. In addition, since the period of tutelage is often one of unemployment or, at least low pay, a person pursuing such training would need the reserve financial resources to carry him through to the completion of the training. From this description of what is needed to attain white collar positions, it is clear that youth would be disadvantaged in the completion of such requirements by low parental occupational status, being Negro, coming from a large family, and the absence of the father from the family.

Shown in Table 2 is the distribution of education goal aspirations and occupational goal aspirations that were found to exist respectively in the educational and occupational aspirations samples of this research project. It is clear that high aspirations are much more common than low aspirations and that educational aspirations tend to be higher than occupational aspirations.

Socio-economic opportunities Having examined the measurement and coding of the concepts dealing with goal aspirations we must now turn to the question of opportunities. The critical question now becomes, "What kinds
Table 2. Aspirations distribution for educational and occupational aspirations samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Aspiration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (high school completion or less)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (&quot;some college&quot; or &quot;college completion&quot;)</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Aspiration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (skilled worker or lower)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (White collar worker or higher)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of opportunity limitations act to prevent an adolescent from attaining at least some college training and the higher occupational levels which tend to accompany it?" Four kinds of opportunity limitations are measurable from the responses given by the adolescents to the questionnaire. These are: the occupational level of the parents, the race of the respondent, the size of the family, and finally, whether the father is resident in the family.

Obviously, the kinds of factors studied are limited by the characteristics of the respondents in the sample. While it would, no doubt, have been valuable to find out the income
of the family or the educational backgrounds of both father and mother, there seemed to be little likelihood that adolescent respondents would be able to convey this kind of information to us.

**Parental occupational level**

Questions 8 through 11 were designed to elicit information from the adolescent respondent about the father's occupational level, while questions 12 through 15 were designed to gather that same information about the mother. For the most part, the questions are open-ended, and the child was encouraged to describe in as much detail as possible the parental occupational characteristics. Once again, the open-end question brought less than fully desired results, since the respondents seemed unable or unwilling to comment on their parent's occupational characteristics in other than a very minimal way. The highly simplistic character of our coding, however, enabled us to place almost every written response into either the category of skilled worker or lower, as opposed to white collar worker or higher. It is remarkable, however, what a large number of SHOC sample respondents would not or could not give us even the most basic information about their parent's occupation. If the father was absent from the home, we based our estimation of socio-economic status on the occupational level of the mother.

When it was not possible to use the respondent's answers
as the key to parental occupational level, two other alternative were used. School records normally include a reference to the occupational designation of the parents. It tends to be accurate, since it normally is a form taken home by the child and filled out by the parent. Once again, information for families outside the city limits was not available. In addition to filling in some missing data, school records on parental occupation served as a way of checking the adolescent responses. Finally, in about 10 cases the city directory was used to provide information about parental occupational levels.

For the remaining three questions dealing with opportunity limitations, the information provided by the adolescent respondents was quite adequate. Question 6 provided information as to the size of the family living at home and, in addition, specified whether the father was living in the home. The size of the family was tabulated by taking the number of persons indicated by the child and adding one additional person since there was no place in the response for the child to count himself.

Race Respondents who were members of racial minorities were viewed as having an opportunity limitation. While there are many ways to identify minority group members, such as through objective characteristics, such as skin color or hair texture, in this research we
have allowed the respondent to specify his racial character. A respondent who checks the response category "Negro" is considered to be such in this research project.

**Head of household** The absence of the father from the family home is also considered to be an opportunity limitation. The father's absence was noted when the respondent failed to check the category "father" when identifying those "family members living at home." Included in such a category would be voluntary departure of the father (divorce, desertion), as well as involuntary departure (death, imprisonment).

**Family size** The size of the family living at home should be an indication of overcrowding, particularly in the working and lower classes. Exactly at what point a large family becomes so large as to constitute an opportunity liability is not known. I have arbitrarily chosen eight as the number of total family members which would create difficulties in the home. Eight or more family members was coded as an opportunity limitation and less than eight was not coded as an opportunity limitation.

It might be argued that a large family is only a disadvantage in those families with limited financial resources, and that families with large incomes easily accommodate themselves to large families. If there were true, a measure of opportunity limitations should include a combination of
socio-economic status and family size. There are two limitations in this type of reasoning. First, it is commonly the economically less well off families who have the larger numbers of children as well as the accumulations of other relatives in their household. The economically well off are likely to have smaller families and are better able to care for indigent relatives in ways other than a mutual dwelling.

Secondly, a large family can constitute a socio-economic limitation for the child even apart from the question of family living standards. A large family tends to mean that the children receive less of parental attention and supervision. Even in a well-to-do family, children may grow up feeling neglected and less subject to parental control and supervision than will children growing up in smaller families. For these reasons, I have chosen not to measure opportunity limitation with some combination of socio-economic status and family size.

Given in Table 3 is the distribution of the four types of socio-economic opportunity. There are given for the educational aspirations sample. From Table 3 it can be seen that the single most common opportunity limitation is that of parental occupational level (blue collar or lower is 45 percent). Limitations by nature of race (Black) were
Table 3. Socio-economic opportunity distribution for educational aspirations sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (white collar or higher)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Occupational Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (blue collar or lower)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother or Guardian</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (8 or more)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (7 or less)</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

characteristic of 26.3 percent while the limitation of an absent father and a large family size characterized 16.8 percent and 10.9 percent, respectively.

**Opportunity index** Having examined the four measures of socio-economic opportunity, I now propose to compile them into a single index of socio-economic opportunity, hereafter known as the opportunity index. In
the construction of the index, I have chosen to weigh each of the four factors equally, since there exists no clear rationale for weighting them differently.

Potential scores for the index range from zero to four, a point being given for each opportunity limitation. The respondents were divided in such a way that scores of zero and one are classified as high opportunity, while scores of two, three, and four are classified as low opportunity. The reasons for dividing the responses at this point are as follows: (1) Theoretically, it would seem that one limitation might be overcome, but two limitations would constitute a significant hurdle. (2) In anticipation of the partialling process which is to follow, it was necessary to divide the opportunity scores in such a way as to create a large number of cases in each of the two opportunity categories. By "breaking" the index scores between "1" and "2", this end was accomplished. (3) Since there were a large number of church sample cases and a few SHOC cases whose parental occupation could not be ascertained but who suffered from no other limitations, it was possible, under this coding system to place them into the high opportunity category, since it was clear that they could not have had more than one opportunity limitation.

From Table 4 it is concluded that three out of four youths in our survey could be characterized as being "high"
Table 4. Opportunity index distribution for educational aspirations samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity Limitation (score of 2 or more)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Limitation Index (Educational aspiration sample)</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Opportunity Limitation (score of 1 or 0)</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in socio-economic opportunities. Operationally this means that only about one youth in four had more than one opportunity limitation.

Aspiration-opportunity categories

Every respondent, then, was coded as either high or low on the opportunity index. These designations were then joined with those responses dealing with goal aspirations. The result was that for each aspirational sample four aspiration-opportunity categories were generated. The distribution of these is as shown in Table 5 and Table 6.

In both tables, respondents with high aspirations and low opportunities were classes as "high anomie" while the remaining categories were classes as "low anomie."
Table 5. Aspiration-opportunity categories for respondents specifying educational aspiration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(High Anomie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High educational aspiration-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low opportunity (HA-LO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Anomie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High educational aspiration-</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High opportunity (HA-HO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Anomie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low educational aspiration-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High opportunity (LA-HO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Anomie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low educational aspiration-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low opportunity (LA-LO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

475 100.0

aFor both Tables 5 and 6, the distribution of responses is based on the total number of codeable responses to aspiration and opportunity questions. When these categories are related to anti-social behavior categories, only the N for the juvenile delinquency distribution remains at the levels shown here. The N for school dropout is slightly less and the N's for STA and GPA are substantially lower. (See Appendix A, Tables A1-A8.)

Table 6. Aspiration-opportunity categories for respondents specifying occupation aspiration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(High Anomie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High occupational aspiration-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low opportunity (HA-LO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Anomie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High occupational aspiration-</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High opportunity (HA-HO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Anomie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low occupational aspiration-</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High opportunity (LA-HO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Anomie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low occupational aspiration-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low opportunity (LA-LO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

399 100.0
Perceived goal blockage  The second independent variable under consideration is that of perceived blockage. Having asked the respondents to indicate their goal aspirations in the areas of education and occupation, I then asked the respondents to indicate the likelihood with which they would attain the desired goal. Questions 19 and 23 ask about the likelihood of attaining the desired occupational level and the desired educational level respectively.

Educational blockage  It was originally my plan to code the responses to question 23 in such a way that "very good", "good", and "fair" would constitute the absence of perceived educational blockage, while "poor" and "very poor" would be indicative of perceived blockage. However, the very small number of respondents specifying the latter categories indicated the desirability of including the designation of "fair" in the category of perceived blockage. This seems a justifiable coding maneuver in that those specifying "fair", as their assessment of the "occupational" changes certainly are more pessimistic than those indicating "good" or "very good".

This experience with perceived blockage would seem to be a suitable commentary on the need to keep a certain amount of flexibility in designated coding categories.
Table 7. Perceived blockage distribution for educational and occupational aspirations samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Educational Blockage (Educational aspirational sample)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (good and very good educational chances)</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (fair, poor and very poor educational chances)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived Occupational Blockage (Occupational aspirations sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Occupational Blockage (Occupational aspirations sample)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (&quot;good&quot; and &quot;very good&quot; occupational chances)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (&quot;fair&quot;, &quot;poor&quot; and &quot;very poor&quot; occupational chances)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupational blockage**

The coding operations for the matter of perceived occupational blockage were subject to the same changes as in the case of perceived educational blockage. The absence of response patterns of "poor" and "very poor" required that the response "fair" be placed in the category indicating perceived blockage.

Table 7 suggests that a large majority of youth in the survey feel that their chances of attaining their success goals are either "good" or "very good". There was somewhat greater pessimism concerning their achievement of occupational goals (25 percent) than was true of their achievement.
of educational goals (17 percent).

**Institutional alienation** In the theory chapter it was specified that one intention of the alienation section of the research was to examine alienation as being "institutionally specific" rather than generally applicable to all situations. This point of view led to the development of a number of concepts, such as law enforcement alienation, school authority alienation, and parental alienation. It was further suggested that these types of alienation could be focused either at the personnel which directed these basic institutions or toward the rules under which they are governed. In this research, our intent is to focus primarily upon the personnel of institutions as the targets of youthful animosity, but to touch upon other sources of potential irritation as well.

The following items (Table 8) were used from question 38 as indicators of institutional alienation. The Law Enforcement Alienation Index consisted of six items while the School Authority Alienation Index and the Parental Alienation Index each consisted of only two items each. Each of these questions is shown below in terms of the question number, the item content and the responses indicative of alienation. SD stands for "strongly disagree", D stands for "disagree", A stands for "agree" while SA stands for "strongly agree". See Appendix B, pages 258-259.
Table 8. Institutional alienation indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item Content</th>
<th>Responses Indicative of Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Alienation Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-1</td>
<td>&quot;fair trial&quot; (police and court authorities)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-2</td>
<td>&quot;big time crooks&quot; (police and court authorities)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-3</td>
<td>&quot;report friend&quot; (police and court authorities)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-4</td>
<td>&quot;innocent persons&quot; (police and court authorities)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-5</td>
<td>&quot;police loyal&quot; (police and court authorities)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-16</td>
<td>&quot;society treats&quot; (police and court authorities)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Authority Alienation Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-8</td>
<td>&quot;teachers grade lower&quot; (attitude toward school authorities)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-14</td>
<td>&quot;respect teachers and prin.&quot; (attitude toward school authorities)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Alienation Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-9</td>
<td>&quot;talk to parents&quot; (attitude toward parents)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-15</td>
<td>&quot;parent's controls&quot; (attitude toward parents)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the three separate institutional alienation indices was examined to discover the degree to which the various items within it were intercorrelated. While neither of the two items in school authority alienation nor the two items in parental alienation were intercorrelated, there did exist a high degree of intercorrelation within the six items of the law enforcement alienation index. (See Table 9.) Of the 15 possible relationships within the law-enforcement alienation index, seven were found to be statistically significant. These significant relationships are shown in Table 9. Because of the highly intercorrelated character of the six items in the law enforcement alienation index it was decided that this index would be used as the main investigative tool in the examination of institutional alienation. Also, as stated earlier, an attempt will be made to see whether alienation toward law-enforcement institutions will be associated with delinquency specifically or with a wider range of anti-social behaviors such as that of school dropout and underachievement. If we find that law-enforcement alienation goes beyond delinquency in its impact then this would underscore the approach of many writers who have attempted to measure alienation as a general concept rather than as an "institutionally specific" one.

Since the question of alienation from school authority
Table 9. Significant intercorrelations for police-court alienation (6 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report friends (Q-38-3)</td>
<td>.197**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair trial (Q-38-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest innocent (Q-38-4)</td>
<td>.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report friends (Q-38-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police loyal to each other (Q-38-5)</td>
<td>.250**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report friends (Q-38-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police loyal to each other (Q-38-5)</td>
<td>.200**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest innocent (Q-38-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police loyal to each other (Q-38-5)</td>
<td>.190**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society treats so badly (Q-38-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police loyal to each other (Q-38-5)</td>
<td>.164**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest innocent (Q-38-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society treats so badly (Q-38-16)</td>
<td>.149*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair trial (Q-38-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.
is an important one in this research the two items dealing with that will be examined for their separate relationships with anti-social behavior in Chapter Five.

**Law-enforcement alienation**

Questions 38-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 16 all attempt to measure alienation toward law enforcement institutions. Questions 1 and 2 focus upon the functioning of the courts, while questions 3, 4, and 5 concern police activities. In both cases, the conduct is appraised in light of ideals which are normally expected of police and court activity. Question 16 focuses upon society in general and raises the question as to whether civil disobedience is not justified for particularly disadvantaged persons.

One of the common measurement distinctions discussed in the social psychological literature is that which differentiates between the cognitive, evaluative, and behavioral intention dimensions of a statement. By cognitive is meant that a person perceives that something occurs apart from making any judgment about it. By evaluative is meant that a person makes a value judgment about a perceived "fact". In the behavioral intention form, the respondent goes beyond the evaluation to the point of saying that he is so stirred by the act that his behavior will be affected by it. There is good evidence to believe that this final dimension is the one which is most highly correlated with the actual
behavior of the respondent, if such could be observed. Of
the six questions in the law enforcement index, 1, 2, 4, and
5 are strictly cognitive, with 3 and 15 being evaluative
statements. None of the statements fall into the classi­
fication of behavioral intention, and thus the statements
must be thought of as probably less than fully adequate
predictors of behavior. The reason behavioral intention
statements were not included is that the kind of behavior
being investigated is controversial, and thus might serve
to pressure respondents into the falsification of answers,
and even perhaps create a feeling of suspicion toward the
research.

The questions take the form of a Likert scale, with a
range of options from strongly agree to strongly disagree.
A deviation of our form from that of the Likert scale is
that a respondent is not able to register a "no opinion"
in a way other than refusing to answer. This is a delib­
erate attempt on our part to encourage every respondent to
take a position on every statement included. Since there
were controversial statements, it would seem to be very
tempting for the respondent to answer "no opinion". The
danger in this approach is that the limited number of op­
tions may force the respondent into a response that he
would not ordinarily make. In particular, it may force
persons into responding in the "agree" or "disagree"
categories, rather than in a "no opinion" category which they might have preferred. I offer three defenses against this criticism although they by no means allow the problem to be dismissed. Initially, a person would be able to register his lack of opinion by not responding to the statement. Secondly, since these matters are controversial, it seems unlikely that youth would have no opinion about them, particularly since the questions were designed for youthful respondents. Indeed, it seems questionable to even encounter "no opinion" as a theoretical alternative, since this would require either a total lack of information about the issue involved, or a situation of such ambivalence that exactly the same weight of opinion exists on the agree and disagree sides of the issue. Finally, I would argue that "no opinions" would tend to be randomly distributed among the "agree" and "disagree" alternatives, and thus could be largely eliminated from consideration as a biasing influence.

While these three arguments somewhat offset the criticism about the forced response pattern, the absence of a "no opinion" category may bias the conclusions somewhat. My ultimate defense of this procedure is that I believe that the inclusion of a "no opinion" category would have done more harm to the research design than good because of the release from response that would have been offered to the respondents.
Table 10. Law-enforcement alienation index distribution for educational aspirations samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (score of 0-3)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law-Enforcement Alienation Index (Educational aspirations sample)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (score of 4-6)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 10, 64 of 360 or 17.7 percent of the respondents were scored as alienated toward law enforcement institutions. In Chapter Four an investigation will be conducted to show the degree to which high law enforcement alienation is associated with the forms of adolescent antisocial behavior.

The six items in the law enforcement alienation index were given equal weight. It was arbitrarily decided that if a respondent gave an alienative response three times or less, he would be classed as nonalienative. If his alienative responses totaled four or more, he was classed as being alienative.

School authority alienation The two questions dealing with adolescent Alienation toward school authority were not intercorrelated. This requires a separate examination for each question as to how its responses are
correlated with the types of anti-social behavior. Because of the weak character of our school authority alienation measure it was decided not to employ it in the stage III hypotheses but to employ the law-enforcement alienation index only. As indicated on page 115 a second reason for applying the law-enforcement character index to all forms of anti-social behavior was that we wanted to see whether a single type of institutional alienation was able to help explain both these forms of anti-social behavior specific to it (delinquency) as well as those not specific to it as in the cases of school dropout and underachievement.

Statistical tests As this chapter of measurement is concluded it is well to specify the character of the statistical test to be used in making conclusions about the data. For the purposes of this study a statistical test is needed which will specify the likelihood that a particular finding could be attributed to chance. In this matter this research will follow the convention of concluding that an hypothesis is supported if the chance component is considered to be five percent or less. When one speaks of an hypothesis as being supported as the .05 level of statistical significance one says, in effect, that the possibility that such a finding could have occurred by chance is five percent or less.

Statistical significance is largely a function of the
strength of the substantive relationship between the variables and the size of the sample. While a very strong association may be seen to exist within the variables a small number of cases would mean that the outcome could be heavily influenced by chance. Conversely, a relatively small association distributed over a large number of cases may be considered to be statistically significant. In the main our concern is with statistical significance but where it seems helpful to do so, it will be pointed out that cases of substantive significance (as indicated by a high association among the variables) have been obliterated by a small number of cases.

Since the data in this research involve almost entirely variables which are nominal and ordinal rather than interval and ratio it was necessary to use a nonparametric statistic. Within the wide range of nonparametric statistics available it was decided to use Chi-Square \((X^2)\). Chi-Square is a relatively simple test statistic useful with both nominal and ordinal data. In this instance while some of the data was ordinal in character, the research plan called for placing all data in 2x2 contingency tables so as to create the sufficient numbers in each category needed to effectively carry out an extended partialling process. In so doing the continuous character of some variables has been recoded in such a way as to produce discrete variables. The fact that
we are working solely with discrete variables constitutes an important reason for the use of the Chi-Square statistic. The statistical hypothesis has been framed in such a way so as to review for the reader the theoretically anticipated outcome in the $H_A$ form as well as the null hypothesis ($H_0$) form more appropriate to the use of the Chi-Square statistic.\footnote{The author recognizes that the Chi-Square results as given in the tables are not completely accurate in so far as the assumption of independence has been violated to some extent.}

Finally, Chi-Square is a measure of association between two or more variables. Theoretical considerations demand that we move beyond matters of association and, at least, suggest the direction of causal relations. This speculation about causal relations will be carried out in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FOUR FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH

In this section the hypotheses will be stated parsimoniously at the four levels previously discussed. Following the presentation of the null statistical hypothesis the data will be introduced in order to test the hypothesis. Chapter Five will be devoted to a discussion of the findings and the conclusions which may be drawn from them.

Stage I Statements and Tests of Hypotheses

General Hypothesis I:

If youth have more anomie (high goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth who have less anomie.

Sub-Hypothesis 1:

If youth have high educational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency than youth who do not.

Empirical Hypothesis 1:

If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater incidence of referrals
to the juvenile court for delinquent behavior than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

**H₁**: If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of cases referred to the juvenile court than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

**H₀₁**: If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will not have a greater proportion of cases referred to the juvenile court than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

When the high aspirations-low opportunities category was examined separately with the other three aspiration-opportunity categories the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. While the HA-LO category¹ as

¹Throughout this assessment of findings the aspiration-opportunity categories will be designated by their initials. These are as follows: HA-LO=high aspiration-low opportunity; HA-HO=high aspiration-high opportunity; LA-HO=low aspiration-high opportunity; LA-LO=low aspiration-low opportunity.
predicted had significantly greater delinquency than the HA-HO category, $X^2 = 64.80$ (sig. at the .01 level), the HA-LO category did not have significantly greater delinquency than the LA-HO category, $X^2 = 1.60$ (not sig. at the .05 level) and the HA-LO category had significantly less delinquency than did the LA-LO category, $X^2 = 4.03$ (sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Table A1.

General Hypothesis I:

Youth who have more anomie (high goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth who have less anomie.

Sub-Hypothesis 2:

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency than will those who do not.

Empirical Hypothesis 2:

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then
they will have a greater incidence of referrals to the juvenile court for delinquent behavior than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

**H**$_2^A$: If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of cases referred to the juvenile court than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

**H**$_0^2$: If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will not have a greater proportion of cases referred to the juvenile court than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

When the high aspiration-low opportunity category was examined with the other three aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. While the HA-LO category had significantly more delinquency than the HA-HO category $X^2 = 32.5$ (sig. at the .01 level); and the LA-HO category $X^2 = 14.7$ (sig. at
the .01 level), the HA-LO category did not have significantly more delinquent than the LA-LO category $X^2 = 1.2$, (not sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Table A2.

General Hypothesis 1:

If youth have more anomic (high goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth who have less.

Sub-Hypothesis 3:

If youth have high educational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout than will those who do not.

Empirical Hypothesis 3:

If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater incidence of cases appearing on school dropout lists than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.
H₃: If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of cases appearing on school dropout lists than will be true of youth in the other aspiration-opportunity categories.

H₀₃: If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will not have a greater proportion of cases appearing on school dropout lists than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

When the high aspiration-low opportunity category was examined with the other three aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. While the HA-LO category had a significantly higher proportion of school dropouts than did the HA-LA category $X^2 = 53.04, (\text{sig. at the .01 level})$, the HA-LO category did not have a greater proportion of dropouts than the LA-HO category $X^2 = .4 \ (\text{not sig. at the .05 level})$. When paired with the LA-LO category, the HA-LO category was seen
to have a significantly lower proportion of dropouts $X^2 = 4.7$ (sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Table A3.

General Hypothesis I:

If youth have more anomie (high goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth who have less.

Sub-Hypothesis 4:

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout than will those who do not.

Empirical Hypothesis 4:

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater incidence of cases appearing on school dropout lists than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

H₄: If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities
(a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of cases appearing on school dropout lists than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

H⁰₄: If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will not have a greater proportion of cases appearing on school dropout lists than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

When the high aspiration-low opportunity category was examined with the other three aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. While the HA-LO category had significantly greater dropout proportions than the HA-HO category $X^2 = 27.7$ (sig. at the .01 level), differences with the LA-HO category were not significant $X^2 = 2.0$ (not sig. at the .05 level). When paired with the LA-LO category, the HA-LO category had a significantly lower proportion of dropouts $X^2 = 5.0$ (sig. at the .01 level). The overall data did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Table A4.
General Hypothesis I:

If youth have more anomie (high goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will those youth who have less.

Sub-Hypothesis 5:

If youth have high educational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not.

Empirical Hypothesis 5:

If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater incidence of low grades (as measured by the average of "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

H₅: If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of low grades (as measured by the average of "tracked" Junior High grades in
English and Social Studies) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

H₀5: If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will not have a greater proportion of low grades (as measured by the average of "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

When the high aspirations-low opportunities category was examined separately with the other three aspirations-opportunity categories the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. While the HA-LO category had significantly lower grades than the HA-HA category $X^2 = 32.50$ (sig. at the .01 level), the HA-LO category did not have significantly lower grades than either the LA-HO category or the LA-LO category ($X^2 = 1.32$ and 2.52 respectively, both non-sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Table A5.
General Hypothesis I:

If youth have more anomie (high goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth who have less.

Sub-Hypothesis 6:

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not.

Empirical Hypothesis 6:

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater incidence of low grades (as measured by the average of "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

H₆: If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of low grades (as measured by the average of "tracked" Junior High grades in English
and Social Studies) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

H.6: If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and low opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will not have a greater proportion of low grades (as measured by the average of "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

When the high aspiration-low opportunity category was examined with the other three aspiration-opportunity categories, the overall result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. While the HA-LO category had a significantly higher proportion of low grades $X^2 = 4.12$ (sig. at the .05 level); when compared to the LO-HA category, the proportion was not significant $X^2 = .22$ (not sig. at the .05 level). When paired with the LA-LO category, the HA-LO category had a significantly lower proportion of low grades $X^2 = 7.6$ (sig. at the .01 level). The data overall did not support the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Table A6.
General Hypothesis 1:

If youth have more anomie (high goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth who have less.

Sub-Hypothesis 7:

If youth have high educational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not.

Empirical Hypothesis 7:

If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater incidence of lower achievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

H₇: If youth who have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of cases of lower achievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-
If youth have high educational goal aspirations ("some college" or "college completion") and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will not have a greater proportion of cases of lower achievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

When the high aspirations-low opportunity category was examined with the other three aspirations categories the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. While the HA-LO category had significantly lower test scores than the HA-HO category $X^2 = 22.77$ (sig. at the .01 level), the HA-LO category did not have significantly lower test scores than either the LA-HO category or the LA-LO category ($X^2 = 3.08$ and 3.06 respectively, both nonsig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Table A7.

General Hypothesis I:

If youth have more anomie (high goal aspirations and low opportunities) then they will have a higher incidence of
ant-social behavior than will youth who do not.

Sub-Hypothesis 8:

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not.

Empirical Hypothesis 8:

If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater incidence of lower achievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

$H_A$: If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of cases of lower achievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

$H_0$: If youth have high occupational goal aspirations ("white collar" or higher) and limited opportunities (a score of "2" or more on the opportunity limitations index) then they will have a greater proportion of cases of lower achievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.
limitations index) then they will not have a greater proportion of cases of lower achievement as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ, than will be true of youth in the other three aspiration-opportunity categories.

When the high aspiration-low opportunity category was examined with the other aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. While the HA-LO category had significantly lower ITED scores than the HA-HO category $X^2 = 22.77$ (sig. at the .01 level), and the LA-HO category $X^2 = 4.6$ (sig. at the .05 level), the HA-LO category was not significantly less than the LA-LO category $X^2 = .22$ (not sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are found in Appendix A, Table A8.

Stage II Statements and Tests of Hypotheses

General Hypothesis II:
If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will those not perceiving blockage.

Sub-Hypothesis 1:
If youth perceive that their educational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of
juvenile delinquency than will those who do not perceive educational goal blockage.

Empirical Hypothesis 1:

In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured by juvenile court records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

H₁: In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a significantly higher proportion of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured by juvenile court records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

H₀₁: In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured
by juvenile court records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

When the relationship between perceived blockage and delinquency was examined for each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In none of the four categories was perceived blockage significantly associated with juvenile delinquency. The computed values were HA-LO, $X^2 = .42$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = 3.2$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = 2.58$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and LA-LO $X^2 = .19$ (not sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A9, A10, A11, A12.

General Hypothesis II:

If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of antisocial behavior than will those not perceiving blockage.

Sub-Hypothesis 2:

If youth perceive that their occupational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency than will those who do not perceive occupational goal blockage.
Empirical Hypothesis 2:

In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured by juvenile court records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

H$_A^2$: In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a significantly higher proportion of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured by juvenile court records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

H$_0^2$: In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured by juvenile court records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."
When the relationship between perceived blockage and delinquency was examined for each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In none of the three categories was perceived blockage associated with a significantly high proportion of delinquency cases. The computed statistics were HA-LO $X^2 = .05$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = 2.18$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and LA-LO $X^2 = .18$ (not sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A13, A14, A15, A16.

General Hypothesis II:

If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of antisocial behavior than will those not perceiving blockage.

Sub-Hypothesis 3:

If youth perceive that their educational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout than will those who do not perceive educational goal blockage.

---

1 As shown on page 223, the blockage-delinquency association in the LA-HO class was not calculated since no delinquents were located in that category.
Empirical Hypothesis 3:

In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout (as measured by school dropout lists) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

$H^3_A$: In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a significantly higher proportion of school dropout cases (as measured by school dropout records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

$H^3_0$: In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of school dropout cases (as measured by school dropout records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."
When the relationship between perceived blockage and school dropout was examined for each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In none of the four categories was perceived blockage significantly associated with school dropout. The computed values were HA-LO $X^2 = .61$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = 2.48$ (not sig. at the .05 level), LA-HO $X^2 = .23$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and LA-LO $X^2 = 1.8$ (not sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A17, A18, A19, A20.

General Hypothesis II:

If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will those not perceiving blockage.

Sub-Hypothesis 4:

If youth perceive that their occupational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout that will those who do not perceive occupational goal blockage.

Empirical Hypothesis 4:

In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, youth who state that their chances of attaining
their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" will have a higher incidence of school dropout (as measured by school dropout records) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

\[ H_A^4: \text{In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are } "fair", "poor" \text{ or } "very poor" \text{ then they will have a significantly higher proportion of school dropout cases (as measured by school dropout records) than will those who state that their chances are } "good" \text{ or } "very good." \]

\[ H_0^4: \text{In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are } "fair", "poor" \text{ or } "very poor" \text{ then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of school dropout cases (as measured by school dropout records) than will those who state that their chances are } "good" \text{ or } "very good." \]

When the relationship between perceived blockage and school dropout was examined for each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In only one of the
four categories (HA-HO) was perceived blockage significantly associated with low grades. The computed values were HA-LO $X^2 = 0.003$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = 13.6$ (sig. at the .01 level), LA-HO $X^2 = 0.08$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and LA-LO $X^2 = 0.02$ (not sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A21, A22, A23, and A24.

General Hypothesis II:

If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will those not perceiving blockage.

Sub-Hypothesis 5:

If youth perceive that their educational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not perceive educational goal blockage.

Empirical Hypothesis 5:

In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a higher incidence of low grades in school (as measured by the average of "tracked"
Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

H$_5^A$: In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a significantly higher proportion of low grades in school (as measured by "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

H$_0^5$: In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will not have a higher proportion of low grades in school as measured by "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

When the relationship between perceived blockage and grades in school was examined for each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. Some support,
however, was evidenced in the two categories amenable to $X^2$ analysis. $^1$ In the HA-HO category perceived blockage was significantly associated with low grades, with a $X^2 = 26.8$ (sig. at the .05 level). In the HA-LO category $X^2 = 2.40$ (not sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A25, A26, A27, and A28.

General Hypothesis II:

If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will those not perceiving blockage.

Sub-Hypothesis 6:

If youth perceive that their occupational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not perceive occupational goal blockage.

Empirical Hypothesis 6:

In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining

$^1$Both the LA-HO category and the LA-LO category lacked sufficient observations so as to be amenable to $X^2$ analysis.
their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" will have a higher incidence of low grades in school (as measured by "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

$H_A$: In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a significantly higher proportion of low grades in school (as measured by "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

$H_0$: In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of low grades in school (as measured by "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."
When the relationship between perceived blockage and low grades was examined for each of the occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In only one of the four categories (LA-LO) was perceived blockage significantly associated with low grades. The computed values were \( HA-HO \chi^2 = 0.65 \) (not sig. at the .05 level), \( LA-HO \chi^2 = 1.5 \) (not sig. at the .05 level), \( HA-LO \chi^2 = 1.9 \) (not sig. at the .05 level), and \( LA-HO \chi^2 = 4.2 \) (sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A29, A30, A31, and A32.

General Hypothesis II:

If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of antisocial behavior than will those not perceiving blockage.

Sub-Hypothesis 7:

If youth perceive that their educational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not perceive educational goal blockage.

Empirical Hypothesis 7:

In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining
their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a higher incidence of lower standardized test achievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

\[H_A: \text{In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a significantly higher proportion of lower standardized test achievement scores (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."} \]

\[H_0: \text{In each of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their educational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of school underachievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed for IQ) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."} \]

When the relationship between perceived blockage and standardized test achievement was examined for each of the
four educational aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In neither of the two categories providing enough cases for statistical analysis was perceived blockage associated with a significantly high proportion of lower standardized test achievement scores. The computed values were HA-LO $X^2 = .01$ (not sig. at the .05 level) and HA-HO $X^2 = 2.9$ (not sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A33, A34, A35 and A36.

General Hypothesis II:

If youth perceive that their goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of antisocial behavior than will those not perceiving blockage.

Sub-Hypothesis 8:

If youth perceive that their occupational goal aspirations are blocked then they will have a higher incidence of school underachievement than will those who do not perceive occupational goal blockage.

1 The LA-HO category and the LA-LO category lacked sufficient observations to be amenable to $X^2$ analysis.
Empirical Hypothesis 8:

In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a higher incidence of lower standardized test achievement (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

$H_A^8$: In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will have a significantly higher proportion of lower standardized achievement scores (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

$H_0^8$: In each of the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth state that their chances of attaining their occupational goal aspirations are "fair", "poor" or "very poor" then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of lower standardized test achievement scores (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than
will those who state that their chances are "good" or "very good."

When the relationship between perceived blockage and low standardized test achievement was examined for each of the occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In only one of four categories (LA-LO) was perceived blockage significantly associated with low standardized test achievement scores. The computed values were HA-LO, $X^2 = .07$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = 1.3$ (not sig. at the .05 level), LA-HO $X^2 = .11$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and LA-LO $X^2 = 3.8$ (sig. at the .05 level). The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A37, A38, A39, A40.

Stage III Statements and Tests of Hypotheses

General Hypothesis III:

If youth exhibit high "institutional alienation" then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than youth who do not exhibit institutional alienation.

Sub-Hypothesis I:

If youth exhibit high "law enforcement alienation" then they will have a greater incidence of juvenile delinquency
than will youth who do not exhibit high law enforcement alienation.

Empirical Hypothesis 1:

In each of the two sets of four aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth perceive a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will have a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured by juvenile court records) than will those scoring from 0-3.

H₁: In each of the four aspiration-opportunity categories if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will have a significantly higher proportion of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured by juvenile court records) than will those scoring from 0-3.

H₀₁: In each of the four aspiration-opportunity categories if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of juvenile delinquency cases (as measured by juvenile court record) than will those scoring 0-3.
When the relationship between law-enforcement alienation and juvenile delinquency was examined in each of the two sets of four aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In none of the four categories of occupational aspirations and opportunities, nor the four categories of educational aspirations and opportunities, was there a single instance of a significant association between law enforcement alienation and delinquency.

The computed values for the categories of occupational aspirations and opportunities are HA-LO $X^2 = .06$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = .36$ (not sig. at the .05 level) and LA-LO $X^2 = 2.3$ (not sig. at the .05 level).  

The computed values for the categories of educational aspirations and opportunities are HA-LO, $X^2 = .20$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = .28$ (not sig. at the .05 level), LA-HO $X^2 = .29$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and LA-LO $X^2 = 1.6$ (not sig. at the .05 level).

The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A41, A42, A43, A44, A45, A46, A47, and A48.

1 The LA-HO category contained no delinquents and was thus not amenable to a $X^2$ type of analysis.
General Hypothesis III:
If youth exhibit high "institutional alienation" then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth who do not exhibit high institutional alienation.

Sub-Hypothesis 2:
If youth exhibit high "law enforcement alienation" then they will have a greater incidence of school dropout than will youth who do not exhibit high law enforcement alienation.

Empirical Hypothesis 2:
In each of the two sets of four aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will have a higher incidence of school dropout cases (as measured by school dropout records) than will those scoring from 0-3.

H^2: In each of the four aspiration-opportunity categories if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will have a significantly higher proportion of school dropout cases (as measured by school dropout records) than will those scoring from 0-3.
$H_0^2$: In each of the four aspiration-opportunity categories if youth exhibit a "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of school dropout cases (as measured by school dropout records) than will those scoring from 0-3.

When the relationship between law enforcement alienation and school dropout was examined in each of the two sets of four aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In none of the four educational aspiration-opportunity categories was there a significant association between law-enforcement alienation and school dropout. The computed values were $HA-LO \chi^2 = 1.2$ (not sig. at the .05 level), $HA-HO \chi^2 = .74$ (not sig. at the .05 level), $LA-HO \chi^2 = .14$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and $LA-LO \chi^2 = 2.2$ (not sig. at the .05 level).

In the four occupational aspiration-opportunity categories, two of the four categories (HA-LO and HA-LA) were found to contain significant associations between law enforcement alienation and school dropout. The computed values were $HA-LO \chi^2 = 6.6$ (sig. at the .01 level), $HA-HO \chi^2 = 5.2$ (sig. at the .01 level), $LA-HO \chi^2 = 2.0$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and $LA-LO \chi^2 = .36$ (not sig. at the .05 level).

The data overall did not support the statistical
hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A49, A50, A51, A52, A53, A54, A55, and A56.

General Hypothesis III:

If youth exhibit high "institutional alienation" then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will those youth who do not exhibit institutional alienation.

Sub-Hypothesis 3:

If youth exhibit high "law enforcement alienation" then they will have a greater incidence of school underachievement than will youth who do not exhibit high law enforcement alienation.

Empirical Hypothesis 3:

In each of the two sets of four aspiration-opportunity categories, youth characterized by a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) will have a higher incidence of low grades in school (as measured by "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those scoring from 0-3.

Hₐ₃: In each of the four aspiration-opportunity categories if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6
point law enforcement alienation index) then they will have a significantly higher proportion of cases having low grades in school (as measured by "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those scoring from 0-3.

$H_0^3$: In each of the four aspiration-opportunity categories if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of cases having low grades in school (as measured by "tracked" Junior High grades in English and Social Studies) than will those scoring from 0-3.

When the relationship between law enforcement alienation and low grades was examined in each of the two sets of four aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected. In none of the three occupational aspiration-opportunity categories amenable to test$^1$ was law enforcement alienation significantly associated with low grades. The computed values were LA-HO $X^2 = .71$ (not sig. at the .05 level) and LA-LO $X^2 = .47$ (not

$^1$The HA-LO category had no cases of high law enforcement alienation and thus was not amenable to Chi Square ($X^2$) analysis.
sig. at the .05 level). In the category HA-HO, high alienation was significantly associated with high grades, $X^2 = 4.0$ (sig. at the .05 level).

In the categories of educational aspiration-opportunity, neither of the two categories amenable to $X^2$ analysis revealed a significant association between law enforcement alienation and low grades. The computed values were HA-LO $X^2 = .55$ (not sig. at the .05 level) and HA-HO $X^2 = .00$ (not sig. at the .05 level).

The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A57, A58, A59, A60, A61, A62, A63, and A64.

General Hypothesis III:

If youth exhibit high "institutional alienation" they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will those youth who do not exhibit institutional alienation.

Sub-Hypothesis 4:

If youth exhibit high "law enforcement alienation" then they will have a greater incidence of school underachievement than will youth who do not exhibit high law enforcement alienation.

1 The LA-HO category and the LA-LO lacked sufficient number of cases to be amenable to Chi Square ($X^2$) analysis.
Empirical Hypothesis 4:

In each of the two sets of four aspiration-opportunity categories, if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will have a higher incidence of lower standardized test achievement scores (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will those scoring from 0-3.

$H_A^4$: In each of the four aspiration-opportunity categories if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will have a significantly higher proportion of cases having low standardized test achievement scores (as measured by ITED scores, normed by IQ) than will those scoring from 0-3.

$H_0^4$: In each of the four aspiration-opportunity categories if youth exhibit a high "law enforcement alienation" score of 4-6 (as measured by the 6 point law enforcement alienation index) then they will not have a significantly higher proportion of cases having low standardized test achievement scores (as measured by ITED scores normed by IQ) than will those scoring from 0-3.
When the relationship between law enforcement alienation and standardized test achievement was examined in each of the two sets of four aspiration-opportunity categories, the total result was that the null hypothesis was not rejected.

In none of the four categories of occupational aspiration-opportunity, nor the two categories of educational aspiration-opportunity, was there a single instance of a significant association between law enforcement alienation and underachievement.

The computed values for the categories of occupational aspirations and opportunities are HA-LO $X^2 = .75$ (not sig. at the .05 level), HA-HO $X^2 = .00$ (not sig. at the .05 level), LA-HO $X^2 = .36$ (not sig. at the .05 level), and LA-LO $X^2 = .18$ (not sig. at the .05 level).

The computed values for the categories of educational aspirations and opportunities are HA-LO $X^2 = 1.7$ (not sig. at the .05 level) and HA-HO $X^2 = .02$ (not sig. at the .05 level).

The data overall did not support the statistical hypothesis, but instead supported the statistical null hypothesis. The data distributions are shown in Appendix A, Tables A65, A66, A67, A68, A69, A70, A71 and A72.

1 The two final categories, those of LA-LO and LA-HO, did not have sufficient observations to allow for the use of the $X^2$ statistic.
The purpose of this chapter is to review the findings of the last chapter and to specify the conclusions which seem warranted, given the limitations of the study. Near the end of the chapter it will be my purpose to point the directions for future research along both the theoretical and methodological dimensions of our research problem.

Stage I Findings and Conclusions

Eight separate test groupings involving eight tables (Tables A1-A8) were examined to discover the relationship between anomie (aspirations-opportunities discrepancies) and anti-social behavior in adolescents. For not one of the eight tests covering the four types of anti-social behavior and the two types of aspirations was it possible to reject the null hypothesis. This being the case, it is obviously necessary to develop an hypothesis which can express the unexpected character of the findings.

In all instances the HA-LO category had substantially greater anti-social behavior than did the HA-HO category. In four cases, however, the LA-LO category had greater anti-social behavior than did the HA-LO category. This means that the greatest proportion of anti-social behavior was found among those youth with low aspirations, either educational or occupational, and low opportunities. The
lowest proportion of anti-social behavior was in the high aspirations-high opportunity category with the high aspirations-low opportunity category having an intermediate position. Diagramatically the pattern is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Aspirations-</th>
<th>High Aspirations-</th>
<th>Low Aspirations-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunities:</td>
<td>Low Opportunities:</td>
<td>Low Opportunities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Anti-Social Behavior</td>
<td>Moderate Anti-Social Behavior</td>
<td>Most Anti-Social Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the fourth category (that of low aspirations and high opportunities) is concerned, the findings are much less definite. On only two occasions out of eight was the HA-LO category more significantly associated with anti-social behavior than was the LA-HO category. The remaining six occasions yielded findings of no significance. On this basis it is not possible to conclude that the HA-LO category has a greater association with anti-social behavior, in general, than does the LA-HO category.

On the basis of these findings it was then necessary to reformulate the hypothesis along the following lines. The first general hypothesis for Stage I now states:

1. If youth have low aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth in the other aspirational-opportunity categories.
A second general hypothesis for Stage I is as follows:

2. If youth have high aspirations and low socio-economic opportunities then they will have a higher incidence of anti-social behavior than will youth having high aspirations and high opportunities.

Both of these hypotheses can be supported in our data regardless of the type of anti-social behavior or type of aspiration under consideration.

Discussion

It seems clear that the discussion of Stage I points to the combination of low aspirations and low socio-economic opportunity as being the category most heavily associated with adolescent anti-social behavior. It would seem clear that if we were to take such youth and raise their level of aspirations it would be possible to reduce somewhat their resort to anti-social behavior. Finally, if in combination with raised aspirations we also improved their level of socio-economic opportunity we possibly could considerably decrease their resort to anti-social behavior. The tentative character of these suggestions rests on the premise that it is difficult to know what consequences are generated when one begins altering cultural patterns which are part of a larger whole.

How, then, are we to understand the social psychology
of the lower class youth?

In our earlier discussion the question was raised as to whether low aspirations were "genuinely held" or whether they were held only as a defense against the continual experience of failure characteristic of their social relations, particularly those of the classroom. Our investigation attempted to throw light upon this time dimension by studying Junior High youth who presumably had not yet experienced the frustrations which lead to attitudes of resignation. Despite our emphasis on these youth in their early adolescence, we continue to find that the problem youth are those without high goal aspirations. Are we to assume that we have still been too late in measuring them before the process of failure and resignation has overwhelmed them? Or is it more reasonable to assume that the anti-social youth of the lower class have their deviance generated out of basically low levels of aspiration rather than high?

While the evidence is by no means clear, the fact that we have been dealing with Junior High youngsters suggests that there has not yet been time for the period of failure resignation to become established. The data suggests, rather, that these youth, so characterized by anti-social behavior, come to be characterized in this way because they have not chosen to be highly aspiring rather than because they have. In short, it is suspected that if youth can be
stimulated to hold higher levels of aspiration their anti-social behavior will be substantially reduced during their adolescent years.

Our conclusions at this point take us into the literature which suggests that youth subcultures exist not as reactions to the frustrations of the individual members (Cohen's position) but as a consequence of the life style common to the members and to the community of which they are a part. Thus, adolescent gang behavior and subsequent deviance are viewed as a "normal" adaptation, given the cultural values of the lower class subculture. Walter B. Miller is probably the foremost advocate of this approach. He characterizes lower class male gangs as having the following "focal concerns." (a) Concern with "trouble" involving official authorities, (b) Desire for immediate gratifications rather than deferred gratifications, (c) Emphasis on physical prowess, masculinity, fearlessness, bravery and daring, (d) Ability to "outsmart" others and gain money by their "wits," (e) The excitement of thrills, risks and danger, (f) The belief that people are favored by fate, fortune and luck.

The conclusion generated by views such as that of Miller is that lower class boys live in a world which places little value upon the material success goals of the middle class and thus are little frustrated by their absence of
opportunities. Concomitant with these short-run goals, however, are those aspects of the group life which frequently bring the gang into conflict with police and other institutional authorities. In short, lower class adolescents (particularly males) are viewed as having an integrated life style in which low aspirations and deviant activities constitute important aspects of the life style. Missing from arguments such as Miller's is the belief that lower class boys want middle class success goals and that the frustration from failure produces deviance or resignation.

While this research project has not been designed to test these alternative theories of delinquency, dropout and underachievement, there are, it would seem, a few hints from the research data which would support such a viewpoint as that of Miller.

From question 35 it is clear that delinquents and school dropouts were much more likely to have "friends in trouble" than were nondelinquents and nondropouts. Of 61 youth who were either delinquents or dropouts 42.6 percent had three or more friends who had been in trouble with the police. The comparable figure for nondelinquents and nondropouts was 13 percent.

While slightly over 18 percent of the nondelinquents and nondropouts indicated that they participated in extra
school activities "less than" or "much less than" other youth their age, the comparable figure for delinquents and dropouts is 30 percent.

Finally while 46.5 percent of the delinquents and dropouts agreed that "a person shouldn't have to report a friend to the police" a comparable figure for nondelinquents and nondropouts was 29.7 percent.

These figures taken together suggest that troubled youth exist in a subculture which tends to support norms and values somewhat at variance with those which would keep one in school and out of trouble with the law.

Stage II Findings and Conclusions

Eight separate test groupings, involving 32 tables (Tables A9 - A40), each examining the relationship between perceived blockage and a type of anti-social behavior in each of the eight aspiration-opportunity categories, failed to provide support for the hypothesis. It is clear that perceived blockage does not have an independent effect upon all of the forms of anti-social behavior.

As in Stage I, however, it seems possible to modify the hypothesis in such a way as to interpret the unexpected findings. It appears that the impact of perceived blockage varies according to aspirational-opportunity categories as well as anti-social behavioral forms. The HA-HO category
surprisingly provides the context in which perceived blockage is associated with low G.P.A. (Table A27) and with school dropout (Table A23). The reformulated hypotheses are as follows:

1. If youth have high educational aspirations and high socio-economic opportunities, then perceived blockage is more highly associated with low grade point average than is the case for youth in the high educational aspirations-low opportunity category.¹

2. If youth have high educational aspirations and high socio-economic opportunities, then perceived blockage is more highly associated with school dropout than is the case for youth in the other aspiration-opportunity categories.

While the data in Stage I revealed that the high aspiration-high opportunity category the one least likely to be associated with adolescent anti-social behavior we are now faced with the findings of Stage II which suggest that when aspiration-opportunity categories are controlled it is the HA-HO category which, in two cases, provides the

¹This hypothesis is limited to the HA-HO and HA-LO categories because the two categories involving low aspirations did not contain enough observations to constitute an adequate test.
setting for high associations between perceived blockage and anti-social behavior. While the number of anti-social cases in each table is small and while it is clear that the statistical significance of the test statistic is largely due to the influence of the large number of cases in the HA-HO category, nevertheless, the consistency of the finding necessitates that we speculate about the causal pattern.

Discussion

It is important to recall that while the HA-HO category was characterized by high opportunities this meant that each respondent so identified had a score of either zero or one on the opportunity limitations index. It may be that the imprecision of our measurement is masking an important relationship. It may be that those persons perceiving blockage may, in fact, suffer from an opportunity limitation which serves to convince them that they are blocked, a consequence which, in turn, may lead them to engage in anti-social behavior in forms other than delinquency. To examine this possibility the HA-HO category was examined for the degree to which each of the four socio-economic opportunity factors separately might be significantly associated with the anti-social behavior.

The separate examination of the four opportunity factors upon grade point average (see 1 above) revealed that only the
parental occupational level was influential in providing the basis for the impact of perceived blockage upon grade point average. Furthermore, within the five categories of class rank for which parental occupational level is a measurement, it is only in the lower middle class, not the lower class, that one finds a significant association between perceived blockage and low grade point average.

This being the case a sub-hypothesis 1a now is developed as a more detailed explanation of hypothesis 1 (reformulated).

1a. Within the category of those youth with high aspirations and high opportunity, those youth whose parental occupation level is that of white collar worker will give evidence of a significant association between perceived blockage and low grade point average (see Figure 1).

In an attempt to explain why the HA-HO category (Figure 1) provided the context for a meaningful association between perceived goal blockage and low grade point average (Table A47 in Appendix A) the four variables dealing with opportunity limitation were held constant individually. The result was that most of the impact of blockage-grade point association was created by four respondents in the lower middle class (measured by parental occupational level). It was these four cases which were characterized by perceived
Figure 1. Establishing the impact of perceived blockage upon low grades for lower middle class respondents

blockage and low grades despite the fact that they had no objective opportunity limitations whatsoever.

For hypothesis 2 above, we once again attempted to isolate the impact of the four opportunity variables upon the relationship between blockage and (in this case) school dropout. On this occasion, however, there were no significant results. We are not able to throw additional light on the association between blockage and dropout in the HA-HO category by examining opportunity factors individually.
Our hypothesis la, then, is limited to that association between perceived blockage and low grades in HA-HO category. This association is traced to those respondents whose parental occupational level is white collar.

In attempting to make sense of these findings it would seem profitable to turn to the analysis of anomie by Mizruchi (1965). It was his position that the means-ends discrepancy is more pronounced among the lower middle class than among the lower classes, since the lower middle class has as its reference point the lofty material life style of the upper middle class while it has resources scarcely above those of the working class. The gap, then, between aspirations and opportunities is greater for the lower middle class than for any other class in society and particularly greater than in the lower class where the aspirations are not as likely to soar, given the limitations upon experience.

Added credence is given to this argument when we note that in recent years the rising salaries of working class men have placed the lower middle class in a less enviable position. Added to that, the pressure being exerted by minority groups seems to be perceived as a threat by the middle class. It is widely believed that the lower middle class constitutes a basic source of strength of the white "backlash" so widely discussed today. The general point here is that a number of forces are at work in the United
States which have raised the level of frustration being experienced by the lower middle class. It is in this context that we can better understand the frustrations experienced by the youth of the lower middle class.

Finally, the perceived blockage data, once again, turns our attention upon the low-aspiring, low opportunity youth (LA-LO), for it is clear that perceived blockage affects both grades and standardized test scores for youth in this category. The following hypothesis formalizes the research finding.

3. Perceived blockage is more highly associated with low standardized test achievement and low grades for youth who have low occupational aspirations and low opportunities than is the case for youth in other aspirational-opportunty categories.

This being the case it now becomes clear that the adolescent anti-social behavior, in general, is related to the LA-LO category such that we can predict much anti-social behavior simply by knowing aspiration and opportunity levels of youth (Stage I). In addition, however, a small group of underachievers is influenced by their perception of blockage in the context of their LA-LO status.

In viewing Stages I and II jointly it seems possible to make a conclusion of the following sort. It is clear that adolescent anti-social behavior is in general much more a
function of low rather than high aspirations and opportunities. In addition, we find that the low aspirations-low opportunities category provides the context in which perceived blockage has an added association with low grades and low standardized test achievement. It seems clear that there is a certain remainder of cases of youth from middle class homes who, while holding high occupational aspirations and high opportunities find that the lower middle class character of their lives places them at a disadvantage as they move toward the attainment of their high aspirations. This convergence of factors seems, for such middle class youth, to serve more effectively as a predictor of low grades in school than for other kinds of adolescent anti-social behavior.

Stage III Findings and Conclusions

Eight separate test groupings, involving 32 tables (Tables A41-A72), each examining the relationship between law-enforcement alienation and anti-social behavior, in each of eight aspiration-opportunity categories, as a whole, failed to support the hypothesis. It is clear that law-enforcement alienation does not have an independent effect upon all the forms of anti-social behavior. In fact, it is only under specified conditions that any association is noticed. Tables A54 and A49 show that it is in the context of high occupational aspirations, rather than low, that
school dropout is most associated with law-enforcement alienation.

I. If youth have high occupational aspirations then they will exhibit a greater positive association between law-enforcement alienation and school dropout than will youth with low occupational aspirations.

It is interesting to note, however, that while the six items of the law-enforcement alienation index had little predictive power for adolescent anti-social behavior, the two of the six items dealing with "evaluations" rather than "cognitions" appeared to be somewhat better predictors. (See our earlier discussion of this matter on pages 117-118.)

Evaluative question 38-3 dealing with the report of friends to the police was found to associated positively with delinquency (the greater the alienation, the greater the delinquency) in the LA-LO category.

Similarly evaluative question 38-16 suggesting that law violators are justified because their poor treatment by society was found to be positively associated with under-achievement in the LA-LO category and also with school dropout in the HA-LO category.

While findings such as these are widely scattered and hardly conclusive, they do add support both for the idea that evaluative statements are better predictors of behavior
than cognitive statements and for the premise that it is in the context of the low opportunities rather than high that alienation is associated with anti-social behavior.

While school authority alienation has not been systematically included in our statements of Stage III hypotheses (see page 120) some findings concerning school authority alienation will now be discussed.

Two questions from the questionnaire, 38-8 and 38-14, examined the adolescent attitude toward school authorities. When question 38-8 was examined in each of the educational aspiration-opportunity categories there was found to be no significant associations existing between alienation and anti-social behavior. Thus, the item "teachers tend to grade lower if they don't like you" failed to elicit responses meaningfully related to the key variables of this study. Question 38-14, however, did provide some interesting results. Within each of the four education aspiration-opportunity categories the responses to the question "most kids my age have great respect for teachers and principals" were examined for their possible relationship to the four types of anti-social behavior. The result was that within the HA-LO category, school authority alienation was found to be significantly higher in three of the four types of anti-social behavior. Only in the case of dropout was high school authority alienation not found to be highly associated
within the high aspirations low opportunity category. This being the case a second hypothesis concerning institutional alienation may be formulated.

2. If youth have high educational aspirations and low opportunity then they will exhibit a greater positive association between school authority alienation and delinquency and school underachievement than will youth in other aspiration-opportunity categories.

Discussion

This hypothesis suggests the following causal process. Youth with high aspirations for educational success but limited opportunities find themselves becoming increasingly alienated from school authorities and increasingly prone toward behavior which is both delinquent and underachieving. While the number of cases is small this finding represents the only instance in this study in which the high aspiration-low opportunity category has been found to be the context in which institutional alienation is found to be related to adolescent anti-social behavior.

The findings concerning law-enforcement alienation suggest, also, that it is the high-aspiring youth rather than the low-aspiring youth who is high alienated and that such youth are more likely to experience a high level of school
dropout. In general it is high-aspiring youth who experience
the institutional alienation which results in anti-social be-
havior. The impact of low opportunities within this group
is not clear. For youth affected by school authority aliena-
tion their anti-social behavior seems abetted by a low level
of opportunity as was also true in one of the two cases of
law enforcement alienation.

The Anti-Social Profile

In an effort to illustrate some of the principles es-
tablished in this research a deeper assessment will now be
made of those youth who have been found to be both delinquent
and school dropouts.

Twenty-four youths fit this category. Of the twelve
for whom we have underachievement information, eight had
grade point averages of below 1.75 and eleven had under-
achievement scores beneath the 20th percentile.

Nine of twenty-three had low educational aspiration, a
percentage much higher than that of youth in our sample
generally. Most significant of all, in light of earlier
findings, is that twenty-two out of twenty-four had at
least two opportunity limitations. Of this number thirteen
had three opportunity limitations while one had four. The
opportunity limitations most common in the group of twenty-
four was Race since twenty-one of twenty-four were Black.
Fourteen of twenty-one were from families where the breadwinner was semi-skilled, unskilled or unemployed. Eleven of twenty-four came from homes headed either by a mother or guardian. Finally eight of twenty-four came from homes in which there were eight or more family members.

As far as perceived blockage is concerned, only nine had perceived educational blockage. This is the same number who perceived occupational blockage and it serves to remind us that perceived blockage has not been an important associate of adolescent deviance.

In terms of law-enforcement alienation only nine of twenty-three scored high with three or more alienative responses of the six possible responses. However, it is important to note that fourteen of twenty-four agreed that "teachers grade you lower if they don't like you" and that seventeen of twenty-four disagreed with the statement "kids my age have a lot of respect for teachers and principals."

In general, then, school authority alienation seems stronger than law-enforcement alienation.

Reflective of the subcultural tradition is the fact that among the twenty-four youth in the combined delinquency-dropout category 43.5 percent had three or more friends in trouble with the police compared to 13 percent for the non-delinquent dropout group.

Twenty-five percent indicated that they participated
in extra school activities more often or much more often than other children their age. The comparable figure for nondelinquents and nondropouts combined was nearly fifty percent.

Finally, 47.8 percent indicated that "one should not be expected to report one's friends to the police" while a comparable figure for the combined nondelinquent, non-dropout category was 30 percent.

In the pages following a series of case studies have been included which will give the reader a better understanding of the causal pressures which lead youth to antisocial behavior and why some youth become more deeply involved than others in such behavior.

Case Histories

C.R.N. was 14 years old at the time he filled out the questionnaire in 1965. He was Black and the family head was his natural mother. He was the only child and he and his mother constituted the total family. He held low aspirations for both his educational and occupational future despite the fact that he scored better than a B average in his Junior High years and had achievement scores of a highly satisfactory nature. In his attitude he was quite conventional with a very low law-enforcement alienation score and supportive attitudes toward school personnel.

At the age of 15, C.R.N. was found delinquent on a
charge of assault and battery together with the carrying of a concealed weapon (presumably a knife). He had evidently threatened another boy with the weapon. Since this was his only confrontation with the law, his case was settled informally out of court. He had no subsequent encounters with law enforcement officials.

Clifford C. was 12 at the time of questionnaire return. He was Black and his small family was headed by his mother. While he aspired to high school graduation and while he thought that his chances of attaining it were good, he found himself in the State Training School at Eldora at age 16. In the questionnaire Clifford gave little evidence of being alienated. He had a very low-score on law-enforcement alienation although he felt that some people were treated so badly by society that he did not blame them of breaking the law. He expressed no alienation toward school authorities. At age 15 he was adjudged delinquent for possessing liquor in an automobile. Within the next year and one-half he was apprehended and judged delinquent three times for charges of assault with a deadly weapon, shoplifting and disturbing the public quiet. Following his fourth offense he was sent to Eldora.

Frank S was 14 at the time of the questionnaire. He lived with stepparents. He was white and the family was small. A year before the questionnaire he had been judged
delinquent on a charge of larceny. One year after the questionnaire he was judged truant and out of the parents control and was sent to Eldora State Training School. He stated in the questionnaire that he thought his chances of attaining his school and monetary aspirations were only fair. He further revealed a very high law-enforcement alienation score but while his grades and achievement tests were very poor he had no alienation toward school authorities.

Marvin J. was 14 at the time of the questionnaire. On the questionnaire Marvin indicated relatively low goals with only "fair" chance of success. He did reveal himself to be fairly alienated from both law enforcement officials and school authorities. His family was large. Soon after the questionnaire he was found delinquent on a charge of shoplifting. Six months later he was referred by his mother to the juvenile court on the grounds of incorrigibility. Twenty days later he was found guilty of breaking and entering. In January of 1968 he quit Tech High School and joined the marines.

Research Limitations

In this section an attempt will be made to summarize the limitations of the study, since the conclusions are no
more valid and reliable than the methodological rigor upon which they are based. Having specified the limitations of the study, we will then be in a position to specify the degree to which the substantive conclusions may be thought to be accurate.

**Sampling limitations**

The sampling procedure used in the study suffers from several limitations. Initially, rather than being a random sample, the respondents constituted a purposive sample. That is, they were elicited because of the special purpose of the research program, that being the contrasting of middle class and lower class youth. In addition, an attempt has been made to discover the degree to which the respondents may be thought to be representative of the Des Moines Metropolitan Area. It appears that the sample slightly under-represents white males and Black females as well as whites and Black at the lowest occupational positions. Blacks were substantially overrepresented, since it was the intention to have an unduly large number of Blacks with which to perform a more adequate analysis of that subgroup. Since Blacks were present in the sample well out of proportion to their numbers in the population, the comparisons of the sample characteristics with those of the population were undertaken separately for whites and Blacks.

This slightly biased character of the sample raises a
question about the reliability of the findings. It seems likely that if the same survey materials were used again on random samples from the Des Moines area, the results might be slightly different, given the nonrandom charter of our sample.

A second factor which affects response reliability is the fact that the SHOC sample was acquired some 16 months before the CHURCH sample. The differences in the sample response patterns may be, in part, a function of these differing time periods, although it seems unlikely that this is a major factor with which to contend.

A third and probably more critical weakness in the sampling procedure is that the number of cases with which we are working shows great variability. When dealing with delinquents, we are working with a measure, the County Juvenile Court Records, which enables us to utilize the entire sample from Polk County, Iowa. For the discussions of school dropout, the number of cases is reduced by about 100 persons, since we are now dealing with measures of variables strictly associated with the City of Des Moines. For the discussion of underachievement, the sample size is still narrower, given the large number of youth who despite their presence in the city school system, did not have as a part of their permanent school record the complete listing of scores which make the analysis of underachievement
possible. If, as the sample size decreases, the cases remaining come to constitute a biased segment of the whole, then generalizations to the whole Des Moines Metropolitan Area are inappropriate. To be on the safe side, it is well to think of our conclusions for dropout and underachievement to be generalizable only to the SHOC and CHURCH population from which the youth were drawn.

On the basis of a number of comparisons of the TOTAL sample with the characteristics of the Des Moines Metropolitan Area it was concluded that the TOTAL sample is not a seriously biased segment of the whole.

Measurement limitations

While the basic question of reliability is whether a replication of the same study will produce the same conclusions, a basic question of validity is whether the study measures what it purports to measure. It is clear that limitations in measurement constitute limitations upon the validity of the study. The major measurement limitations of the study will now be discussed.

As noted in Chapter Two, the SHOC sample received the questionnaire under the direction of settlement house and opportunity personnel. From the number of incompletions and lack of response depth, I am inclined to believe that the supervisors were less than fully helpful to the young respondents, and thus the answers given to the questions
may not be entirely valid. The problem was complicated when I took great pains to insure that the CHURCH respondents would encounter Central College students who were thoroughly knowledgeable about the instrument and were anxious to elicit complete responses. The point is that the results from the two samples may not be comparable because of the externalities of the response situation. The validity of the questionnaire items is then, in part, a consequence of the controls exerted over the response situation.

Independent variables Our investigation of adolescent aspirations is caught in the same kind of measurement problems as is the case with most of the previous research in the field. I agree with Corwin that youth may well give very superficial answers to questions about goal aspirations unless they must also confront a clearer understanding of the implications of the choices which they are making. For example, a statement such as this might be an improvement. "Kids who desire to go to college ought to be willing to work hard in school and save their money."

When we consider the independent variable of perceived blockage, we once again must wonder how seriously the aspirations are held. Aspirations held seriously must generate frustration in young persons who come to see themselves as blocked. Aspirations not held seriously will not likely induce frustration in youth who acknowledge that they
are blocked from aspirational attainment. An effective measurement of perceived goal blockage depends upon an effective measure of goal aspirations.

As far as the measure of law-enforcement alienation is concerned, it might be argued that the forced format of question 38 required that persons who had no feeling about the matters of police and court action were, nonetheless, compelled to either agree or disagree with the statement. Since the coding was arranged in such a way as to group together the moderate and extreme responses, there is the possibility that some persons without strong views would, nonetheless, be placed in the category of either the alienated or the nonalienated. While some would argue that a no-opinion category should be added to the list of options my preference would be to require the respondent to take a position on one side of the issue or the other, but with six categories (3 in favor, 3 against) instead of four. In so doing those two choices closest to the center could be eliminated from the designations "alienated" and "non-alienated". An example of this technique would be the following:

Q. Police use more force in making arrests than they need to. (Circle preferred answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree-</td>
<td>Agree-</td>
<td>Agree-</td>
<td>Disagree-</td>
<td>Disagree-</td>
<td>Disagree-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment</td>
<td>ment</td>
<td>ment</td>
<td>ment</td>
<td>ment</td>
<td>ment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienative</td>
<td>Excluded From Analysis</td>
<td>Nonalienative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The value of such a technique is that each person is required to make a choice, but that weak choices do not count in the determination of alienated and nonalienated categories.

Finally there is, of course, the need to include several items in a scale type form than to try to predict on the basis of responses to one item or two.

**Dependent variables** It is with respect to the independent variables that measurement weaknesses are particularly limiting. Earlier it was indicated that our measure of delinquency probably distinguishes more effectively between the nondelinquent and nonserious delinquent on the one side, and the serious delinquent on the other. That is, the label "delinquent" ought to be understood as "serious delinquent", since many nonserious cases do not come to the attention of juvenile court authorities.

In regard to "dropout" measurement, while we went to some trouble in the theoretical chapter to develop the concept of "voluntary school dropout", it is disappointing to note that Des Moines school records do not take seriously this distinction and have not set up a structure which would require the child to show in detail the reasons for his dropout behavior. A second limitation in school dropout records is that one has no way of knowing the length
of time that the adolescent was out of school, that is, whether the dropout was temporary or permanent.

From the standpoint of measurement validity, the two measures of underachievement are probably the most valid of the dependent variables. It would seem that it is in respect to conclusions about grade point average and standardized test achievement that our findings would be most valid. The one exception to this is that school personnel doubted the utility of the standardized test since students did not see such tests as having a determinative influence over their future. In particular, it is widely assumed among school personnel in the Des Moines school system that adolescents with high ability do not necessarily attain the high test scores of standardized tests.

Suggestions for Future Research

In the following paragraphs I will point out possible directions for future research based on the limitations which have affected this study's findings, as well as the results of the study which I believe are worth pursuing.

While it seems clear that most anti-social behavior of adolescents is related to low aspirations rather than high, it is yet by no means clear whether these low aspirations are a natural, normal part of the lower class life pattern or whether they arise from the repeated failure of the child
to move toward higher goals. My data suggests that troubled youth as early as age 12 and 13, have low aspirations. It may be that studies of even younger children should be carried out in an attempt to understand possible opportunity limitations, probably of a very subtle nature, which youth may experience well before the age of twelve (which might create feelings of failure). In this connection, it would seem that case histories of youth between the ages of eight and fourteen would serve a more useful purpose than the latitudinal studies based in a short time period which emphasize associational matters. That is, we might find that the delinquent youth is prone to have low aspirations, but the important causal influence of failure in earlier life may have escaped our scrutiny. In addition, case histories would serve to identify better those influences which produce a perception of blockage in the youth. Such an approach could better establish the relationship between the various kinds of anti-social behavior. Are delinquency and school dropout mutually interrelated as our common sense would have us believe? or is Elliott correct when he theorizes that they represent alternative response patterns to the anomie problem (Elliott, 1966).

Finally, I believe that more research inquiries into alienation would be valuable, particularly those which assume that alienation will be found to be specific to
institutional areas. We have established, in this research, that anti-law enforcement attitudes tend to coalesce, and that persons who hold such patterns of thought are not necessarily alienated toward other institutions. We do not yet have information as to the causes and consequences of such patterns of thought except that alienation was not shown to be associated with youthful anti-social behavior. More research into alienation toward family life, religious life, and occupational life might well prove fruitful, since political alienation has been the most often studied form (Dean, 1960). Subsequent research effects with these materials will attempt to throw additional light on the matter of the specificity of institutional alienation.

Whatever the substantive focus of our studies of attitudes, we ought to undertake such research with an eye toward distinguishing between cognitive, evaluative, and behavioral intention statements in an effort to see which of these is most highly associated with, and thus most predictive of actual behavior.
CHAPTER SIX  SUMMARY

The intention of this study was to attempt the development of more efficient models for the prediction of adolescent anti-social behavior. In particular, the interest was in developing better explanations of the social psychological factors influencing delinquency, school dropout and school underachievement.

A total of 475 adolescents filled in a questionnaire during an 18 month period between October of 1965 and April of 1967. The questionnaire contained all of the independent or "causal" variables of interest in the research. In the summer of 1969 juvenile court and school records were examined to see which of the survey youth qualified as being delinquents, dropouts and school underachievers.

The measure for delinquency was specified as those youth who appeared in the juvenile court records of Polk County, from the years 1965-1969. Des Moines school records provided the measures for school dropout and underachievement. School records measuring underachievement are of two types. Standardized Test Achievement scores are produced by utilizing Iowa Test of Educational Development Scores normed by I.Q. Grade points average scores result from taking the average of Junior High English and Social Studies scores within the three classroom tracks of basic, general
and advanced.

The key independent variable investigated in this research is that of anomie. Anomie was defined as the condition of normlessness which arises from the discrepancy between goal aspirations and socio-economic opportunities. By "normlessness" is meant that, given this discrepancy, a person no longer feels obliged to follow societal rules concerning appropriate behavior for goal attainment.

Anomie scores were determined by a combination of responses to questionnaire items dealing with goal aspirations and socio-economic opportunities. In the question about educational goal aspirations, the intent was to distinguish between those youth who desired at least some college from those who did not. In the question about occupational goal aspirations, the intent was to distinguish between those youth who desired at least a white collar occupation (which normally requires college training) from those youth who did not.

In terms of opportunity limitation it was considered to be disadvantageous to upward mobility (a) if the respondent's parental occupational level was blue collar or less; (b) if the respondent was a member of a minority group; (c) if the respondent came from a family in which the natural father was not the resident head and (d) the respondent came from a family in which the family size was eight persons or greater.
A person rated high on anomie would be a person who rated high on occupational or educational goal aspirations and low on socio-economic opportunities (HA-LO). The other three combinations of aspirations and opportunities (HA-LO, LO-HO, and LA-LO) were rated as low on anomie.

It was hypothesized in Stage I that youth in the high anomie category would have greater proportions of anti-social behavior than would youth in each separate low anomie category. The research data failed to support the hypothesis. Instead, it was clear that it was youth in the low aspiration-low opportunity category who were most likely to be associated with delinquency, dropout and underachievement. It was true, however, that the high aspirations-low opportunity category was more highly associated with all forms of anti-social behavior than were the youth in the high aspirations-high opportunity category.

In Stage II of the research design the emphasis was shifted from aspirational-opportunity discrepancies to the problem of perceived blockage. Since W. I. Thomas, sociological investigation has taken seriously the premise that if an individual perceives a situation to exist, he will act in terms of its existence even if an objective assessment would show the perception to be incorrect. In the present investigation this means that if individuals perceive that their goal-aspirations are blocked, their behavior may
reflect that perception.

Within each of the aspiration-opportunity categories it was hypothesized that perceived goal blockage would have an impact upon anti-social behavior. It was found necessary to delimit the hypothesis considerably. The emphasis upon the low aspirations-low opportunity category (LA-LO) continued in that perceived blockage for youth in this category was significantly associated with both low grades and low standardized test scores. This finding leads to the conclusion, then, that not only is it in this grouping that higher levels of anti-social behavior are manifested but it is also in this category that perceived blockage exercises an independent influence upon low grades and low scores in standardized tests.

In addition, however, a significant association between blockage and school dropout was established in the high aspirations-high opportunity category. Further analysis revealed that this relationship between blockage and school dropout occurred predominantly in that group of youth whose parental occupational level was lower middle class. This finding led to our use of the interpretation of Mizurchi to the effect that, for some youth, it may be that the discrepancy between goal aspirations and socio-economic opportunities is greater in the lower middle class than in other classes since they may have the aspiration of the professional
class but a level of opportunity comparable to that of the blue collar class.

In Stage III of the research program we found little support for the hypotheses that alienation will be associated with adolescent anti-social behavior. It is mainly with respect to the high aspirations categories that some forms of institutional alienation are associated with some forms of anti-social behavior. In particular, we noted that high-aspiring youth, apart from opportunity levels, constituted the category in the law-enforcement alienation index which was found to be positively associated with school dropout.

Within the alienation index it was found that "evaluative" items rather than "cognitive" items were found to influence a wide range of anti-social behaviors within the context of the low opportunity rather than high opportunity categories.

With respect to school authority alienation it was in the high aspiration-low opportunity category that a high level of alienation was found to be positively associated with delinquency and school underachievement.

In conclusion, our findings of institutional alienation would appear to be the least well understood of the three stages of this research project. It is by no means clear whether alienation should be thought of as a general
or specific concept. The evidence is conflicting whether it is high opportunity categories or low opportunities which set the stage for the impact of alienation upon anti-social behavior. Finally, this project has only taken a small step toward a more complete understanding of the different dimensions of an attitude and how such dimensions might be related to adolescent anti-social behavior.

In the main, then, we found little support for Merton's contention that lower class persons have high levels of anti-social behavior due to the discrepancy between aspirations and opportunities. While there is little doubt that lower class people have higher rates of anti-social behavior (as measured by official records) there is little evidence that such deviants have high levels of aspiration. One place where aspiration-opportunity discrepancies may be important is in the lower middle class. Such a conclusion, however, is equally foreign to Merton's analysis.

A number of limitations prevent us from having full confidence in these findings. These may be thought of as sample limitations and measurement limitations.

The principle sample limitation is that the sample is not a random selection from the Des Moines Metropolitan Area population. It is a purposive sample and while it seems reasonably representative of important characteristics in the population, nevertheless, the white segment of the sample
is biased in favor of Protestants, females and middle class occupational categories. The Negro proportion of the sample slightly underrepresents both females and the lowest occupation categories.

A second criticism which may be leveled at the sampling procedure is that the respondents in the CHURCH sample filled out the questionnaire one and one-half years after it was completed by the SHOC group of respondents. Some of the differences which we noted between these two samples may be due to the slightly different time periods in which they were examined, as well as to the class and race differences between them.

A final sampling limitation is that while findings about delinquency cover youth for the Des Moines Metropolitan Area, findings for school dropout and underachievement focus on the city of Des Moines, where school records were readily available.

In as far as most of the questionnaire data utilized in this report stemmed from closed-format questions and that little of our data resulted from answers given to open-ended questions, there is a possibility that answers given are somewhat superficial and thus may not be accurate assessments of true feelings—job aspirations being a case in point. Closed-format data also suffers from the defect that much of what the respondent has to say may not be
included in the prescribed questions and thus escapes the searching eye of the investigator. These criticisms are defended, in part, by the necessity of having to utilize a questionnaire, given the time and expense limitations of the standard interview technique. Further limitations in the data have been incurred, particularly with respect to the SHOC data, because it seemed strategic at the time to hire opportunity center personnel to distribute and proctor the taking of the questionnaire. While there was an advantage in using as a proctor someone familiar to the respondent, it is also clear that the proctors were not as fully conscientious about their responsibility as persons closer to the research effort might have been (see Chapter 3).

A number of other measurement limitations have plagued the study. The four dependent variables, particularly, complicate the validity of our findings. The delinquency measure (juvenile court records) failed to fully differentiate delinquents from nondelinquents. The measure of school dropout failed to distinguish fully between the voluntary and the involuntary dropout, a theoretical distinction of great significance. In addition we were unable to distinguish the temporary dropout from the permanent one. The measures of grade point average and underachievement are limited to the city of Des Moines proper and thus, with absences taken into account, seldom gave us a greater base
than about half the sample.

Finally, we confront the question as to how to measure aspirations. It is too easy to conclude that an adolescent's stated "desired goal" is that which has great meaning and potential trauma for him. The aspirational level given may better reflect a whim not taken seriously by the respondent and thus is no basis upon which to build a theory of deviance (see Chapter 3).

Finally, on the basis of this research experience what kinds of research programs might be suggested as being valuable for the future?

Theoretically, additional attempts should be made to focus more precisely upon the years 9 to 12. That period may be when many lower class children lower their aspirational levels. It is yet by no means clear whether low aspirations are absorbed normally from lower class life, or whether they are produced by the experiences of early failure in the life of the child. If it is the latter, our research seems to suggest that such experiences of failure take place much earlier than has heretofore been realized.

A second area of theoretical concern which has been discussed in this report but which is worthy of further scrutiny is that of institutional alienation. Instead of dealing with alienation in general, it would seem valuable to conceptualize alienation as occurring in specific
institutional settings; i.e. we might find a person alienated to law-enforcement institutions but meaningfully supportive of other institutions such as church or school. In following this approach, it would seem that greater attention could be given to specific causes and consequences of particular kinds of alienation.

In terms of measurement improvements I have suggested that probes of goal aspirations should be accompanied by methods by which to ascertain the degree to which the aspirations are seriously rather than whimsically held. In addition, school systems must develop better methods of distinguishing the voluntary from the involuntary dropout.

Finally, a much more sophisticated attempt should be made to distinguish such attitudinal dimensions as cognitive, evaluative and behavioral intentional and to see how each kind of attitude corresponds to the actual behavior.


In the course of completing a project covering a five year time span I have become indebted to a number of persons who have given a great deal of time and effort in my behalf. In particular I would like to thank Professor John Stratton who gave an initial stimulus to the research project, Professor Walter Lunden who nurtured its growth along the way and to Professor Dwight Dean who gave it full flowering. In addition, I am very appreciative of the assistance in revision afforded by Professor Gerry Klonglan.

I want to express my appreciation to the Commission on Race of the Reformed Church in America for a grant of $3000 which made this study possible.

Five years of work create many strains but were it not for Carolyn, Danny and Susan I would not have had the encouragement to see this study through to its completion.
Table Al. Delinquency and educational aspiration - opportunity categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Delinquent</th>
<th>Low Opportunity</th>
<th>High Opportunity</th>
<th>Low Opportunity</th>
<th>High Opportunity</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Phi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>20 (.2)</td>
<td>2 (.0)</td>
<td>15 (.4)</td>
<td>3 (.1)</td>
<td>4.03*</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Specifies throughout Appendix A that the relationship is significant at the .05 level of significance.

** Specifies throughout Appendix A that the relationship is significant at the .01 level of significance.
Table A2. Delinquency and occupational aspiration - opportunity categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Occupational Aspiration</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Occupational Aspiration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>34 (.8)</td>
<td>223 (.99)</td>
<td>33 (.7)</td>
<td>81 (.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>9 (.2)</td>
<td>3 (.01)</td>
<td>15 (.3)</td>
<td>1 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Phi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus HA-HO</td>
<td>32.5*</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-LO</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-HO</td>
<td>14.7*</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3. School dropout and educational aspiration - opportunity categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Aspiration</th>
<th>Low Aspiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>42 (.7)</td>
<td>216 (.995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>15 (.3)</td>
<td>1 (.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square Phi

- HA-LO versus HA-HO: 53.04** .44
- HA-LO versus LA-LO: 4.7* .24
- HA-LO versus LA-HO: .4 .08
Table A4. School dropout and occupational aspiration - opportunity categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Aspiration</th>
<th>Low Aspiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>29 (.8)</td>
<td>200 (.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>8 (.2)</td>
<td>3 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square Phi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Phi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus HA-HO</td>
<td>27.7**</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-LO</td>
<td>5.0*</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-HO</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A5. Grade point average and educational aspiration - opportunity categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Aspiration</th>
<th>Low Aspiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>34 (.7)</td>
<td>212 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>13 (.3)</td>
<td>7 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Phi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus HA-HO</td>
<td>32.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-LO</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-HO</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A6. Grade point average and occupational aspiration - opportunity categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Aspiration</th>
<th>Low Aspiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>23 (.85)</td>
<td>175 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>4 (.15)</td>
<td>5 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus HA-HO</td>
<td>4.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-LO</td>
<td>7.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-HO</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05 level
**significant at .01 level
Table A7. Standardized test achievement and educational aspiration - opportunity categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Aspiration</th>
<th>Low Aspiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>26 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>24 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square          Phi
HA-LO versus HA-HO  22.77** .30
HA-LO versus LA-LO  3.06  .21
HA-LO versus LA-HO  3.08  .21
Table A8. Standardized test achievement and occupational aspiration - opportunity categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Aspiration</th>
<th>Low Aspiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>11 (.4)</td>
<td>140 (.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>15 (.6)</td>
<td>19 (.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Phi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus HA-HO</td>
<td>31.08**</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-LO</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-LO versus LA-HO</td>
<td>4.6*</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A9. Perceived blockage and delinquency for youth with low educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>18 (.6)</td>
<td>6 (.7)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>13 (.4)</td>
<td>3 (.3)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = .19\]

\[\text{Phi} = .07\]

Table A10. Perceived blockage and delinquency for youth with low educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>22 (.9)</td>
<td>5 (1.0)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>3 (.1)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = 3.2\]

\[\text{Phi} = .33\]
Table A11. Perceived blockage and delinquency for youth with high educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>280 (.996)</td>
<td>37 (.97)</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>1 (.004)</td>
<td>1 (.03)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.58 \]

\[
\text{Phi} = .09
\]

Table A12. Perceived blockage and delinquency for youth with high educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>45 (.8)</td>
<td>21 (.7)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>12 (.2)</td>
<td>8 (.3)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .42 \]

\[
\text{Phi} = .07
\]
Table A13. Perceived blockage on delinquency for youth with low occupational aspirations and high opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Delinquent</strong></td>
<td>37 (1.0)</td>
<td>13 (1.0)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delinquent</strong></td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A14. Perceived blockage on delinquency for youth with low occupational aspirations and low opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Delinquent</strong></td>
<td>20 (.7)</td>
<td>14 (.6)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delinquent</strong></td>
<td>8 (.3)</td>
<td>8 (.4)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .18 \]
\[ \Phi = .06 \]
Table A15. Perceived blockage on delinquency for youth with high occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>210 (.995)</td>
<td>19 (.95)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>1 (.005)</td>
<td>1 (.05)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = 2.18
\]

\[
\text{Phi} = .10
\]

Table A16. Perceived blockage on delinquency for youth with high occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>25 (.7)</td>
<td>8 (.7)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>8 (.3)</td>
<td>3 (.3)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = .04
\]

\[
\text{Phi} = .04
\]
Table A17. Perceived blockage on school dropout for youth with high educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>220 (.996)</td>
<td>24 (.93)</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>1 (.004)</td>
<td>2 (.07)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.48 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .10 \]

Table A18. Perceived blockage on school dropout for youth with high educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>35 (.7)</td>
<td>14 (.6)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>13 (.3)</td>
<td>8 (.4)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .61 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .09 \]
Table A19. Perceived blockage on school dropout for youth with low educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>10 (.5)</td>
<td>1 (.2)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>11 (.5)</td>
<td>5 (.8)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.8 \]
\[ \Phi = .26 \]

Table A20. Perceived blockage on school dropout for youth with low educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>18 (.8)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>4 (.2)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .23 \]
\[ \Phi = .10 \]
Table A21. Perceived blockage on school dropout for youth with low occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>11 (.55)</td>
<td>10 (.5)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>9 (.45)</td>
<td>9 (.5)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .02 \]
\[ \text{Phi} = .023 \]

Table A22. Perceived blockage on school dropout for youth with low occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>30 (.91)</td>
<td>7 (.9)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>3 (.09)</td>
<td>1 (.1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .08 \]
\[ \text{Phi} = .045 \]
Table A23. Perceived blockage on school dropout for youth with high occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>185 (.995)</td>
<td>15 (.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>1 (.005)</td>
<td>2 (.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 13.6^{**} \]

\[ \Phi = .259 \]

Table A24. Perceived blockage on school dropout for youth with high occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>22 (.8)</td>
<td>7 (.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>6 (.2)</td>
<td>2 (.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .0037 \]

\[ \Phi = .01 \]
Table A25. Perceived blockage and GPA for youth with low educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>7 (.6)</td>
<td>1 (.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>5 (.4)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.6 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .23 \]

Table A26. Perceived blockage and GPA for youth with low educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>6 (.4)</td>
<td>2 (.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>8 (.6)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.03^* \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .41 \]
Table A27. Perceived blockage and GPA for youth with high educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>192 (.99)</td>
<td>19 (.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>2 (.01)</td>
<td>5 (.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 26.8^{**}$

$\Phi = .351$

Table A28. Perceived blockage and GPA for youth with high educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>24 (.8)</td>
<td>10 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>6 (.2)</td>
<td>7 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 2.4$

$\Phi = .227$
Table A29. Perceived blockage and GPA for youth with low occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>22 (.9)</td>
<td>4 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>3 (.1)</td>
<td>2 (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 1.5 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .228 \]

Table A30. Perceived blockage and GPA for youth with high occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>162 (.98)</td>
<td>16 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>4 (.02)</td>
<td>1 (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .65 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .06 \]
Table A31. Perceived blockage and GPA for youth with high occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>15 (.8)</td>
<td>8 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>4 (.2)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.9 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .271 \]

Table A32. Perceived blockage and GPA for youth with low occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>9 (.7)</td>
<td>3 (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>4 (.3)</td>
<td>8 (.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.2^* \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .419 \]
Table A33. Perceived blockage and STA for youth with low educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>3 (.6)</td>
<td>2 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>11 (.9)</td>
<td>1 (.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.2 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .36 \]

Table A34. Perceived blockage and STA for youth with low educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>10 (.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>5 (.3)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .51 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .18 \]
Table A35. Perceived blockage and STA for youth with high educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>152 (.9)</td>
<td>18 (.7)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>26 (.1)</td>
<td>7 (.3)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 2.9$

Phi = .12

Table A36. Perceived blockage and STA for youth with high educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>17 (.5)</td>
<td>9 (.5)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>16 (.5)</td>
<td>8 (.5)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .01$

Phi = .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A37. Perceived blockage and STA for youth with high occupational aspirations and high opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonblockage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.3 \]

\[ \Phi = .08 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A38. Perceived blockage and STA for youth with high occupational aspirations and low opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonblockage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .07 \]

\[ \Phi = .053 \]
Table A39. Perceived blockage and STA for youth with low occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>17 (.7)</td>
<td>6 (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>8 (.3)</td>
<td>2 (.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 8 33

\[ x^2 = .11 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .06 \]

Table A40. Perceived blockage and STA for youth with low occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonblockage</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>13 (.65)</td>
<td>4 (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>7 (.35)</td>
<td>9 (.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 13 33

\[ x^2 = 3.7^* \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .334 \]
Table A41. Law enforcement alienation and delinquency for youth with low educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>17 (.7)</td>
<td>6 (.5)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>8 (.3)</td>
<td>7 (.5)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 1.6 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .21 \]

Table A42. Law enforcement alienation and delinquency for youth with low educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>21 (.91)</td>
<td>5 (.8)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>2 (.09)</td>
<td>1 (.2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .29 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .10 \]
Table A43. Law enforcement alienation and delinquency for youth with high educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>268 (.992)</td>
<td>47 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>2 (.008)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = .28\]

\[\Phi = .03\]

Table A44. Law enforcement alienation and delinquency for youth with high educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>48 (.8)</td>
<td>13 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>14 (.2)</td>
<td>5 (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = 2.0\]

\[\Phi = .05\]
Table A45. Law enforcement alienation and delinquency for youth with low occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>25 (.8)</td>
<td>8 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>8 (.2)</td>
<td>7 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 2.3\]

\[\text{Phi} = .22\]

Table A46. Law enforcement alienation and delinquency for youth with high occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>29 (.8)</td>
<td>5 (.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>8 (.2)</td>
<td>1 (.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = .06\]

\[\text{Phi} = .04\]
Table A47. Law enforcement alienation and delinquency for youth with low occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>38 (1.0)</td>
<td>3 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .00 \]

\[ \Phi = .00 \]

Table A48. Law enforcement alienation and delinquency for youth with high occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Delinquent</td>
<td>185 (.99)</td>
<td>38 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>2 (.01)</td>
<td>1 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .36 \]

\[ \Phi = .04 \]
Table A49. Law enforcement alienation and dropout for youth with high occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>Non-Dropout</th>
<th>Dropout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167 (.994)</td>
<td>32 (.94)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>1 (.006)</td>
<td>2 (.06)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.2^* \]

\[ \Phi = .163 \]

Table A50. Law enforcement alienation and dropout for youth with low educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>Non-Dropout</th>
<th>Dropout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (.5)</td>
<td>2 (.2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>8 (.5)</td>
<td>7 (.8)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.2 \]

\[ \Phi = .295 \]
### Table A51. Law enforcement alienation and dropout for youth with low educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>15 (.8)</td>
<td>3 (.75)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>3 (.2)</td>
<td>1 (.25)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .14 \]
\[ \Phi = .08 \]

### Table A52. Law enforcement alienation and dropout for youth with high educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>207 (.991)</td>
<td>36 (.97)</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>2 (.009)</td>
<td>1 (.03)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .73 \]
\[ \Phi = .056 \]
Table A53. Law enforcement alienation and dropout for youth with high educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>38 (.7)</td>
<td>8 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>14 (.3)</td>
<td>6 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = 1.2\)

\(\Phi = .14\)

Table A54. Law enforcement alienation and dropout for youth with high occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dropout</td>
<td>25 (.8)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>6 (.2)</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = 6.6^*\)

\(\Phi = .45\)
Table A55. Law enforcement alienation and dropout for youth with low occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Dropout</strong></td>
<td>14 (.6)</td>
<td>6 (.5)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dropout</strong></td>
<td>11 (.4)</td>
<td>5 (.5)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = .36 \)

\( \Phi = .01 \)

Table A56. Law enforcement alienation and dropout for youth with low occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Dropout</strong></td>
<td>35 (.92)</td>
<td>2 (.7)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dropout</strong></td>
<td>3 (.08)</td>
<td>1 (.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 2.0 \)

\( \Phi = .223 \)
Table A57. Law enforcement alienation and GPA for youth with low educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>5 (.5)</td>
<td>3 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>6 (.5)</td>
<td>2 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not enough observations for adequate test of significance.

Table A58. Law enforcement alienation and GPA for youth with high occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>22 (.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>4 (.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0 \]
\[ \phi = 0 \]
Table A59.  Law enforcement alienation and GPA for youth with low educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>5 (.6)</td>
<td>2 (.7)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>4 (.4)</td>
<td>1 (.3)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not enough observations for adequate test of significance.*

Table A60.  Law enforcement alienation and GPA for youth with high educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>181 (.97)</td>
<td>29 (.97)</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>6 (.03)</td>
<td>1 (.03)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .00 \]

\[ \Phi = .00 \]
Table A61. Law enforcement alienation and GPA for youth with high educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>29 (.8)</td>
<td>5 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>9 (.2)</td>
<td>3 (.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .55 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .11 \]

Table A62. Law enforcement alienation and GPA for youth with low occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>9 (.7)</td>
<td>9 (.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>4 (.3)</td>
<td>2 (.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .47 \]

\[ \text{Phi} = .14 \]
Table A63. Law enforcement alienation and GPA for youth with low occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>24 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>2 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .71 \]
\[ \text{Phi} = .153 \]

Table A64. Law enforcement alienation and GPA for youth with high occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GPA</td>
<td>148 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GPA</td>
<td>5 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 4.0^* \]
\[ \text{Phi} = .15 \]
Table A65. Law enforcement alienation and STA for youth with high educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>23 (.6)</td>
<td>2 (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>18 (.4)</td>
<td>5 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 1.7
Phi = .19

Table A66. Law enforcement alienation and STA for youth with high educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>145 (.8)</td>
<td>22 (.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>29 (.2)</td>
<td>4 (.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = .02
Phi = .01
Table A67. Law enforcement alienation and STA for youth with low educational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High STA</strong></td>
<td>9 (.7)</td>
<td>3 (1.0)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low STA</strong></td>
<td>4 (.3)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not enough observations for adequate test of significance.

Table A68. Law enforcement alienation and STA for youth with low educational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High STA</strong></td>
<td>3 (.3)</td>
<td>2 (.5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low STA</strong></td>
<td>10 (.7)</td>
<td>2 (.5)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not enough observations for adequate test of significance.
Table A69. Law enforcement alienation and STA for youth with low occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>7 (.4)</td>
<td>1 (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>12 (.6)</td>
<td>3 (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = .18
\]

\[
\text{Phi} = .09
\]

Table A70. Law enforcement alienation and STA for youth with low occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>15 (.6)</td>
<td>7 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>10 (.4)</td>
<td>4 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = .36
\]

\[
\text{Phi} = .034
\]
Table A71. Law enforcement alienation and STA for youth with high occupational aspirations and high opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>119 (.9)</td>
<td>21 (.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>16 (.1)</td>
<td>3 (.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .00 \]

\[ \Phi = .00 \]

Table A72. Law enforcement alienation and STA for youth with high occupational aspirations and low opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Alienation</th>
<th>High Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High STA</td>
<td>11 (.4)</td>
<td>0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low STA</td>
<td>14 (.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .75 \]

\[ \Phi = .17 \]
CHAPTER TEN  APPENDIX B  QUESTIONNAIRE

You can help us do a better job in our community center if you would tell us a little about yourself and what some of your ideas are. Feel free to be completely honest and you may be sure that we will not show these questionnaires to persons not concerned with the community center program.

1. Name ____________________________ 2. Birth Date ________________
   (Last) (First) (Middle) (Day, Mo., Year)

3. Sex (Circle) Male Female 4. Home Address ________________

5. Race (Circle) Negro White

6. Check the family members living at home
   __ father __ brothers (how many?) __
   __ mother __ sisters (how many?) __
   __ guardian __ others? (how many?) __

7. Education (Circle the number of years completed)
   Elem. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Jr. High 7 8 9 Sr. High 10 11 12
   7a. Are you enrolled in school this Sept? Yes No

8. Is your father working now? Yes No

9. If so, where does he work?

10. If not employed now, where did he last work?

11. Briefly describe the kind of work your father does.

12. Is your mother working now? Yes No

13. If so, where does she work?

14. If not employed now, where did she last work?

15. Briefly describe the kind of work your mother does.
16. Are you presently employed? No Part Time Full Time

17. If so, where are you employed and what do you do?

18. What kind of work would you like to do for a living?

19. What do you think your chances are of doing that kind of work? (Circle)
   a) very good
   b) good
   c) fair
   d) poor
   e) very poor

20. About how much money do you hope to be earning if you get the job you want?

21. What do you think your chances are of earning that amount of money?
   a) very good
   b) good
   c) fair
   d) poor
   e) very poor

22. About how much schooling do you think you ought to have to get the kind of job that you want?
   a) completion of the ninth grade
   b) some high school training
c) completion of high school

d) some college training

e) completion of college

23. What do you think your chances are of getting that far in school?
   a) very good
   b) good
   c) fair
   d) poor
   e) very poor

24. What kinds of things might stop you from getting that far in school? (Circle as many as you wish.)
   a) desire to earn money
   b) school work is too hard
   c) I don't get along well with my classmates.
   d) teachers are unfair
   e) my family needs me at home
   f) other? ________________________________

25. What kinds of jobs (if any) have you had?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Jobs</th>
<th>Job Held</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Date Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Round</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year Round
Full Time

1.

2.

26. Have you had training in any of the MDTA training programs sponsored by the center on South West Bell St., such as welding, mechanics, radio repair, etc.
   Yes  No

27. If so, would you say that such training will better help you to get what you want out of life?
   Yes  No

28. Have you had training in an apprenticeship program?
   Yes  No

29. If so, would you say such training will better help you to get what you want out of life?
   Yes  No

Choose the single best answer in each of the following questions (30-37)

30a. What do you think is the most important thing for a young person to consider when he or she is choosing a life's work?

   a) enjoyment from the work
   b) a chance to help other people in some way
   c) earning lots of money
   d) becoming somebody important

30b. Which of the above answers is second in importance?

31. Which of the following kinds of jobs would you like best?

   a) a steady job with low pay
   b) a job with good pay but a 50-50 chance of losing it
   c) a job with very high pay but a very great chance of losing it
32a. Which of the following is the most important thing for a young person to learn to prepare him for life?

a) to obey
b) to work hard
c) to be well liked or popular
d) to make something of himself

32b. Which of the above answers is second in importance?

33. Which of the following is most true of your family?

a) we are better off than most families in our neighborhood
b) we are about equal with most families in our neighborhood
c) we are not as well off as most families in our neighborhood

34. Circle the statement which best applies to you.

a) I am usually glad to help around the house
b) Although I don't like to do it I usually help around the house if I am needed.
c) I don't feel that its part of my job so I don't usually help around the house.

35. About how many of your close friends have been in trouble with the police or the juvenile court?

a) none
b) one or two
c) three or four
d) five or more
36. When compared with other kids my age I would say that I participate in extra-school activities such as clubs, sports, plays, etc.

a) very often
b) often
c) about average
d) seldom
e) very seldom

37. Who is it that has been most important in the last few years in shaping your feelings about such things as:
   (Circle the best answer)
   clothes, personal grooming
   principles of right and wrong
   what you really want out of life
   what to look for in a date or possible marriage partner
   your choice of a lifetime job
   clergymen, teachers
   parents, friends

38. In the following statements would you tell us whether you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD). (Circle)

SA  A  D  SD  1. Anyone, no matter who he is, can get a fair trial.

SA  A  D  SD  2. Big time crooks are seldom punished.

SA  A  D  SD  3. A person should not be expected to report a friend to the police.

SA  A  D  SD  4. Policemen are careful not to arrest innocent persons.
5. Policemen are more loyal to each other than they are to the citizens.

6. A person should work even if he can make almost as much money by being on relief.

7. More kids would stay in school if they could work part time and earn a little money for clothes, transportation or entertainment.

8. Teachers tend to grade lower if they don't like you.

9. Most teens find it difficult to talk over really important things with their parents.

10. Negroes would prefer not to live near white people.

11. White people would prefer not to live near Negroes.

12. Most Negroes and whites get along well together in integrated areas but the coming of a third group, like the Spanish, often means that problems will occur.

13. Pressure from friends makes it difficult for a person to do a good job in school.

14. Most kids my age have great respect for school teachers and principals.

15. Most kids my age feel that parents place too many controls on them and don't allow them enough freedom.

16. Society treats some people so badly that I don't blame them for breaking the law to get what they want.

17. Whenever my parents seem unconcerned with what I'm doing it usually doesn't bother me as I am just as happy to act on my own.
Information on Church Affiliation
(Respondents Ages - 12-17)

1) Do you have a religious preference? That is, are you either Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else?

2) If you are Protestant, what specific denomination are you affiliated with?

3) If you attend a particular church or synagogue regularly, please give us the name of it.

4) About how often, if ever, have you attended religious services in the last year?
   a) once a week or more
   b) two or three times a month
   c) once a month
   d) a few times a year or less

5) If you had a serious problem, would you be likely to talk your problem over with a person (or persons) whom you have known from church or synagogue attendance?

6) Do you believe that in the next life some people will be punished and others rewarded by God, or not?

7) Do you believe that God judges people on the basis of whether they had faith in Him, or on the basis of the kind of lives they lead?
CHAPTER ELEVEN  APPENDIX C  QUESTIONNAIRE CODE

General Instructions

At the start of your Fall programming we ask that you distribute copies of the enclosed questionnaire to all youth, of both sexes, ages 12 through 17. If additional young people, not in this age range, are mixed in the group, they may also take the questionnaire but their responses will not be tabulated.

1. Read through the questionnaire thoroughly so as to be familiar with its contents. You may be asked to clarify some of the questions. There are sheets attached here to help you. With young persons in the 12 to 14 age range, you may want to read through the document part by part.

2. Be sure that each person answers the questions by himself. Noise should be kept to a minimum.

3. Some of the respondents may feel that some of the questions are not pertinent to their situations. Where a father is deceased questions 8 through 11 are inappropriate. In other cases a child ought to be encouraged to put down even his vaguest notions such as those concerning eventual job or eventual income level. (Q. 18, 20 and 22) It is permissible, however, to leave questions blank.

4. If you are asked what the purpose of the questionnaire is or what the purpose of specific questions is do not mention our interest in the delinquent or dropout. Rely, rather, on the paragraph on the top of page one.

5. Following the completion of a set of questionnaires you are urged to do the following at your earliest convenience.
   a. Write the child's name, which appears on the first page, onto the last page. Tear off the last page for your own center's analysis.
   b. Read through the questionnaire responses. If you have reason to believe that some information given is incorrect, please make the correction on a separate sheet of paper, not on the questionnaire. On the separate sheet indicate the number of the question which is in doubt, the correction which you wish to make and why you feel that a correction should be made. Your
assistance in this matter of validation is extremely important, particularly with respect to such information as address, occupation of father, age, race, etc.

6. Finally, it would be helpful to us if you would keep a listing of the names of the young persons who refuse to respond to the questionnaire. This is simply to enable us to determine the degree to which our sample may be significantly biased.

When all the appropriate classes have responded to the questionnaire please notify the Council of Social Agencies and we will arrange to have the questionnaires collected.

Instructions for Specific Questions

In the material found below an attempt has been made to indicate the intent of each question and to anticipate as much as possible the kinds of questions which respondents may have.

Questions 1 through 15 are concerned with the background information of the respondent. We are primarily interested in how such data is related to delinquency and dropout. Most of the items are self explanatory. A few comments, however, are in order.

Q. 5 It may be that American Indians or Orientals will appear in the sample. In such cases it will suffice for them to put down the name with which they feel identified or simply to put "other."

Q. 6 The respondent should not include himself in the count of family members.

Q. 8-11 Here the intention is to discover the socio-economic class level of the family provider. If the father is dead or otherwise not with the family this section may be left unanswered.

Q. 12-15 Likewise this section may be left unanswered if inappropriate.

If neither parent is living or connected with the family of the respondent the respondent should be directed to complete the information requested with respect to the male and/or female guardian.
Q. 16-17 Here our concern is to discover if the respondent is already a part of the work force. In some cases this aspect may be more predictive of his attitudes and behavior than would the work experience of his parents. If the description of his employment requested in question 17 demands additional space the respondent should feel free to write on the back of the page.

Q. 18-23 The objective of this set of questions is to ascertain the kinds of aspirations held by the respondents but also the degree to which the respondent feels that the aspirations can be fulfilled. It is extremely important that even vague responses are recorded. Be prepared for the respondents to indicate that these questions have little relevance for them.

Q. 24 Here the respondent should be encouraged to list as many of the factors as might be applicable. Should the respondents mention additional factors an attempt should be made to see if they might be properly associated with those responses which are listed. If the response is genuinely inappropriate to the list which is given it should be written out in the space listed as "other."

Q. 25 While we expect few adolescents to have had elaborate work histories time should be allowed for some adolescents to complete this section. Once again it may be necessary to use the back side of the sheet.

Q. 27 This question should be left blank by all those youth who have not had the MDTA training.

Q. 29 This question should be left blank by all those youth who have not had training in the apprenticeship program.

Q. 33 In this question we have not attempted to provide the criteria by which the child will compare his family with other families. The child should be free to use whatever criteria he or she feels appropriate. What is important to us is that the respondent compare his family to others. Should this be a very helpful question in expanding youthful deviance we can, at a later time, try to better understand the criteria which go into the making of such judgments.
Q. 34 This question is designed to enlist responses from both males and females. The supervisor should not hesitate to give examples of the kinds of things teen-age boys and girls normally do around the house. For girls this might mean helping with the housework or babysitting while for the boys running errands or yardwork would seem more appropriate.

Q. 37 For each series of items listed at the left the respondent is asked to circle one of the categories of persons shown at the right.

Q. 38 Respondents should be shown that the letters given on left correspond to the response alternatives shown in the introduction to the question. SA means, for example, "strongly agree." Some respondents, feeling neutral about a particular question may choose neither to agree or disagree. In such cases encourage the respondent to respond even to very slight preferences in either direction. Should the respondent be without even such slight preferences he may be told to leave the question blank.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY