

A NEW MULTIPLE-
FACTOR APPROACH
TO DELINQUENCY....

N. Reuterman, 1968

Published on demand by
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
University Microfilms Limited, High Wycombe, England

18885

This is an authorized facsimile
and was produced by microfilm-xerography
in 1975 by
Xerox University Microfilms,
Ann Arbor, Michigan,
U.S.A.

This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 68-14,397 7

REUTERMAN, Nicholas Arthur, 1939-
A NEW MULTIPLE-FACTOR APPROACH TO
DELINQUENCY AND ITS APPLICATION TO
TYPES OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

University of Colorado, Ph.D., 1968
Social Psychology

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

A NEW MULTIPLE-FACTOR APPROACH TO
DELINQUENCY AND ITS APPLICATION
TO TYPES OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

by

Nicholas Arthur Reuterman

B.A., Southern Illinois University, 1962

M.A., University of Colorado, 1965

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of the University of Colorado in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

1968

This Thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree by

Nicholas Arthur Reuterman

has been approved for the

Department of

Psychology

by

Desmond S. Cartwright
Desmond S. Cartwright

Ronald C. Johnson
Ronald C. Johnson

David T. Vernon
David T. Vernon

Date 5-13-68

Reuterman, Nicholas Arthur (Ph.D., Psychology)

A New Multiple-Factor Approach to Delinquency and Its Application to
Types of Juvenile Offenders

Thesis directed by Professor Desmond S. Cartwright

The importance of distinguishing among types of juvenile offenders is discussed. The difficulties and advantages of the multiple-factor approach to delinquency are noted. A systematic multiple-factor scheme is discussed. This approach is based on three principal dimensions; the source of the factor (Social or Individual), the life segment in which the factor operates (Peers, Family, School or City), and the causal relationship the factor has with a delinquent act (Instigation, Facilitation, Permission, Diversion and Prohibition). The combination of these dimensions permit the specification of 40 separate factor categories. The study is concerned with the application of the multiple-factor scheme to various types of juvenile offenders. The purpose is to determine how various types of delinquents differ in terms of the multiple-factor scheme.

A questionnaire intended to provide a measure of each of the factor categories was developed. Reliability and validity coefficients were found for each item of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was then administered to a group of adjudicated delinquents and a group of comparable non-delinquents. The subjects were classified according to a number of offender variables, including sex, age, socio-economic status, intelligence, mobility, family composition and ethnic group membership. In addition, the delinquents were classified according to a number of offense type

variables. These included criminal-conflict-retreatist, utilitarian-non-utilitarian, victim present-victim absent, group-individual, criminal-CHIN, and multiple-first.

Different types of delinquents were then compared in order to determine if they scored differently on the various factor categories. The non-delinquents were used as control Ss to insure that differences among delinquents were not due to general differences found for all adolescents. The influence of other variables was controlled. Data analysis was accomplished through the use of multivariate analysis of variance and multiple linear regression.

No differences were found among family composition groups or mobility groups. Differences between sexes were found for Individual Family Permittors (females scored higher), Individual School Facilitators (females scored higher) and Individual City Diverters (males scored higher). Differences between age groups were found for Social Peer Instigators (older scored higher) and Social Peer Facilitators (older scored higher). Differences among socio-economic status levels were found on Social Peer Permittors (medium status scored highest, low status lowest). Differences among intelligence levels were found on Social Family Facilitators (high I.Q. scored highest, low I.Q. lowest) and Individual School Prohibitors (high I.Q. scored highest, low I.Q. lowest). Differences among ethnic groups were found for Social Peer Permittors (Anglo scored higher) and Individual Family Instigators (Anglo scored higher).

No differences were found on the criminal-conflict-retreatist, victim present-victim absent, group-individual or utilitarian-non-utilitarian variables. Differences between criminal and CHIN offenses

v

were found on Social City Instigators (criminal scored higher) and Social City Permittors (criminal scored higher). Differences between multiple-first offenses were found for Social City Diverters (first scored higher) and Individual City Diverters (first scored higher).

These results were related to previous findings in the area of delinquency research. Several general conclusions were drawn from the study. Distinctions between types of offenses are not as important as distinctions between types of offenders. Socio-economic status, broken homes and group-individual offenses are not as important as is generally believed. The proposed multiple-factor scheme is a useful way of determining etiological differences among types of delinquents.

Several applications of the present results to the prevention and control of delinquency are noted. Also a number of directions which future work might take are discussed.

This abstract is approved as to form and content. I recommend its publication.

Signed

Charles S. P. Carpenter
Faculty member in charge of dissertation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of individuals without whose assistance and cooperation the present study would have been impossible to conduct.

Mr. George Taylor, Chief Probation Officer, Boulder County Juvenile Probation Department, provided considerable assistance with item construction for Experience Survey I.

Mr. Robert Hughes, Director, New Start Project, Denver, Colorado provided considerable assistance with item construction for Experience Survey II.

Judge Horace B. Holmes, Boulder County Juvenile Court, and Mr. John Hargadine, Mr. George Taylor, Mr. Charles Cameron and Mrs. Mary Osterberg, Boulder County Juvenile Probation Department, were most helpful in obtaining delinquent subjects.

Judge James J. Delany, Adams County Juvenile Court, and Mr. Jerry Nordstrom, Chief Probation Officer, Adams County Juvenile Probation Department, were most helpful in obtaining delinquent subjects.

Special appreciation is due Mr. Jerry Nordstrom, Adams County Juvenile Probation Department, for his invaluable assistance in obtaining non-delinquent subjects.

Special appreciation is also due Mr. Sam Coleman of the Applied Mathematics Department of the University of Colorado for his work on the computer programs used for data analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MULTIPLE-FACTOR APPROACHES TO DELINQUENCY.	6
III. PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT WORK.	10
IV. A SYSTEMATIC MULTIPLE-FACTOR SCHEME.	13
V. PROCEDURE.	24
Test Construction	24
Subjects.	28
Data Collection	30
Variables	31
Analysis.	38
VI. RESULTS.	47
Offender Variables.	49
Offense Variables	63
VII. DISCUSSION	72
Offender Variables.	72
Offense Variables	84
General Observations.	91
Suggestions for Application	96
VIII. SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY	98
REFERENCES	101
APPENDICES	111
A. Reported Delinquency Scale.	111
B. Experience Survey II.	112
C. Independent Variable Form	132
D. Experience Survey I	134
E. Detailed Tables for Analyses.	150

I. INTRODUCTION

The present work is concerned with the application of a multiple-factor etiological scheme to various types of delinquent behavior. The conception of law-violation as consisting of non-homogeneous groups has long been a part of the thought and research into delinquency and crime (Lindesmith & Dunham, 1941; MacIver, 1962). More recent writings also indicate the belief, on the part of many workers in the field, that it is necessary to give serious consideration to the possibility that the causes of delinquency may very well be quite different for varying types of law-violation.

Merton (1957) maintains that the idea of a theory of juvenile delinquency may be very much akin to the idea of a theory of disease as opposed to distinct theories of diseases. Kinch (1962a) suggests that "research could legitimately start with the assumption that types do exist and go on from there" (p. 326). According to Clinard and Wade (1957) "to understand delinquency more fully it is necessary to study the various career patterns and types of offenses in which the delinquent participates" (p. 494). Browning (1964) notes the necessity of studying limited and homogeneous categories of delinquents in an effort to get valid, but limited theories of delinquency. Vold (1958) makes the following statement supporting the need for study of types of delinquency:

Crime must be recognized clearly as not being a unitary phenomenon but as consisting of many kinds of behavior occurring under many different situations. No single theory therefore should be expected to provide the explanations for the many varieties of behavior involved. The

problem calling for clearer thinking in the future than has been given it in the past is the systematic and realistic delineation of kinds or types of criminality actually occurring that need to be comprehended. Consistent and unitary theory then should be possible for each type, so there would be less confusion due to the utilization of a non-applicable theory to any particular type (pp. 313-314).

Martin (1961) also stresses the importance of studying different types of delinquency:

Delinquency consists of many kinds of deviant behavior committed by different types of juvenile offenders for various purposes in a variety of concrete situations (p. 5).

Therefore, we must not be concerned with general explanations of delinquency We must, instead, isolate and study particular types of delinquency, describe the characteristics of the individuals involved in each type, and determine, as best we can, the purposes of their behavior and the kinds of situations in which it occurs (p. 5).

Martin continues:

The classification of law-violators into subtypes often serves a highly useful function not performed by points of view which fail to distinguish categories of offenders. By dividing offenders into subtypes, thereby differentiating categories of offenders, we see that the roots of crime are dissimilar in each category and that the problems of prevention and control are also different for each category (p. 31).

The need for delineating types of offenders is also recognized by many others (Block, 1957; Cohen, 1957; Gibbons, 1962; Gibbons, 1966; Kinch, 1962b; Robison, 1960; Roebuck, 1963; Roebuck, 1967; Roebuck & Cadwallader, 1961; and Schuessler & Cressey, 1953).

While there is extensive agreement regarding the need for a typology of offenders, there is considerably less agreement as to what such a typology should be based upon. A number of bases for the development of a typology of offenders have been suggested.

Robison (1960) notes the possibility of regarding delinquency as a continuous variable, with various degrees being represented by various scale types, each scale type being a combination of delinquent

actions. Conger and Miller (1966) have used this approach in classifying delinquents according to seriousness-nonseriousness and aggressiveness-passiveness of offenses. In opposition to the above position is the possibility of delinquent acts as clusters or patterns that tend to recur and which may have some elements in common but are distinctive patterns which are not points along a scale (Robison, 1960). Proponents of the latter view include Roebuck (1967) who strongly favors the use of the offense pattern as the basic variable in a typology, and Clinard (1957, 1959) who takes a quite similar position. Also Cloward and Ohlin (1960) and Spergel (1964) have used this approach in their work on lower class gang delinquency, and Scott (1959) has identified two independent dimensions of delinquent offenses. Korn and McCorkle (1959) have criticized classifications based on legal offense categories as follows: Such classifications (1) create a false impression of homogeneity by suggesting that persons committing the same act are similar in other respects, (2) tell nothing about the person, his personal characteristics or the circumstances of the offense, (3) create a false impression of specialization by implying that criminals confine themselves to one particular kind of crime for which they are caught at a given time, and (4) purport to define the actor in terms of his act, but precision in describing the act itself is often lacking. Substantive work on various types of offenses is quite extensive and has been previously reviewed (Reuterman, 1967b).

A third approach to the development of a typology has concentrated on distinguishing between offenders on the basis of personality constellations. This is best exemplified in the work of Jenkins

4

(1955), Jenkins (1957), Jenkins and Hewitt (1944), Quay, Peterson and Consalvi (1960), Shinohara and Jenkins (1967), and Stein, Gough and Sarbin (1966).

Korn and McCorkle (1959) have criticized this approach to classification as follows: It ignores situational factors as causal elements. It may produce rigid diagnostic categories. A false impression of homogeneity may also be present only at the diagnostic level rather than at the behavioral level.

Finally, attention has been directed toward offenders who differ in terms of some inherent personal characteristic (e.g., I.Q., sex) or in terms of personal attributes which they possess more or less due to external forces acting on them (e.g., socio-economic status, family composition). Cohen (1957) has been one of the many proponents of this approach.

Extensive reviews of previous attempts to develop typologies can be found in Gibbons and Garrity (1959) and Kinch (1962a).

As noted by Abrahamsen (1960) all of the above general approaches to typology development seem to be based on one of two ideas: First, the idea of classifying according to the act committed (i.e., type of offense), or second, classifying according to some attribute of the offender himself (i.e., type of offender).

The present work is concerned with the investigation of the relative importance of various etiological factors of delinquent behavior classified both in terms of type of offender and type of offense. The specific offender and offense categories employed will be discussed in detail in a later section of the paper. Attention

will now be directed to a brief discussion of the general conception of multiple-factor approaches to delinquency.

II. MULTIPLE-FACTOR APPROACHES TO DELINQUENCY

The basic conception of the multiple-factor approach to delinquency and crime is that law violation results from a multiplicity of influences which act to predispose toward or precipitate a given illegal act. According to this orientation the critical causal influences may be any subset of a large number of potentially important factors. No particular set or type of factor is selected apriori as being crucial.

Considerable controversy exists regarding the usefulness of multiple-factor approaches to delinquency. Some of the principal criticisms of the multiple-factor approach are as follows: (1) A distinction must be made between factors and contingencies. Factors are influences which in all cases have some etiological significance. Contingencies may or may not be important in a given case. Often contingencies are regarded as factors with the resulting position being one of saying that everything may be etilogically significant (Matza, 1964). (2) No rules are provided for interrelating various aspects of the multiple-factor approach or for shifting from one aspect to another. Multiple-factor theories are commonly collections of various single factor theories (Glaser, 1956). (3) Multiple-factor approaches simply enumerate variables rather than organizing and relating them which is the purpose of theory (Sutherland & Cressey, 1955). The use of multiple-factor approaches leads to a continuing succession of exploratory studies. Research should go beyond multiple-factors and reduce the series of factors to simplicity by the

method of logical abstraction (Sutherland & Cressey, 1955). (4) Multiple-factor studies must necessarily limit the universe of variables in some way. This is usually accomplished in an implicit manner without any theoretical basis (Wolfgang, Savitz & Johnston, 1962). (5) Multiple-factor theories do not "facilitate the deduction of any hypotheses or practical consequences that are of any help whatsoever" (Wilkins, 1965, p. 37). Multiple-factor theories are said to apply to all factors which are found to be related to criminal tendencies, thus it is impossible to find any test by which the theory can be proved wrong (Wilkins, 1965). Lastly, Wilkins (1965) maintains that multiple-factor approaches do not make clear just what observations they are concerned with. (6) Cohen (1962) presents the most extensive critique of the multiple-factor approach:

A multiple-factor approach is not a theory; it is an abdication of the quest for a theory. It simply asserts that this particular event is caused by this particular combination of concrete circumstances and that particular event by another combination of circumstances. This delinquency is caused by 'bad neighborhood', . . . that delinquency is caused by 'poverty', What makes these 'causes' other than the fiat or 'intuition' of the author? Nothing, if nothing more is offered. Probably, in many cases, the assertion that this complex of circumstances is causally related to that event rests upon implicit, inarticulate, 'preconscious' theoretical assumptions in the mind of the author; but explanation lies precisely in making these theoretical assumptions explicit, showing their applicability to concretely or 'phenotypically' different 'special cases' of the general theory, and demonstrating that this particular complex of circumstances fits the conditions required by the theory (p. 78).

Cohen's second point is that multiple-factor adherents fail to realize that the consequences of the presence of a factor are not determined solely by the intrinsic characteristics (either pro- or anti-delinquency) of the factor, but also by the total field in which the factor is embedded and by the subject's definition of the situa-

tion. This failure results from the assumption that each factor has a capacity within itself to produce or deter from delinquency (1962). Cohen's third criticism is that most multiple-factor approaches assume that bad conditions cause deviant behavior. The difficulty here is that this assumption is actually the point to be demonstrated. It is an empirical question whether and/or what bad conditions are the causes of deviancy (1962).

While a number of difficulties may be encountered in the multiple-factor approach, there are many who regard this approach as the most useful. This is exemplified in the classic works of Burt (1965), Healy (1915), Glueck and Glueck (1934), Shaw (1929), Thomas (1951), and Thrasher (1926). More recent proponents of the multiple-factor approach are also quite numerous. McCord, McCord and Zola (1959) maintain that crime cannot be understood by examining one factor alone. Many aspects of the family and interaction between the family and the neighborhood should be examined. Nye (1958) notes that the single factor theories may be useful in examining some aspects of delinquency. However, delinquents often show evidence of many different influences. Short (1960b) claims that many factors are associated in the causation of delinquency and thus no simple factor can explain it. Barnes and Teeters (1959) state: "In short, the eclectic or 'multiple causation' thesis is the most fruitful, though perhaps the most frustrating, position that can be taken" (p. 208). Other proponents of the multiple-factor approach include Block (1957), Glueck and Glueck (1950, 1959), and Kvaraceus (1959).

The principal argument for a multiple-factor approach seems to be that there is considerable evidence which suggests the operation of

a multiplicity of etiological influences in delinquency. Thus the distinctive advantage of a multiple-factor approach (although a number of disadvantages may also exist) lies in the explicit attempt to give consideration to all potential influences in delinquency causation.

A number of criteria to be met by multiple-factor approaches have been suggested. They are as follows: (1) State more explicitly the reasons for the choice of particular items of analysis. (2) Attempt to arrange these reasons for delimited factor choice within an integrated and meaningful interrelationship of factors. Factors which remain outside of the framework of rationale for selection are meaningless even if correlated with delinquency. (3) Try to connect previously unintegrated, but highly correlated, data to existing theory. (4) Produce new theory which integrated data may provide (Wolfgang, Savitz & Johnston, 1962).

III. PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT WORK

The present work is based on two basic decisions: First, that a typological approach to juvenile delinquency is necessary. Second, that the most effective method of determining causal factors operative in various types of delinquent behavior is through the use of a multiple-factor approach. These assumptions represent a departure from the usual approach to the problem of delinquency in that multiple-factor approaches have previously been commonly employed as an alternative to typological approaches. Multiple-factor approaches have ordinarily been used in efforts to arrive at general causal formulations applicable to all varieties of offenders and offenses (Browning, 1964; Gibbons, 1962).

In short, the present concern is with the application of a "systematic" multiple-factor scheme to a selected number of different types of delinquent behavior classified according to both characteristics of the offender and the type of offense committed.

It is felt that the typological conception necessarily suggests, at least at one level of analysis, a multiple-factor theory. That is, if there are different types of delinquent behavior, these must necessarily be accounted for in terms of the operation or non-operation of a number of different factors. This implication of the typological approach has been recognized by several workers in the area.

An explanation for white-collar crime will not fit juvenile gang warfare; a suitable explanation as to why a person persistently commits arson will not suffice to explain syndicated crime; to offer an explanation as to why a man kills his spouse in a jealous rage will not be helpful to explain why a young adult wantonly kills a small shopkeeper for a paltry sum of money. The reasons why the Mad Bomber of

New York City persisted in placing bombs in many public places a few years ago for a fancied wrong will not apply to the black marketeer or the extortionist. Nor can any one explanation of crime cover both the occasional or accidental criminal acts of persons and the persistent pattern of professional criminal activity. To build up a system of crime causation that will include all types of criminals and their acts is unrealistic and futile (Barnes & Teeters, 1959, p. 208).

Thus a necessary part of distinguishing various types of delinquent behavior seems to be the adoption of some type of multiple-factor approach.

The combination of these two approaches plus the attempted systematization of multiple factors into a coherent scheme avoids a number of the difficulties which occurred in previous usages of multiple-factor orientations.

Many previous studies have used such things as I.Q., broken homes, socio-economic status, etc., as independent variables which were then related to delinquency. This resulted in the simple enumeration of related conditions which is condemned by multiple-factor critics (Cohen, 1962; Sutherland & Cressey, 1955). The present approach uses these kinds of variables as one of the bases for the classification of offenders. Thus they become independent variables whose relationship to other more explicit dependent variables is the focus of attention.

The present approach also allows for the possible consideration of all potentially important factors in that it removes the problem of having every factor being important for every type of offender. Thus it permits the inclusion of what Matza (1964) has termed contingencies (influences which may or may not be important in a given case). This is possible because factors important in one type of offense may be

entirely irrelevant for another. Attention is directed to specifying what influences or combinations thereof are important to what kinds of delinquent behavior, and how they are important. Thus the idea is to move from contingencies to factors for given types of offenders. Such activity is here regarded as the basis for theory, and when completed will provide causal propositions which are amenable to testing. The absence of testable theory has been noted as another problem in multiple-factor approaches (Wilkins, 1965).

The particular multiple-factor scheme here employed avoids several other difficulties attributed to multiple-factor approaches. It provides the basis for interrelating various aspects of the system; it specifies the theoretical assumptions underlying the selection of causal factors; it considers the effects of the subject's perception of the situation; and, it provides at least a beginning in the difficult task of limiting the universe of variables in some systematic manner. These have been points of criticism offered by Glaser (1956), Wolfgang, Savitz and Johnston (1962), and Cohen (1962).

In addition the present work meets Kinch's (1962a) criteria for typological schemes of using the same concepts in attempting to explain the various types of delinquent behavior. This results from the application of the same multiple-factor scheme to each type.

IV. A SYSTEMATIC MULTIPLE-FACTOR SCHEME

Several aspects of the present scheme have been discussed in detail by Cartwright, Reuterman and Vandiver (1967) and these will be only briefly described in the present discussion. Certain other aspects of the scheme will be considered in detail.

The present scheme is basically a multidimensional classification of factors potentially relevant to the commission of a delinquent act. It deals only with direct causes like a present wish for "kicks" or a current lack of supervision (rather than considering the state of society at large, as in alienation theory). This is quite similar to the view of Briar and Piliavin (1965). Factors are classified in two ways: by the type of causal relation to the commission of a delinquent act; and by the proximal source of the factor.

There are five classes of causal relations between factors and delinquent acts: Instigation, Facilitation, Permission, Diversion, and Prohibition. Factors are classified according to the relations they bear. Instigators are those factors which provide the push or impulse to action. Facilitators are those factors which provide the means for carrying the impulse into actual behavior. Permitters are those factors which allow the act to go forward (once impelled and given means), providing silent applause or tacit encouragement. Diverters are those factors which militate against commission of delinquent acts by virtue of preoccupying time, attention, or interest in other directions. Prohibitors are those factors which directly oppose, inhibit, or block the commission of delinquent acts.

There are two general classes of proximal source of a factor: Social and Individual. Social factors are those which come from outside the person, usually from other persons in one way or another. Individual factors are those which come from within the person himself.

Various factors can then be classified on the basis of the above two dimensions. Thus a given factor may be regarded as a Social Instigator, or as an Individual Diverter, etc.

Cartwright, Reuterma and Vandiver (1967, pp. 5-6) make several points regarding the above aspects of the classification scheme:

The component concepts and even the terms expressing them are not new. For example, Thrasher (1963) wrote: 'Junkmen sometimes actually instigate robberies . . . ' (p. 110) (instigation); 'Opportunity to sell junk is an important element in the situation' (p. 110) (facilitation); 'The general point of view of the parents . . . seems to be that thievery from a railroad is not wrong because it is a big corporation' (p. 114) (permission); 'The recreation of boys who become 'wholesome citizens' is provided by parents, friends, teachers, and recreation leaders . . . ' (p. 341) (diversion); 'He was the one who organized us into an independent Boy Scout troop, brought about the prohibition of swearing and smoking . . . ' (p. 355) (prohibition).

The distinction between social and individual factors is also clearly parallel to Burt's distinctions between environmental conditions and physical-plus-psychological conditions. These distinctions were employed as classification bases by Burt. Thrasher too saw both social and individual sources of causation conditions, as is clear from all five social factors listed above and one of his discussions of 'interstitial phenomena', a term central to Thrasher's account of the gang. He wrote: 'The problem (of nothing to do in leisure hours) is greatly intensified in gangland areas by the allurements of already existing gang tradition and gang activities The lure of the gang is undoubtedly due in part to the fact that the gang boy is in the adolescent stage . . . the years from twelve to twenty-six. It is a time of physical and social development -- an interstitial period between childhood and maturity . . . marked by conflicts consequent to the attempts of the growing personality to adjust itself in its larger social milieu . . . ' (pp. 65, 66). Throughout his

work Thrasher noted many forces of both social and individual kinds which led to joining delinquent gangs and committing delinquent acts.

Thus while the specific aspects of the present scheme are not new, the particular organization presented here is new. There have been systems combining several of the major classes here proposed. For example, Nye (1958) stresses social and individual controls, and Cloward and Ohlin (1961) stress the opportunity for legitimate (social diverters) and illegitimate (social facilitators) means. However, positions such as these have typically emphasized a particular factor or subset of factors within the context of a general theory. "The present system does not prescribe the contents of the classes; but retains rather the flexibility (and initial imprecision) of equifinal classification" (Cartwright, Reuteran & Vandiver, 1967).

Besides the conceptions of causal relations and proximal source the present system is heavily dependent on one additional consideration. This is the conception of "segmentation". The use of segmentation in the present system has been briefly discussed by Cartwright and Reuteran (1967). It will be considered in detail in the following discussion.

The first aspect of the segmentation view is that present-day society is composed of a number of distinct institutions. Merton (1963) maintains that a non-primitive society cannot be assumed to have functional unity. Toby (1964) notes that urban environments are especially segmented in social structure and thus in individual participation in units of the structure and in items of belief, custom, and ritual practice. Volkhart (1951) takes a similar position. Shibutani (1963) maintains that mass societies are diversified and

pluralistic; and that "most people live more or less compartmentalized lives, shifting from one social world to another as they participate in a series of transactions" (p. 103). The net result of this segmentation of the social structure is that individuals are subject to different influences, expectations, controls, etc., as they move from one social segment to another in the course of everyday living.

The second major aspect of the segmentation view is that the individual accumulates segments of experience composed of bonded sets of habits and expectancies. It is thought that each segment of experience corresponds to one of the major social institutions in which the person participates. Thus when an individual is functioning within a given social segment, the corresponding experience segment is the most salient in controlling behavior. It is assumed that the transfer of experience elements among segments is not a common phenomenon and can occur only under very special circumstances.

The proposition of individual segmentation contrasts sharply with many prevailing assumptions concerning the unity of the personality. In particular the segmentation view conflicts with the idea of consistent personality traits which at all times determine behavior, feelings, etc. It also conflicts with the idea of internal consistency which is held by most individuals.

Men have become so accustomed to this mode of life (changing from one segment to another) that they manage to conceive of themselves as reasonably consistent human beings in spite of this segmentalization and are generally not aware of the fact that their acts do not fit into a coherent pattern (Shibutani, 1963, p. 103).

Segmentation suggests the existence of a fair amount of inconsistency on the part of the individual as different experience segments become

sallent for him. This position is not dissimilar to that taken by a number of others.

Thorndike (1907, 1949) emphasizes the idea that a person's response to a situation depends largely on the closeness of the connection between the response and some element of the situation. Thus different situations would be expected to elicit different mental states and responses on the part of the person; and consistency of response would depend on similarity in situation elements. Burgers and Akers (1966) also note the importance of similar stimulus elements necessary for response generalization to different situations.

Thomas (1964) maintains that "definitions of situations" can arise from a number of sources and may well vary depending on the source. These differing definitions can affect the personality of an individual. "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 follows from a series of such definitions" (p. 233). Thus the end result of this process may be a number of "life-policies" each applying to a different segment of the person's life. Gergen (1966) also strongly favors a segmentation idea, or at least the view that personal consistency across differing situations may not be as prevalent as is commonly assumed.

Several lines of evidence are relevant to the idea of individual segmentation. Many studies have suggested an inconsistency in behavior in different situations. LaPiere's (1934) classic attitude study clearly indicates that directly opposing behaviors may occur in different situations depending on whether the attitude object is actually present or not. Robinson and Rohde (1946) report consider-

able changes in interviewee responses depending on the appearance of the interviewer. Cohen (1962) reports significant differences in the social behavior of a 13 year old boy depending upon who he was interacting with. Borgatta and Bales (1955) have shown that the consistency of behavior across situations increases if the situations are made more similar by including the same individuals. Bishop (1955) demonstrated differences in the play activity of children depending on what adults were present. Whyte (1955) noted differences in a specific ability depending on the situation in which the ability was being exercised. "Accustomed to filling an inferior position, Frank was unable to star even in his favorite sport (baseball) when he was competing against members of his own group" (p. 19). Gergen (1966) reports that Hartshorne and May concluded in their classic study that deviant behavior represents situationally specific habits rather than personal or consistent traits. Several others have also noted that inconsistent behavior seems to be quite common (Jenkins & Hewitt, 1949; Matza, 1964; and Shaw, 1929).

Evidence also suggests that individuals tend to be inconsistent in self-descriptions or self-evaluations. Gergen (1965) found that self-evaluation can be varied by the manipulation of social feedback. Gergen (1966) reports several studies demonstrating changes in self-evaluation depending upon the type of person the subject interacts with and the purpose of the situation. Cartwright (1957) reports that candidates for psychotherapy describe themselves differently in relation to different people and that this inconsistency is more pronounced for attributes which they consider to be most important in describing themselves.

Several studies suggest that values, ideals, etc., are also segmented to a large extent. Short and Strodtbeck (1965) note a considerable discrepancy in the reporting of family ideals by Negro gang members depending on whether the member was talking to a detached worker alone or the entire gang was present. Short and Strodtbeck maintain that value systems do not apply consistently to all situations or to all roles. Different situations and roles require different values and different behavior patterns. This is often seen in the seemingly contradictory ideas of gang members. However, the contradiction arises from ideas occurring in different situations (Short and Strodtbeck, 1965). The apparent incongruity of gang members' endorsement of middle class values may also be explained on the basis of the situation in which the endorsement occurred (i.e., the very middle-class setting of a university combined with the involvement of detached workers in the procedure) (Gordon, et al., 1963). Allport (1955) reports that "mental-processes" are often quite different in social and solitary conditions. Horrocks and Gottfried (1966) report that differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in regard to psychological needs are more pronounced when considered from the point of view of various behavioral segments than when considered from the point of view of specific needs. In other words there were greater differences between the two groups in terms of the various behavioral settings in which the needs occurred than there were with regard to any one specific need. "This finding . . . , would imply that the place to start looking for differential behavior of delinquents should be in the settings in which the behaviors take place" (p. 191).

The final line of evidence supporting individual segmentation concerns the apparent situation specificity of conscience or morality. Work by Allinsmith (1957, 1960) indicates that guilt feelings vary according to the type of transgression. They also appear to vary according to who is offended by the transgression (Lurie, Goldwasser & Goldwasser, 1963; and Stendler, 1949). Hartshorne and May (1930) conclude from the administration of tests of moral opinion in several settings that:

The wide differences in means of tests taken by the same children in different situations and the relatively low correlations between the scores of the same children indicate quite clearly that a child does not have a uniform generalized code of morals but varies his opinion to suit the situation in which he finds himself (pp. 107-108).

Brown (1965) concludes from his review of relevant work that all three dimensions of conscience (knowledge, conduct and emotion) seem to be more specific to the situation than general. He suggests that since moral conduct is learned, it may be that in one situation the conditions are favorable for learning and in another they are unfavorable, thus inconsistency in morality across setting may be expected to occur.

To summarize, the present point of view emphasizes both the segmentation of the existing social structure and the segmentation of the individual in terms of behavior, values, impulses, controls, etc., into experience segments which directly correspond to the social structural segments. Thus an individual in a particular social segment is not only subject to the various influences unique to that social segment, but also operates according to his own particular experience mass which is associated with that social setting. Most commonly there is as little overlap among the various individual

experience segments as there is among the various social segments, and usually little generalization of individual segments occurs across social segments.

Assuming the correctness of the segmentation view, the problem in the present work becomes one of identifying meaningful life segments for adolescents. Four aspects of the adolescent's environment have been identified as particularly important. These are the peer group, the home or family situation, the school, and the city or neighborhood. Initially these segments were identified with the consultation of several juvenile probation officers. Later it was confirmed that these four areas are accepted by many workers as being significant in the lives of most adolescents and of particular importance in regard to delinquency. Healy and Bronner (1926) note the importance of peer group influences and the school. Tannenbaum (1938) puts particular emphasis on the importance of neighborhood influences in delinquency. Reiss (1951) stresses the family, school and community as sources of controls. Thomas (1951) notes the importance of the family and school in both causing and preventing delinquency. Vedder (1963) also stresses the home and the school. Several others have emphasized the importance of these four segments (Lurie, et al., 1943; Matza, 1964; Shaw, 1929, 1931).

It is intended that these aspects are inclusive enough to cover all areas of an adolescent's life in which his normal functioning occurs. In other words, they are meant to encompass the "significant others" and the "significant environment" of adolescents. It is felt that the total contribution of factors toward (or against) delinquency may be very uneven in the different settings of a youth's life. The

home may be good, but the companions bad; the city at large may be bad, but the particular school good; and so on.

According to the present system the two dimensional classification of factors is applied in each of the four life segments. Thus a given factor may be classified as a Social School Diverter, an Individual Home Facilitator, a Social Peer Instigator, etc.

Examples of classified factors are presented in Figure 1. It should be emphasized that Figure 1 is applied to each of the segmented areas.

In summary, both the typological and multiple-factor approaches to delinquency are accepted as the basis for the present work. Concern is with the application of a systematic multiple-factor scheme to delinquent behavior classified both according to type of offender and type of offense. It is intended that this procedure will enable specification of the differential importance of various categories of etiological factors for various types of offenders and offenses. For example, preliminary work (Reuterman, 1967a) suggests that low I.Q. delinquents are significantly greater on Individual School Permittors, Social School Facilitators and Individual School Instigators than are high I.Q. delinquents; also, the comparison of recidivists and first offenders indicates the former to be significantly greater on Social Peer Permittors, Social Family Permittors, Individual School Facilitators, and Individual City Permittors.

FIGURE 1

Two-fold Classification of Factors

	Social	Individual
Instigators	(a) people who lure (b) people who tempt (c) people who force (d) movies (e) magazines	(a) wish for kicks (b) wish for status (c) wish for respect (d) desire for material goods (e) role image of tough guy or smart guy
Facilitators	(a) fences and other assistants (b) opportunity in open doors, cars, etc. (c) density of population	(a) skills (b) natural abilities (c) emotional control
Permitters	(a) people who don't care (b) people who are afraid to interfere (c) people who want to avoid involvement	(a) mental retardation (b) ignorance (c) emotional instability (d) alienated attitudes
Diverters	(a) church youth clubs (b) parks and recreation (c) work program (d) schools' interesting activities	(a) hobbies (b) habits of being busy (c) social interest
Prohibitors	(a) police (b) courts (c) teachers (d) strong parents (e) vigilant citizens	(a) conscience (b) fear of punishment (c) self-concept (d) long-run image for career, position in society, etc.

V. PROCEDURE

Test Construction

At the beginning of the present work one instrument (Experience Survey) tapping the various categories of factors had already been developed; however, it was decided to expand this instrument because in it several of the factor categories were represented by only two items. A pool of 400 potential items was collected (including 145 from the first version of the Experience Survey). Both existing and new items were constructed so as to be readable and meaningful for a delinquent subject sample. The items were checked in this regard, and in some cases changed, by either Boulder County Juvenile Probation Officers or by the director of the New Start Project (a demonstration project concerned with the rehabilitation of Denver delinquents selected as having a very unfavorable prognosis). Thus there is some assurance that the items are meaningful for both the "best" and the "worst" delinquents in the Denver area. The 400 items were administered to a group of college students ($N = 76$) who volunteered to take part in this study in order to fulfill the course requirements for Introductory Psychology. Obviously this subject sample is not the same as the population for which the instrument is intended. However, after several unsuccessful attempts to obtain a high school aged sample for the test construction procedure it was decided that the Introductory Psychology group was the only available one. In an effort to minimize any differences in the responses between the test construction sample and the population of interest the upper age limit

for the participating college students was set at 20 years.

The 400 items were administered on two separate occasions, one week apart. At the second administration a 10 item scale of reported delinquency was also included (See Appendix A for the reported delinquency scale). This allowed for the computation of test-retest stability and an estimate of item validity.

Item stability and validity were used as the bases for selection of items to be included in the final form of the questionnaire. Internal consistency and split-half reliability were of no concern because there is no theoretical reason to expect the items in a given category of the classification scheme to be highly related to one another.

Stability was based on the relatively short time period of one week because the items ask for a response in terms of number of times during the past year. Thus allowing a long time period between test administrations would result in the subjects considering different sets of experiences at the two administrations. Since interest was in the selection of stable items for inclusion in the test, stability coefficients were based on the correlation of each item with itself across the two test administrations.

Validation of a questionnaire of the present type presents some difficulty. Emphasis has been given to both content and construct validation (Cronbach, 1960). Considerable effort has been expended to insure that items intended to tap factors at given points in the present scheme do actually refer to factors at those points (i.e., the items refer to the intended content). For example, care has been taken to insure that a Social School Permitter item actually refers to

something that is outside of the subject, within his school related experiences, and allows a delinquent act to occur. A second validation process involved the correlation of individual items with the reported delinquency scale. Valid items were expected to correlate properly with the delinquency scale. "Correlate properly" here refers to instigators, facilitators and permitters correlating positively with the amount of reported delinquency and diverter and prohibitor items correlating negatively.

Since both Experience Survey items and the reported delinquency items had the same response format¹ it would be highly likely that positive correlations between items and the delinquency scale would be inflated and negative ones would be reduced or eliminated due to response tendencies on the part of subjects. Short of changing the response format for one of the sets of items there was no direct way to eliminate this difficulty. However, the influence of response tendency could be greatly reduced by basing the validity coefficients on part correlations (McNemar, 1962). Previous work provided an estimate of the relationship between response tendency and the reported delinquency scale.² Since the reported delinquency scale and the Experience Survey used the same response format it was assumed that the relationship between Experience Survey items and response tendency

¹Both Experience Survey items and the reported delinquency items ask for a response in terms of "number of times during the past year", with an 8 point response scale ranging from "never" to "very often".

²Based on a sample of 81 college students Cartwright found the correlation between response tendency and the reported delinquency scale to be .34.

would be the same. With this information the part correlations between Experience Survey items and the reported delinquency scale were computed and used as estimates of item validity.³

The final items included in the second version of the Experience Survey were selected so as to maximize both item stability and item validity. Examples of several types of items are as follows: Social Peer Instigator: During the past year has some kid had it in for you? Social Peer Facilitator: How many times during the past year have any of your friends told you they wouldn't rat on you if you took chances? Social Peer Permitter: How many times during the past year have you and your friends agreed that most people are not interested in or concerned about others? Social Peer Diverter: How many times during the past year have any of your friends asked you to help out on some work he was required to do? Social Peer Prohibitor: How many times during the past year have any of your friends left a fun party because they had to get home on time? The final form of the test contained 200 items, 5 in each of the factor categories. These items and their stability and validity coefficients are presented in Appendix B.

³The computational formula for part correlations is as follows:

$$r_{1(2-3)} = \frac{r_{12} - r_{13}r_{23}}{\sqrt{1 - r_{23}^2}} ;$$

where, in this case, r_{12} is the item by delinquency scale correlation, r_{13} is the item by response tendency correlation, and r_{23} is the delinquency scale by response tendency correlation.

Subjects

The purpose of the present study (identification of factor categories important in the etiology of various types of offenders and offenses) necessitated the use of two principal subject groups; a delinquent group, and a non-delinquent group. The use of these two groups permitted the determination of not only whether factor categories differed between types of offenders, but also whether such differences simply reflected differences in non-delinquent adolescents in general rather than occurring only in comparisons of delinquents. For example, if a difference is found between high and low I.Q. delinquents on some factor category, it is necessary to know whether this difference reflects a general difference between high and low I.Q. adolescents or whether it occurs only for delinquents. A lack of knowledge on the latter point precludes any meaningful statement concerning the etiological differences between high and low I.Q. delinquents.

The non-delinquent subject group consisted of a total of 296 Junior and Senior High School adolescents. All of the non-delinquent subjects were residents of small suburban towns immediately adjacent to Denver, Colorado. Subjects were obtained from a Junior and Senior High School in a relatively lower socio-economic status, predominantly Spanish-American area and a relatively middle class, predominantly Anglo area.⁴ Due to the necessary consideration of class schedules

⁴The number of subjects from each area and school is as follows: Lower class Junior, N = 100; Lower class Senior, N = 54; Middle class Junior, N = 88; and Middle class Senior, N = 54.

and the normal school routine there was no attempt at any kind of systematic sampling. Instead data were obtained from one or more academic classes in the lower class Junior and Senior High Schools and the middle class Junior High School. In the middle class Senior High School class schedules and other school-related factors necessitated obtaining data from a group of volunteers. In neither procedure is there any real reason to suspect a biased sample with regard to the variables of interest. An attempt was made to obtain data from at least a fair number of students at each grade level in each of the schools.

The delinquent subject group consisted of a total of 161 adjudicated delinquents on probation at the time of data collection. These subjects were drawn from the juvenile court probation departments of three judicial districts in Colorado.⁵ A large part of the area served by each of the three courts is very similar in general population composition to at least one of the areas from which the non-delinquent subject group came. Also, data were obtained from virtually every delinquent put on probation during a certain period of time (the periods of data collection varied for each of the courts), thus there was no problem of sample bias in the selection of delinquent subjects within the three judicial districts. It should be noted, however, that the three time periods during which data were collected did not completely overlap, thus there is some possibility

⁵The judicial districts and the number of subjects obtained from each is as follows: Judicial District 20 (Boulder, Colorado), N = 119; Judicial District 17 (Brighton, Colorado), N = 36; Judicial District 21 (Grand Junction, Colorado), N = 6.

of a time bias if time of year is related to responses on the Experience Survey.

Data Collection

The Experience Survey was administered to the non-delinquent subjects during regular class time in school by their teachers. The one exception to this was in the middle class Senior High School where the Survey was administered during regular school hours, but by one of the school guidance counselors.

Data regarding age, sex, I.Q., etc., were gathered in all but one case from the school files by the experimenter. The exception again being the middle class Senior High School, where only I.Q. was obtained from the files. The other information was supplied by the subjects themselves after the administration of the Experience Survey.

For the delinquent subject group the Experience Survey was administered, in two of the courts, by the probation counselors at the beginning of the subject's probationary period. In the third court it was administered by a volunteer worker at the beginning of the probationary period.

Data regarding age, sex, I.Q., offenses committed, etc., were compiled by the experimenter from the probation department files in one of the courts. In the other two courts the probation counselors completed a written form regarding this information. The form which was used can be found in Appendix C.

Variables

The dependent variables in the present study consist of the ten types of factors presented in Figure 1. These factors are applied to

each of the four experience segments for a total of forty dependent variables.

Due to the lack of a sufficient number of delinquent subjects who could be tested with Experience Survey II, many of the delinquents' scores are based on testing with Experience Survey I.⁶ All of the non-delinquent subjects were tested with Experience Survey II. The correlations between factor categories in the two versions of the Experience Survey are presented in Table 1. With very few exceptions the relationships are high enough to substantiate the assumption that the two Surveys are parallel forms of the same instrument.⁷ Because of the differences between the two tests in numbers of items in a given factor category, the average score across items in a factor category was used as the subject's score on that type of factor.

The independent variables in the present study consist of a number of dimensions which may be used to classify delinquents. Classification is based either on some characteristic of the delinquent himself or some characteristic of the offenses he has committed. Classification according to type of offender was based on sex, age, socioeconomic status, intelligence, stability, family situation and ethnic group. All classification decisions were based on the subject's status on these variables at the time the Experience Survey was administered.

⁶Items and reliability and validity figures for Experience Survey I are given in Appendix D.

⁷It should be noted that there is no theoretical basis for expecting a high correlation among many of the factors in any given category.

TABLE I

Correlations between Factor Categories
of Experience Survey I and Experience Survey II*

Factor	r _{ES I x ES II}	Factor	r _{ES I x ES II}
SPI	.83	IPI	.75
SFF	.93	IPF	.73
SPPe	.90	IPPe	.95
SPD	.78	IPD	.93
SPPr	.92	IPPr	.92
SFI	.97	IFI	.80
SFF	.90	IFF	.77
SFPe	.79	IFPe	.96
SFD	.75	IFD	.97
SFPr	.78	IFPr	.89
SSI	.71	ISI	.85
SSF	.86	ISF	.87
SSPe	.82	ISPe	.90
SSD	.75	ISD	.86
SSPr	.63	ISPr	.86
SCI	.83	ICI	.78
SCF	.82	ICF	.49
SCPe	.79	ICPe	.81
SCD	.86	ICD	.84
SCPr	.83	ICPr	.61

*Based on the college student sample used in constructing Experience Survey II.

Sex: It has long been believed in delinquency research that there are differences in delinquency causation between males and females.

Age: Two age groups were formed; less than 16 years of age and 16 and older. Sixteen was chosen as the dividing point because it is the lower legal limit for operating an automobile in the State of Colorado. Access to an automobile provides a juvenile with considerable freedom from many of the outside restraints to which he was pre-

viously subject.

Socio-economic Status: Three socio-economic groups were formed; lower, middle and upper. The Duncan Index of Socioeconomic Status (Reiss, et al., 1961, pp. 263-275) was used to determine the relative prestige of the occupation of the subjects' parents.⁸ Kahl and Davis (1955) conclude in their review of measures of socio-economic status that the best single index of social status is an occupational scale. In a few cases considerable discrepancy occurred between either education or income and occupational prestige. When such discrepancies appeared the subject was placed in a higher or lower socio-economic status group as indicated by the discrepancy. The lower socio-economic group included such occupations as various types of laborers, janitors, waiters and certain operatives. The middle group included foremen, skilled laborers, certain operatives and small business managers and proprietors. The upper group included engineers, doctors and other professionally trained individuals. The three categories employed are of a relative nature and the upper category is probably composed largely of what is usually thought of as the upper middle socio-economic status.

Intelligence: Three intelligence level groups were formed; below average, average, and above average. The below average group was composed of those subjects having an I.Q. below 90. The average group included those subjects having an I.Q. between 91 and 110. The above average group consisted of subjects with an I.Q. greater than 110.

⁸The dividing points on the Socio-economic Index were 17 and 57.

Stability: This was based on the geographical mobility of the subject's family. If the family had changed their place of residence during the year immediately prior to the time the subject took the Experience Survey, he was placed in the mobile category; if no change in residence had occurred he was placed in the stable group.

Family Situation: Three categories were formed; subjects living with both natural parents, subjects living with one natural parent and one step-parent, and subjects living with one natural parent only.

Ethnic Group: Two categories were formed; Anglo and Spanish-
rican.

Comparisons on all of the above variables involved the use of both delinquents and non-delinquents in the various variable categories.

The second major basis of classification was type of offense. The variables used in this classification were group vs. individual offense, multiple vs. first offense, law violation vs. status-age specific offense, utilitarian vs. non-utilitarian offenses, victim present vs. victim absent, and criminal vs. conflict vs. retreatist offenses. Classification on all of these variables except multiple vs. first offense is based on the offenses committed during the year immediately prior to the administration of the Experience Survey. This was done because the Survey asks for responses in terms of: "How many times during the past year?" The multiple vs. first offense dimension is based on the subject's entire delinquent career.

Group vs. Individual Offense: Classification on this dimension was based on whether the given subject tended to commit law violations alone or in the company of others.

Multiple vs. First Offense: This was based on whether the present offense was the first for a given subject or whether he had a previous record.

Law-violation vs. Status-age Specific Offense: Law violations were defined as those offenses which would be considered grounds for prosecution regardless of who engaged in them. For example, burglary, car theft, assault, etc. Status-age specific offenses were defined as those which are considered law-violating when engaged in by juveniles, but non-law-violating when engaged in by persons above a certain age limit. This type of offense is essentially the same as the "Children in Need of Supervision" category (CHIN) initiated in the Colorado Children's Code of 1967 (Colorado Legislative Council, 1967). In the present study the status-age specific category included truancy, runaway, incorrigibility, drinking, etc.

Utilitarian vs. Non-utilitarian:⁹ Utilitarian offense was defined as a monetary or goods producing law-violation. Non-utilitarian included offenses which did not result in material reward to the offender. Joyriding was regarded as a non-utilitarian offense because it does not result in any lasting increase in material possessions.

Victim Present vs. Victim Absent: This was based on whether the victim of the offense was directly involved with the offender or was in such a position that it was possible for him to actually observe

⁹The present conception of utilitarian differs from that of Cohen (1955, pp. 25-26). He regards virtually all delinquency as non-utilitarian in that while offenses may be monetary or goods producing, the goods, etc., which are obtained are neither needed nor used appropriately by the delinquent.

the offense. The importance of this variable was stressed by several Juvenile Probation Counselors and was included in the present study at their suggestion.

Criminal vs. Conflict vs. Retreatist: This variable is based on the subcultural differentiation proposed by Cloward and Ohlin (1960). In the present study the conflict category was expanded to include those offenses which involved aggression toward property and indirect aggression toward persons. Thus, vandalism, disturbance and malicious mischief were included in the conflict category.

Classification of subjects on the above offense variables (with the exception of the multiple vs. first offense distinction) was accomplished through the use of a modification of the procedure employed by Roebuck and his associates in a series of studies of adult offense types (Roebuck, 1963; Roebuck & Cadwallader, 1961; Roebuck & Johnson, 1962a; Roebuck & Johnson, 1962b; and Roebuck & Johnson, 1964). The Roebuck procedure uses as the basis of classification the most frequent charge or charges in the entire arrest history. Charges appearing more recently are given greater weight under the assumption that they more accurately reflect the current stage in criminal or delinquent development. The classification procedure used in the present study was very similar to this except as previously noted, only offenses committed in the past year were considered.

The rules used for offense classification in the present study are as follows: (1) When there were three or less arrests the subject was put in the category (for a given variable) which a minimum of two of the offenses fit. (2) When there were more than three arrests the pattern for the year was divided chronologically into three seg-

ments each including an equal number of offenses. If equal segments could not be obtained the additional offenses were included in the more recent segment or segments, thus giving more weight to the more recent time periods.¹⁰ A subject was put in the category (of a given variable) into which a minimum of three offenses fit if (a) at least one of these three offenses appeared in the most recent segment, or, (b) if the three or more offenses of the given type constituted a minimum of 33% of the total offenses included in the two most recent segments.

The use of this procedure did not permit a clear-cut classification for every subject on every variable. Thus for virtually all of the offense type variables there is a residual category of subjects which presents a "mixed pattern" (i.e., have two or more arrests but do not show a clear pattern as defined by the above rules).

It should be noted at this point that while predictions of differences on certain types of factors for many of the independent variable categories could possibly be made on the basis of prior theoretical and empirical work, this is not done in the present project. There are two reasons for this: First, many of the theoretical orientations are of a largely speculative nature having little in the way of factual basis and are often too unclear to permit the derivation of testable hypotheses; and many of the empirical findings are

¹⁰ If there were a total of four offenses, the more recent segment would include the two most recent offenses and the other two segments would be composed of the third and fourth offenses. If there were five offenses the two most recent segments would include the four most recent offenses and the third segment the least recent offense.

conflicting and contradictory. Thus predictions from these bases seem somewhat unwarranted. Second, the present approach is in many respects unique and may well be too dissimilar to other orientations to permit it to be used in testing hypotheses derived from other sources. The present classification of factors does not actually correspond to a reasonable degree with any other existing system and thus may not provide a fair test of hypotheses derived from other systems. Rather than making predictions or testing hypotheses the present project is conceived of as an attempted application of the present system to the delineation of delinquency-producing influences in various types of delinquents and in regard to various types of offenses. Any findings which clearly correspond to or contradict previous theoretical or empirical work are noted.

Analysis

The basic interest in the present study is to identify the manner in which various types (in terms of type of offense and type of offender) of delinquents differ from each other in regard to the multiple-factor scheme previously discussed. In addition, if different types of delinquents do differ from each other on some aspect of the multiple-factor scheme, it must be insured that this difference is not simply due to some general disparity which occurs for all juveniles. For the present purposes (the differentiation among types of delinquents) differences should be unique to delinquents. The requirement of uniqueness of differences necessitates the use of a non-delinquent comparison group at some point in the data analysis.

In order to most efficiently identify those specific factor categories in which various types of delinquents differ from each

CONTINUED

1 OF 6

other a three stage analytic procedure was adopted. It should be noted that this procedure also permits the identification of those differences which are unique to delinquents through the use of both delinquent and non-delinquent subject groups in the third stage of the analysis.

Stage One: The complexity of the multiple-factor scheme necessitates the use of some method of identifying where in the scheme differences, among types of delinquents, on specific factor categories may possibly be found. Rather than looking at each individual factor category separately, the present approach is to consider all categories in a given life segment at the same time through the use of multivariate analysis of variance procedures. Only data from delinquent subjects are employed in this stage of the analysis.

Consideration of a specific independent variable (socio-economic status) will serve to clarify the first stage of the analysis. The question to be answered is: "Is there an overall difference on factor scores between low, medium and high social status delinquents within any one of the four life segments (Peers, Family, School and City)?" A multivariate analysis of variance on all ten factor types (Social Instigators, Social Prohibitors, Individual Instigators, etc.) for each of the four experience segments is performed (thus four multivariate analyses of variance are performed for each independent variable). The multivariate analysis of variance procedure is essentially a multivariate generalization of a one-way univariate analysis of variance. In the present multivariate procedure the null hypothesis is that $u_1 = u_2 = u_3$, where the u 's are population centroids or the mean vectors of the factor scores for the three social strata.

According to Cooley and Lohnes (1962) the test of the null hypothesis employs Wilks' lambda which is defined as follows:

$$\Lambda = |W| / |T| ,$$

where W is the pooled within-groups deviation score cross-products matrix and T is the total sample deviation score cross-products matrix.

The elements of the W and T matrices are defined as follows:

$$w_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^g \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{N_g} (x_{ikn} - \bar{x}_{ik}) (x_{jkn} - \bar{x}_{jk}) \right\}$$

$$t_{ij} = \sum_{n=1}^N (x_{in} - \bar{x}_i) (x_{jn} - \bar{x}_j) ,$$

where g = number of groups, N_g = number of subjects in group g, and i and j run from 1 to p, where p = the number of variables¹¹ (p. 61).

The symbol |W| denotes the determinant of matrix W; likewise for |T|.

As |T| increases relative to |W| the ratio decreases in size with an accompanying increase in the confidence with which the null hypothesis is rejected. In testing the significance of Λ the F approximation developed by Rao (1952) is used. This is as follows:

$$F_{ms}^{2r} + 2\lambda = \left(\frac{1-y}{y} \right) \left(\frac{ms + 2\lambda}{2r} \right) ,$$

where $s = \sqrt{(p^2 q^2 - 4)/(p^2 + q^2 - 5)}$, $q = g-1$, g = number of groups, p = number of variables; $m = n-(p+q+1)/2$, $n = N-1$, N = total number of subjects; $\lambda = -(pq-2)/4$; $r = pq/2$; and $y = \Lambda^{1/s}$.¹¹

¹¹Where only two subject groups are involved the procedure is to use Hotelling's (1931, pp. 360-378) T^2 which is a generalization of student's t test, and is a special case for which Wilks' lambda is applicable.

For those segments in which a significant F is not obtained the analysis of socio-economic status is stopped at this point. However, if a significant F is obtained for one or more of the segments the second stage of the analysis is undertaken in only those segments for which the null hypothesis is rejected.

Stage Two: The second stage is again an effort to specify where differences on specific types of factors may possibly be found without having to examine each individual factor category. The question here is: "Given that an overall difference on factor scores among low, medium and high social status delinquents exists within a certain segment, is this difference on the social side, the individual side, or in both of these areas?" A multivariate analysis of variance (as described above) on the five types of factors (Instigators, Prohibitors, etc.) on the individual side and on the social side is performed. If the null hypothesis is rejected for one or both of these the third stage of the analysis is undertaken for the area in which differences are indicated.

Stage Three: In the third stage of the analysis interest is directed to three points. First, to insuring that differences on individual factor categories which may be found among types of delinquents are not due simply to general differences existing in all juveniles. Second, to determining for which individual factor categories a difference among types of delinquents exists. Third, to determining whether differences among delinquents classified according to a given independent variable remain when other independent variables are controlled.

Analyses in this stage employ data from both delinquent and non-

delinquent subject groups, and are based on the multiple linear regression techniques developed by Bottenberg and Ward (1963, pp. 22-23). In general these techniques involve the comparison of the accuracy of two predictions to the criterion variable (Y), one prediction based on the full model (FM) or the inclusion of the "critical" variable, and the other based on a restricted model (RM) or the exclusion of the "critical" variable (actually the squared multiple correlation coefficients of each equation are compared). In the present study the criterion variable is always the score on some individual factor category. Dummy variables are used to indicate a given subject's position with regard to the relevant independent variable (e.g., assigning a 1 if the subject has a high I.Q. and a 0 otherwise). If the inclusion of the "critical" variable results in significantly better prediction this is regarded as an indication of differences in the mean scores on the criterion variable between the groups classified according to the "critical" variable.

The test for the significance of differences between two squared multiple correlation coefficients uses the F-ratio:

$$F = \frac{(R_{FM}^2 - R_{RM}^2)/(df_1)}{(1 - R_{FM}^2)/(df_2)}$$

where df_1 is the difference between the number of linearly independent vectors in the full model and in the restricted model; and, df_2 is the number of subjects minus the number of linearly independent vectors in the full model.

Additional independent variables can be controlled through the application of dummy variables to cross-classified subjects (e.g., assigning a 1 if the subject has a high I.Q. and is in the high social

status group and a 0 otherwise).

An example of the analyses performed for a given independent variable will serve to illustrate the analytic procedures. Assuming that the first stage of the analysis indicated an overall difference between high and low I.Q. delinquents with regard to the ten factor categories in the School segment, the second stage of the analysis would then consist of two multivariate analyses of variance; one on the Individual School factors and one on the Social School factors. Assuming that the second stage of the analysis indicated an overall difference between high and low I.Q. delinquents for the five Individual School factor categories, but not for the Social School factors, the third stage of the analysis would consist of the following steps for each of the five Individual School factors (starting with Individual School Instigators): (1) An effort to insure that differences between I.Q. levels are unique to delinquents and do not simply reflect some general difference associated with I.Q. levels for all juveniles. The null hypothesis is that there is no difference between delinquents and non-delinquents in the low I.Q. group and no difference between delinquents and non-delinquents in the high I.Q. group. The following equations would be employed in testing this hypothesis:

$$FM: ISI = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 + a_4X_4 + e_1 \quad ;$$

$$RM: ISI = b_1W_1 + b_2W_2 + e_2$$

where ISI is the vector of scores on Individual School Instigators; X_1 is 1 if low I.Q. delinquent, 0 otherwise; X_2 is 1 if low I.Q. non-delinquent, 0 otherwise; X_3 is 1 if high I.Q. delinquent, 0 otherwise;

X_4 is 1 if high I.Q. non-delinquent, 0 otherwise; W_1 is 1 if low I.Q., 0 otherwise; W_2 is 1 if high I.Q., 0 otherwise; a_1 and b_1 are appropriate regression weights; and e_1 and e_2 are residual vectors, the differences between the predicted values of ISI and the actual values. The F-ratio discussed above would be employed in comparing R_{FM}^2 and

R_{RM}^2 .

The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates that delinquents and non-delinquents at the same I.Q. levels have different mean scores on Individual School Instigators, and thus any differences which may be found in this factor category between high and low I.Q. delinquents must be unique to the delinquent subject group. If the above null hypothesis is rejected the next step of the analysis is performed. (2) An effort to determine whether different types of delinquents, in terms of I.Q. levels, differ from each other on Individual School Instigators. The null hypothesis is that high and low I.Q. delinquents do not differ on Individual School Instigators. The following equations would be employed in testing this hypothesis:

$$FM: ISI = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + e_1 ;$$

$$RM: ISI = a_0U + e_2 ,$$

where X_1 is 1 if high I.Q. delinquent, 0 otherwise; X_2 is 1 if low I.Q. delinquent, 0 otherwise; a_i are appropriate regression weights; e_1 and e_2 are residual vectors; and U is a unit vector. It should be noted that in the case where the restricted model contains only the unit vector, U , R_{RM}^2 is arbitrarily defined as 0 (Bottenberg & Ward,

1963, p. 126).¹²

The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates a significant difference in mean scores on Individual School Instigators between high and low I.Q. delinquents. If the above null hypothesis is rejected the third step of this stage of the analysis is undertaken.

(3) An effort to determine whether the difference between I.Q. levels remains when other independent variables are controlled. For illustrative purposes only one variable (sex) will be controlled, although in the actual analysis an effort will be made to control each of the independent variables.

It should be noted, however, that consideration of a number of variables at the same time is severely limited by the sample size; the situation of having an extremely small N in certain of the cross-classified groups very rapidly arises. When no Ss fell into a given group the analyses for the given variables could not be performed.

In controlling for the sex variable the null hypothesis is that high and low I.Q. delinquent males do not differ from each other and that high and low I.Q. delinquent females do not differ from each other. The following equations would be employed in testing this hypothesis:

$$FM: ISI = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 + a_4X_4 + e_1 \quad ;$$

$$RM: ISI = b_1W_1 + b_2W_2 + e_2 \quad ,$$

¹²In this case the appropriate F-ratio is as follows:

$$F = \frac{(R_{FM}^2)/df_1}{(1 - R_{FM}^2)/df_2} .$$

where X_1 is 1 if low I.Q. female, 0 otherwise; X_2 is 1 if high I.Q. female, 0 otherwise; X_3 is 1 if low I.Q. male, 0 otherwise; X_4 is 1 if high I.Q. male, 0 otherwise; W_1 is 1 if female, 0 otherwise; W_2 is 1 if male, 0 otherwise; a_i and b_i are appropriate regression weights, and e_1 and e_2 are residual vectors. The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates that high and low I.Q. delinquents of the same sex have different mean scores on Individual School Instigators, and thus differences between I.Q. levels remain when the sex variable is controlled.

As mentioned previously, other independent variables and combinations of variables can be controlled through procedures similar to those outlined in step three of the third stage of the analysis.

It should be emphasized that stage three of the analysis, as illustrated above, is only for one of the five factor categories which the first two stages of the analysis indicated as potentially important. In actual practice stage three is performed on each of the five factor categories, or in some cases on all ten of the factor categories, depending on the results of stage one and stage two of the analysis.

VI. RESULTS

Due to the complexity and length of the analysis a summary of results for each independent variable is presented in Tables 2 through 9 of this section. Detailed data regarding each step of the analysis is provided in Appendix E. Summary Tables 2 through 9 are to be interpreted in the following manner. The Fact column indicates each of the 40 factor categories. The Seg column refers to stage I of the analysis, a multivariate analysis of variance on the 10 factors in each of the four segments. The Sou column indicates the source of the factor, either Individual or Social, and refers to stage II of the analysis, a multivariate analysis of variance on each of the two factor sources. The DIS column refers to stage III, step one of the analysis, a regression analysis comparing delinquency status within the various groups of the given independent variable. This was done to insure that differences between independent variable groups of delinquents were not simply a reflection of some general differences common to all adolescents (i.e., differences occurred only among delinquents). A lack of significant findings in this column indicates that the independent variable groups of non-delinquents differ in the same manner as the independent variable groups of delinquents. The fifth column indicates the particular independent variable of interest in the given table. This column refers to stage III, step two of the analysis, a comparison of the factor scores of delinquents who differ on the particular independent variable (i.e., types of offenders or types of offenses). The remaining columns indicate the other vari-

ables whose influence has been controlled. These columns refer to stage III, step three of the analysis, a comparison of types of offenders (as determined by the independent variable of interest) within levels of other variables (e.g., male and female delinquents within age levels). The body of the Tables contain indicators of significance levels, at the various stages and steps of the analysis, for the factor or factors in the corresponding row. A blank at a particular point in a Table indicates a lack of significant findings for the particular factor and stage of analysis. An "S" (significant) indicates a significant difference at the .05 probability level. An "H" (highly significant) indicates a significant difference at the .01 probability level. A "V" (very significant) indicates a significant difference at the .001 probability level. Bracketed letters are used to indicate a significant difference, found by a multivariate analysis of variance, on a number of factors.

The Tables should be, in general, read from left to right. This provides a description of results as the analysis progressed from stage I through stage III, step three. A given factor, or set of factors in the two initial stages of the analysis, may fail to reach significance at any point in the analysis. In general, when a significant difference was not obtained, the analysis for that factor (or set of factors) was terminated. The point at which a significant difference was not obtained is indicated by the occurrence of blank spaces as opposed to the significance indicators.

It should also be noted that in the following discussion of results, Table numbers for the relevant detailed Tables given in Appendix E are provided. These detailed Tables present appropriate

means, standard deviations, R^2 's, degrees of freedom, F-ratios and probability levels for each individual analysis which was performed. The results discussion will be confined to a consideration of only those factors for which significant differences have been found in all stages and steps of the analysis (i.e., when other variables are controlled).

Offender Variables

Classification according to type of offender is based on the following: residential mobility, family composition, sex, age, socioeconomic status, intelligence and ethnic group membership. A difference between types of offenders, as determined by one of the above variables, is not considered in the following discussion unless it was found to occur regardless of the influence of each of the other variables. In addition, to insure that differences are not due to the extent of delinquency involvement, it was required that they be independent of the number of offenses committed (as measured by the first-multiple offense variable) before they are considered as substantiated results. Besides the multiple-first distinction no control of type of offense was made with regard to the type of offender variables.

Mobility: Stage I of the analysis yielded no significant differences between residentially stable and mobile delinquents in any of the four segments (see Appendix E, Table 10). The analysis of mobility was consequently terminated after stage I.

Family Composition: Again stage I of the analysis indicated no overall significant differences in any segment (see Appendix E, Table 11). Analysis was thus terminated after the first stage.

Sex: A summary of the analysis on sex is contained in Table 2. Significant differences between male and female delinquents, which held up when the influence of other variables was considered, were found for three factors. These factors were Individual Family Permission, Individual School Facilitation, and Individual City Diversion. Females scored consistently higher than males on Individual Family Permittors and Individual School Facilitators. Males scored consistently higher than females on Individual City Diverters. Details of the analyses performed on sex can be found in Tables 12 through 24 in Appendix E.

Age: A summary of the analysis on age is contained in Table 3. Significant differences between young and old delinquents were obtained for the Social Peer Instigators and the Social Peer Facilitators. These differences were independent of the influence of other variables. Older delinquents scored consistently higher than younger on these two factors. Details of the analyses performed on age are contained in Tables 25 through 35 of Appendix E.

Socio-economic Status: A summary of the analyses on socio-economic status levels is contained in Table 4. Significant differences among low, medium and high socio-economic status levels was found for one factor category, Social Peer Permittors. Differences were obtained on this factor regardless of the influence of other variables. Medium socio-economic status delinquents consistently scored highest. The high socio-economic status group scored second highest and the low status group lowest. Detailed results of the analysis on socio-economic status are presented in Tables 36 through 43 of Appendix E.

TABLE 3
Results of Analysis on Age

[illegible]

TABLE 4 (cont.)

Fact	MVANOV					Control for					
	Sec	Sou	DIS	SES	Sex	Ace	IQ	Stb	Fam	M-F	Eth*
SSI											
SSF											
SSPe											
SSD											
SSPr											
ISI											
ISF											
ISPe											
ISD											
ISPr											
SCI											
SCF											
SCPe											
SCD											
SCPr											
ICI											
ICF											
ICPe											
ICD											
ICPr											

*Analysis of socio-economic status within ethnic groups was not performed because no Ss fell into the high socio-economic status-Spanish group.

Intelligence: A summary of the analyses performed on I.Q. levels is contained in Table 5. Significant differences were found for two factor categories, Social Family Facilitators and Individual School Prohibitors. These differences among I.Q. levels remained when the influence of other variables was controlled. One of the controlled variables did, however, have an effect on the direction of the obtained differences. For Social Family Facilitators the relationship was consistent regardless of other factors. The high I.Q. group always scored highest and the low I.Q. group lowest. For Individual School Prohibitors the relationship was also, in general, a positive one (high I.Q.-high mean factor score, low I.Q.-low mean factor score). One exception to this did occur, however. When stability was considered a positive relationship between I.Q. level and mean factor scores was obtained within the stable group. In the unstable group the medium I.Q. level Ss had the highest mean score and the high I.Q. level Ss the lowest. These findings indicate that the relationship between I.Q. and Individual School Prohibition differs depending on whether it occurs in a residentially stable or unstable group of delinquents.

Thus while significant differences among I.Q. levels on Individual School Prohibitors exist regardless of the effects of other variables, it cannot be assumed that these differences are independent of stability. On the contrary the influence of stability was strong enough to, at least partially, change the direction of the relationship between I.Q. level and mean factor scores although the overall significance of the relationship remained.

TABLE 5

Results of Analysis on I.Q.

MVAOV				Control for							
Fact	Seq	Sou	DIS	IQ	Stb	Fam	Age	Sex	Ses	M-F	Eth*
SPI	S										
SPF											
SPPe											
SPD											
SPPr											
IPI											
IPF											
IPPe											
IPD											
IPPr											
SFI	H	S									
SFF			V	S	S	S	S	S	S	H	
SFPe			V	H	S						
SFD			V								
SFPr											
IFI	H	S									
IFF			H								
IFPe			S								
IFD			V								
IFPr											

TABLE 5 (cont.)

	MVANOVA		Control for								
Fact	Seq	Sou	DIS	IQ	Stb	Fam	Age	Sex	SES	M-F	Eth**
SSI	H	[]									
SSF											
SSPe											
SSD											
SSPr											
ISI		[]	S	S	S	S	S	S			
ISF			S								
ISPe		V	S								
ISD											
ISPr			V	S	H	H	H	S	H	H	
SCI											
SCF											
SCPe											
SCD											
SCPr											
ICI											
ICF											
ICPe											
ICD											
ICPr											

*Analysis of I.Q. levels within ethnic groups was not performed because no Ss fell into the high I.Q. level-Spanish group.

Detailed results of the analyses performed on I.Q. levels are contained in Tables 44 through 55 of Appendix E.

Ethnic: A summary of the analysis on ethnic group membership is presented in Table 6. Significant differences between Anglo and Spanish-American delinquents were found for Social Peer Permittors and Individual Family Instigators. These differences existed regardless of the influence of other variables, although again certain of the controlled variables caused changes in the direction of the relationship between ethnic group membership and mean factor scores. Anglos scored consistently higher than Spanish on Social Peer Permittors. For Individual Family Instigators Anglos also, in general, scored higher than Spanish. The exception to this occurred when family composition was considered. Anglo Ss coming from families containing either both natural parents or one parent scored higher than Spanish Ss from corresponding family types. However, in the S group coming from families including a step-parent, the Spanish Ss scored higher than the Anglo. The fact that the relative magnitudes of the mean factor scores for Anglo and Spanish Ss in the step-parent families are almost directly reversed from the scores of Ss coming from the other two family composition groups suggests that the presence of a step-parent may have a positive effect (in terms of Individual Family Instigation) in Anglo families and a negative effect in Spanish families.

Detailed results of the analyses performed on ethnic group membership are contained in Tables 56 through 64 of Appendix E.

Analyses performed for the offense type variables are essentially the same as those performed for the offender type variables with

TABLE 6 (cont.)

	MVANOV						Control for					
Fact	Seq	Sou	DIS	Eth	Sex	Age	Stb	Fam	M-F	SES*	IQ*	
SSI												
SSF												
SSPe												
SSD												
SSPr												
ISI												
ISF												
ISPe												
ISD												
ISPr												
SCI												
SCF												
SCPe												
SCD												
SCPr												
ICI												
ICF												
ICPe												
ICD												
ICPr												

*Analysis of ethnic group within both socio-economic status and I.Q. levels was not performed because no Ss fell into either the Spanish-high socio-economic status group or the Spanish-high I.Q. group.

the one exception being that step one of stage III (the comparison of delinquents and non-delinquents within independent variable categories) of each set of analyses is omitted because presumably the non-delinquents have not committed any offenses. The summary tables of results for the offense type variables are also identical to those of the offender type variables except that the DIS column (delinquency status) is omitted because differences among offense types are, by definition, unique to delinquents.

Offense Variables

A difference between types of offenses was required to occur independently of the influences of the offender variables (sex, age, etc.), and of the influence of extent of delinquency. The latter influence is automatically controlled through the offense classification procedure since this procedure requires the occurrence of a number of offenses before a given individual can be categorized as to offense type. Thus all differences for offense types are for multiple offenses. No control of one offense type on another was performed.

Criminal, Conflict and Mixed Offenses: Stage I of the analysis indicated no significant overall differences in any segment among these three offense types (see Table 65 in Appendix E). Consequently the analysis of these three offense types was terminated after stage I.

Victim Present, Victim Absent and Mixed Offense Types: Again stage I of the analysis indicated a lack of significant overall

differences in any segment (see Table 66 in Appendix E). Thus the analysis was again terminated after stage 1.

Group and Individual Offenses: Stage 1 of the analysis yielded a significant overall difference for the School segment ($F_{10/72} = 2.27; p < .05$). Stage II of the analysis yielded a significant overall difference for Individual sources within the School segment ($F_{5/77} = 2.53; p < .05$). However, the comparison of group and individual offenses on each Individual School factor indicated a lack of significant differences for any one factor. Thus the analysis on this variable was terminated at that point.

Detailed results of the analyses are presented in Tables 67 and 68 of Appendix E.

Utilitarian, Non-utilitarian and Mixed Offenses: A summary of the results of the analysis on this variable is presented in Table 7. Significant differences among these three offense types were found for Individual Peer Permittors; however, when the influences of other variables were considered the differences disappeared. Details of the analyses for this variable can be found in Tables 69 through 77 of Appendix E.

Criminal and CHIN Offenses: A summary of results of the analysis on this variable is presented in Table 8. Significant differences between criminal and CHIN offenses were found for Social City Instigators and Social City Permittors. Differences on these two factors remained significant when the influence of other variables was controlled; however, certain of the controlled variables had an effect on the direction of the differences. For the Social City Permittors the Ss committing criminal offenses scored consistently higher than those

TABLE 7
Results of Analysis for Utilitarian,
Non-utilitarian and Mixed Offenses

[illegible]

TABLE 7 (cont.)

Fact	MVANOV		Util	Eth	Age	Control for				Fam	Sex*
	Seq	Sou				SES	IQ	Stb			
SSI											
SSF											
SSPe											
SSD											
SSPr											
ISI											
ISF											
ISPe											
ISD											
ISPr											
SCI											
SCF											
SCPe											
SCD											
SCPr											
ICI											
ICF											
ICPe											
ICD											
ICPr											

*Analysis of utilitarian-non-utilitarian-mixed offense types within sex group was not performed because no Ss fell into the non-utilitarian-female group.

committing CHIN offenses. For Social City Instigators those committing criminal offenses also generally scored higher; however, this was reversed within the male group. Male CHIN offenders scored higher than male criminal offenders. Details of the analyses on criminal and CHIN offense types are presented in Tables 78 through 87 of Appendix E.

Multiple and First Offenses: A summary of results of the analysis on this variable is presented in Table 9. Significant differences between multiple and first offenses were found for Social City Diverters and Individual City Diverters. These differences remained after the effects of other variables were controlled. For both of the factors Ss committing first offenses scored consistently higher than those committing a number of offenses. Details of the analyses on this variable are presented in Tables 88 through 97 of Appendix E.

VII. DISCUSSION

An important difficulty arises in relating the present results to previous ones because the multiple-factor scheme used in this study is quite different from any prior theoretical bases. Consequently before any comparison of the present and other findings can be made the other findings must be placed in the framework of the multiple-factor scheme. The problem arises in "translating" previous work into the multiple-factor concepts from information provided in study reports. Errors in this "translation" process may result in incorrect identification of other findings in terms of the multiple-factor scheme and thus in misleading comparisons between the present work and prior studies. This cautionary note should be kept in mind when considering the discussion of results.

Offender Variables

Mobility: Previous work regarding residential stability is quite limited. Several studies have suggested a relationship between residential stability and delinquency, although there has been no work directly comparing stable and unstable delinquents. Savitz (1962) reports that stable adolescents evidence a higher delinquency rate than migrants. Redl and Wineman (1962) report extreme mobility in the group of disturbed delinquents they dealt with, and Kvaraceus (1945) reports that mobility is more common among delinquents than among non-delinquents. None of these studies attribute the reported relationships to any particular influence. Nye (1958) maintains that mobility results in a reduction in social controls, particularly in

the Peer and City segments. The present work found no indications of such a reduction of controls among residentially unstable delinquents. Reuteran (1967a) reports that mobile delinquents score higher on Social City Diversion than stable delinquents. The present work does not support this difference.

Family Composition: Considerable work has indicated a relationship between broken homes and delinquency (Barnes & Teeters, 1959; Monahan, 1962; Nye, 1958; Sutherland & Cressey, 1955; and Toby, 1962). This is generally attributed to a reduction in Social Family Prohibitors within broken homes. The relationship between broken homes and delinquency is also generally believed to be differentially affected by the sex of the juvenile. Females in broken homes are believed to experience a greater reduction in Social Family Prohibition than males (Sutherland & Cressey, 1955; and Toby, 1962). No evidence regarding differences among delinquents coming from various types of homes is available. Thus the lack of differences found in the present study cannot be considered in light of other findings, although an earlier study using the multiple-factor scheme also found no differences among delinquents coming from different family situations (Reuteran, 1967a). Two factors should be noted with regard to this lack of differences: First, the present distinction was between physically broken and intact homes, not psychologically broken. The latter type of distinction, encompassing a virtually complete breakdown of relations between parents, may actually be more important than the physical absence of one parent. Second, in the present study interest is focused on juveniles who have already become delinquent. Thus while the influence of broken homes may be important in initially

84
producing delinquency, once it occurs the influences from different types of home situations may either tend to become similar or, if they do remain different, may become less important.

Sex: Present findings indicate that female delinquents are higher than males on Individual Family Permittors. This result is congruent with previous work. Cooper (1957) suggests that the number of delinquency petitions filed on females for "beyond parental control" may indicate that female delinquents have greater home related problems than males. Kvaraceus (1945) found that family-child conflict was more common for female delinquents than for males. While such conflict itself need not necessarily be considered an Individual Permittor, it could certainly produce a home atmosphere which would make the adolescent unhappy and dissatisfied. Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) found the home situation of females to be more tense with the result that they were more hostile toward the home and felt "picked on" to a greater extent than males.

While the present study resulted in no sex differences for Social Family Instigation, Permission or Diversion, Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) report that female delinquents are more rejected by their parents and that the parents of females give less co-operation to law enforcement agencies. Also females have more chores to do in the home and parents participate more in their recreational activities.

Present results indicate that female delinquents score higher than males on Individual School Facilitation. Prior studies make no mention of differences between males and females for this particular influence. Other studies do, however, report differences on Social

School Diverters and Social School Instigators which were not found in the present one. Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) report that females engage in school sponsored leisure activities to a greater extent than males. Also females have poorer relationships with schoolmates and teachers than males.

The present study found that males score higher than females on Individual City Diverters. Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) and Reuterman (1967a) report similar findings.

Summary of Sex Differences: The brief summary sections provided at the end of the discussion of each independent variable are based on the Experience Survey items used as measures of the various factors on which significant differences were found for the given variable. The summaries are intended to provide a composite characterization of the types of delinquents.

Female delinquents can be characterized as being dissatisfied with their home situation, often angry with the general course of events at home, often feeling that they cannot stand to remain at home and often rejecting of parental interest in their affairs. They also feel that they are smarter than other pupils in school and better able to "get away with" forbidden activities. They have little interest in organized recreation and other types of formalized leisure activities and often are unable to find ways of occupying their time in the neighborhood in which they live.

In contrast, male delinquents are relatively satisfied with their home situation, they are not often angry with events there, and do not have a strong feeling of wanting to escape from home and family. Males do not regard themselves as smarter than their class-

mates in school and do not feel that they are better able to "get away with things". They are more interested in organized recreation and activities and can find ways to occupy their spare time in their immediate neighborhood.

Age: Older delinquents were found to score higher on Social Peer Instigators and Social Peer Facilitators. Reuterman (1967a) reports a similar trend for Facilitators. No other evidence is available from other sources regarding similar differences between younger and older delinquents. One interpretation of the present finding is that the peers of an older delinquent are better able, because of their age, to engage in activities bordering on illegality. They may also be less subject to adult pressures to "get along with your friends" and thus may tend to be more aggressive toward each other. They may also, by virtue of their age and presumably wider experience, be in a better position to provide opportunities to engage in delinquent activity. In addition they may be better integrated into the teen-age culture with its norm of "don't tell adults".

Summary of Age Differences: Older delinquents are characterized by being subject to pressures from peers to engage in "semi-legal" behavior and behavior which is likely to lead to delinquent activities. They are more likely to do things just because their friends do them. Their peers also often "have it in for them" and "push them too far". The peer group of older delinquents appears to provide considerable opportunity (even to the point of specific instruction) for them to engage in delinquent behavior. The peer group members often get away with illegal behavior themselves, and they offer protection to those who violate the law by promising not

to Inform.

Younger delinquents are subject to quite different peer group influences. The pressure to engage in "semi-legal" behavior is low and relationships within the peer group are more harmonious. Little opportunity is provided by the peer group for younger delinquents to engage in illegal activities.

Socio-economic Status: Application of the multiple-factor scheme to socio-economic status levels resulted in significant differences on the Social Peer Permittor factor category. Medium social status level delinquents scored highest, high status level delinquents next highest and the low status group lowest. These results are somewhat unexpected because most previous work on differences among social status levels of delinquents would suggest that in general a negative relationship should exist between any pro-delinquency influence and social status level and a positive relationship for any anti-delinquency influence. Present results indicate a curvilinear relationship with the medium and higher status groups scoring higher on a pro-delinquency influence.

One explanation of the present results is suggested by England (1964). He maintains that middle status delinquents are peer oriented for a longer period of time than are low status ones, and that the middle status reject adult values while lower status reject adult institutions such as school. It may be that the present findings are a result of the rejection of adult values in the middle status peer group. The rejection of the value system of the group of which an individual will soon become a member may lead to a general feeling of alienation. This alienated, rejected feeling on the part

of the peers of the middle social status delinquent may account for the high Social Peer Permittor scores found in the present study. Another consideration in interpreting the present results is that they may be due to the presence of a "hippie" orientation within middle status delinquents. Several of the Social Peer Permittor items are quite similar to certain aspects of the "hippie" value system. This interpretation, however, necessitates two assumptions; first, that elements of the "hippie" culture have penetrated downward to the relatively lower age levels of adolescence, and second, that the "hippie" culture is a more powerful influence in the middle and upper socio-economic levels than in the lower level.

It should be noted that the present findings do not agree with Cohen's (1955) theory of lower and middle status delinquency. Cohen maintains that lower status delinquents encounter a major problem of status deprivation in the contemporary middle status school system. Accordingly lower status delinquents would be expected to evidence greater pro-delinquency factors in the School segment. Cohen postulates that middle status delinquent males on the other hand encounter a major problem in the family because of the female centered socialization process of middle status families. Thus middle status delinquents should score high on pro-delinquency influences in the Family segment. The present results support neither of these propositions.

A number of other differences among socio-economic status levels of delinquents not found in the present study have been reported elsewhere. Short, Rivera and Marshall (1964) report that lower status levels rate teachers, police and adult neighbors less favorably than the middle status group. This would suggest the existence of higher

instigation in these areas for the lower status group. Reiss (1952) suggests that lower status delinquents show considerable rejection of school. This would suggest the existence of higher instigation and possibly lower individual prohibition. Kvaraceus and Miller (1959) have postulated extensive differences between middle status and lower status in neighborhood and family structure. Thus differences between middle and lower groups on the social factors in these segments would be expected. Toughness is more highly valued among lower status delinquents than middle status (Short & Strodtbeck, 1965), thus individual peer instigation would be expected to be higher among lower status delinquents. Sherif and Sherif (1964) and Hollingshead (1961) report that school and city diversion is greater in the middle status levels than in the lower for both delinquents and non-delinquents. A considerable amount of evidence suggests that pro-delinquency influences in the school should be greater for lower status juveniles (Becker, 1952; Deutsch, 1964; Gottlieb, 1964; McCandless, 1961; Moore, 1964; Pearl, 1965; and Rich, 1960). The present results do not indicate this for delinquents.

Summary of Socio-economic Status Differences: Low socio-economic status delinquents can be characterized as being exposed to very few attitudes permissive of delinquency on the part of their peers. The peer group does not feel that others are not interested in them or that what they do is no one else's concern. Also they are concerned about others. Upper socio-economic status delinquents are exposed to somewhat more alienated attitudes from their peers. The peer group of middle socio-economic status delinquents has a pronounced feeling of alienation. The peer group feels that other

people are not interested in them, or for that matter in anyone, and that what they do is not the concern of anyone else. They themselves have little concern for or interest in others.

Intelligence: Delinquents coming from different I.Q. levels have different mean scores on Social Family Facilitators and Individual School Prohibitors. For Social Family Facilitators a positive relationship exists between mean factor score and I.Q. level. It appears that higher I.Q. delinquents are exposed to greater opportunity in the home or family situation to engage in delinquent behavior. There is an absence of other evidence relevant to this relationship. Reuterman (1967a) reports that low I.Q. delinquents score higher on Individual Family Instigators. This was not found in the present study.

In general for Individual School Prohibitors high I.Q. delinquents score highest and low I.Q. delinquents lowest. This was also found in an earlier study using the multiple-factor scheme (Reuterman, 1967a). However, one exception to this did occur; within the mobile group the medium I.Q. group scored highest and the high I.Q. group lowest. This reversal of mean scores may be a result of the medium I.Q. group having less difficulty integrating themselves into a new school and thus being better able to identify with the school and teachers. The general positive relationship between I.Q. level and Individual School Prohibition is not unexpected. It can probably be regarded as a reflection of a lack of interest in and identification with the school and its authorities due to a higher degree of incompetence and failure.

In an earlier study which employed the present multiple-factor scheme Reuterman (1967) found that low I.Q. delinquents scored higher on Social Peer Facilitators, Individual School Permitters, Social School Facilitators and Individual School Instigators. They also were lower on Individual School Diverters and Individual City Diverters. However, in this study there was no control for the influence of other variables. In the present study a difference was also found on Individual School Instigators (see Table 5, p. 59), but when the influence of socio-economic status and multiple-first offense was controlled the difference disappeared.

Other work on the I.Q. levels of delinquents is mainly concerned with the relationship between I.Q. and type of offense (Cartwright & Howard, 1960; and Shulman, 1954), and thus is not relevant to the present discussion.

Summary of I.Q. Differences: Low I.Q. delinquents can in general be characterized as being exposed to less opportunity to engage in illegal activities in the home or by other members of the family. Parents do not make it easy for them to "get into trouble", do not take them to establishments where they are likely to be able to engage in illegal activities and do not often back them up against other authorities. However, lower I.Q. delinquents are unfavorable to school, and do not identify with the school or teachers there. They do not regard school as a means of achieving their goals.

Medium I.Q. delinquents are exposed to some opportunity to engage in illegal activities by their families. Parents sometimes make it easy for them to "get away with things", and sometimes will back them up against other authorities. Medium I.Q. delinquents

demonstrate some favorableness toward their schools, and identify to a limited degree with the school and its teachers.

The high I.Q. group is exposed to considerable home-related opportunity to engage in delinquent activities. Parents make it relatively easy for them to engage in illegal behavior, often take them to establishments where they are likely to "get into trouble", and are willing to back them up against other authorities. Their parents also often successfully engage in illegal activities and do not conceal these from their children. In the school segment, however, the high I.Q. delinquent demonstrates considerable identification with the school and its teachers. He enjoys school and regards it as a means of achieving his goals.

In conclusion, it should be noted that within the unstable group it is the medium I.Q. delinquent who demonstrates strong identification with and acceptance of school. The high I.Q.-unstable delinquent is the most unfavorable and uncommitted to school.

Ethnic: Differences on factor scores between Anglo and Spanish delinquents occurred for Social Peer Permittors and Individual Family Instigators. For the Permittors Anglo delinquents scored consistently higher than Spanish. Since the Social Peer Permittor factor category largely reflects a feeling of alienation and apartness from others, the observed difference may result from the frequently reported (Burma, 1954; and Robison, 1960) closeness of the Spanish community. Spanish adolescents may be better integrated into the total community than Anglo adolescents. This may result in a feeling that others are concerned and interested in them. It should be noted, however, that the importance of the difference on Peer Permittors is somewhat

uncertain because differences were also found on this factor among socio-economic status levels. No control for the influence of ethnic group membership and socio-economic status on each other was performed because of the absence of high social status-Spanish Ss. Thus some caution should be exercised regarding the value of the obtained differences on this factor.

For Individual Family Instigators Anglo delinquents also scored higher than Spanish. However, in one case, within the step-parent family composition group, the Spanish scored higher on this factor. In general these results seem to reflect the greater family harmony often attributed to Spanish families (Robison, 1960). This family harmony, however, seems to undergo a severe breakdown with the presence of a step-parent, whereas in Anglo families the presence of a step-parent appears to greatly improve family relationships.

Summary of Ethnic Differences: Spanish delinquents seem to be characterized by the absence of feelings of alienation in their immediate peer group. Their friends feel that other people care about and are interested in them, and that they have a responsibility to others regarding their actions. Spanish delinquents are seldom extremely angry at their family, seldom want to get even with their parents or want to impress their parents, and seldom feel a lack of attention from their family.

Anglo delinquents are characterized by being exposed to very alienated attitudes on the part of their friends. They also do not enjoy harmonious relationships with their families. They are often angry at someone at home, often want to get even with someone and often wish they received more attention.

Offense Variables

Criminal, Conflict and Mixed: This distinction is derived from Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) specification of three distinct types of delinquent subcultures; criminal, conflict and retreatist. None of the present Ss fitted the retreatist subculture so this had to be eliminated from the analysis. Cloward and Ohlin suggest a number of differences among the three subcultures, mainly in the area of Social City Facilitation. The criminal subculture is particularly high on Social City Facilitation, especially in having access to instruction and protection through organized adult crime. The conflict subculture is particularly low on this factor.

A number of other studies also suggest various differences among delinquents engaging in these types of offenses. McCord, McCord and Zola (1959) report relationships between various family influences and criminal and conflict offenses. Conger and Miller (1966) report that conflict oriented delinquents are higher on Individual Peer, School and Family Instigation than delinquents engaging in other types of offenses. Spergel (1964) reports that criminal oriented offenders are low on Social Family Diverters and Prohibitors.

A number of studies indicate substantial differences between offenders who engage in retreatist activities and those who engage in either criminal or conflict activities. Chein, et al. (1964) indicate a relationship between family factors and drug usage. A number of other studies report similar findings (Barker & Adams, 1963; Chein & Rosenfeld, 1957; Fort, 1954; and Zimmering, 1951). MacKay (1963) reports similar findings for delinquent problem drinkers. In general retreatist delinquents seem to come from disturbed families

where there is little supervision or discipline. There is a lack of an adequate adult male identification figure and the mother is often domineering and overprotective.

The present results neither support Cloward and Ohlin's position nor do they agree with other studies. No differences between criminal and conflict oriented delinquents were found. It is most unfortunate that no retreatist Ss could be obtained, as the weight of the evidence seems to suggest a high probability of differences on factor scores occurring between drug users and other delinquents.

There are two possible explanations for the lack of differences. First, the conception of specialized delinquent subcultures has been extensively questioned (see Reuter, 1967b for a review of relevant evidence). The present results lend support to the view that specialized delinquent subcultures of the type proposed by Cloward and Ohlin are not a meaningful distinction.

Second, it is possible that the lack of differences is due to the lack of relevance of Cloward and Ohlin's theory (and much of the other work) to the type of delinquent found in the present study. The Cloward and Ohlin theory was developed with specific reference to organized juvenile gangs in metropolitan areas, and thus many factors contained in the theory may simply not exist in the type of area from which the present Ss came (e.g., it is somewhat difficult to imagine the existence of differential access to organized adult crime systems based on the area in which one resides in Boulder, Colorado). The lack of differences between criminal and conflict offenses for the present Ss may, however, serve to suggest limitations for the applicability of the Cloward and Ohlin theory.

Victim Present, Victim Absent, and Mixed: The victim present-victim absent distinction was suggested by several juvenile probation counselors as something which should be looked at more closely. No differences of factor scores were found between the three groups. Since no previous work has focused on this distinction the present lack of differences cannot be considered in light of other evidence. The only conclusion possible at this point is that the victim present-victim absent distinction is probably not a useful one for juvenile probation work.

Group and Individual: No differences on specific factors were found between delinquents who tend to commit offenses with others and delinquents who tend to commit offenses alone. This lack of differences is opposed to the results of a number of other studies. Miller (1958) postulated a number of delinquent gang values which would seem to result in a high degree of Peer Instigation. Kinch (1962b) suggests that gang delinquents are exposed to little Prohibition in either the Peer, Family or School areas. Thrasher (1963) notes the importance of the absence of Social City Diverters and Prohibitors in the formation of delinquent gangs. Jenkins and his associates have stressed the importance of low Social Family Prohibition and high Social City Instigation and Facilitation for gang offenders and the importance of high Individual Family Instigation and Permission and low Prohibition for individual offenders (Jenkins, 1955; Jenkins, 1957; Jenkins & Hewitt, 1944; and Shinohara & Jenkins, 1967). Other evidence suggests that gang members are likely to be low on Social Family Diversion and individual offenders high on Individual Family Instigation (Wattenberg & Balistrieri, 1966). Also Cartwright and

CONTINUED

2 OF 6

Howard (1966) report an undersupply of mature adults in gang neighborhoods and an oversupply of young people. Thus the balance of age-groupings in gang areas mitigates against strong social controls by adults.

The lack of differences on factor scores between delinquents who tend to commit offenses alone and those who tend to commit them in the company of others is somewhat unexpected. The indication of extensive differences on a number of factors by previous studies would certainly lead to the expectation of differences in the present study. One explanation of the lack of differences may be that the Ss in the present study come largely from small cities and the suburbs of a large metropolitan area while the Ss in most of the previous studies came from large metropolitan areas. It may well be that in large, heavily populated, urban areas there are extensive differences between group and individual offenders, while in smaller cities such differences do not exist. It is certainly the case that a delinquent gang in Chicago or New York is quite different in many respects from a group of offenders in one of the towns from which the present Ss came. In essence, the present lack of results seems to suggest that the results of studies of urban delinquent gangs are quite limited in their relevance to group offenders outside of the large metropolitan area.

Utilitarian, Non-utilitarian and Mixed: No differences among these three groups were found which continued when the influence of other variables were controlled. Other studies indirectly suggest a number of differences between these types of offenses. Dentler and Monroe (1961) report that theft is related to feelings that the family

is unloving and that the adolescent is treated unfairly. Cross-cultural studies also suggest that theft is related to a feeling of lack of family love (Bacon, Child & Barry, 1963). In contrast, findings regarding car theft as a type of offense indicate no differences between car thieves and other offenders with regard to relationships with and attitudes toward parents (Wattenberg & Balistreri, 1954). Several studies of vandalism are relevant to the non-utilitarian group as vandalism was one of the offenses included in this group. Goldman (1961) reports that juveniles in schools characterized by considerable vandalism demonstrated little identification with or interest in their school. Martin (1961) reports that vandals came from families characterized by parent-child conflict and hostility more often than juveniles committing other types of offense.

Some work seems to suggest differences between utilitarian and non-utilitarian offenders, other work does not, and in some cases one characteristic is suggested for the utilitarian group by one study and the same characteristic for the non-utilitarian group by another study. Thus considerable confusion exists as to whether differences do occur between delinquents committing these two types of offenses. The present results indicate that differences do not exist when the influences of other variables are controlled.

Criminal and CHIN Offenses: Delinquents engaging in criminal offenses scored higher in general on Social City Instigators and Social City Permitters. On the Instigator factor, however, male CHIN offenders scored higher than criminal offenders. Three previous studies report results relevant to the distinction between criminal and CHIN offenses. Tyerman (1958) reports that truants are high on

Individual Family Instigation, Social Family Permission and Individual School Instigation. Browning (1960) compared auto theft with truancy. Truants tended to come from homes high on Individual Family Instigation. Reuterman (1967a) reports that CHIN offenders scored lower on Individual Family Diverters and higher on Individual Family Instigators and Permittors. They also scored higher on Individual School Diverters. The present results do not coincide with any of the previous findings.

The present findings suggest that delinquents who commit more serious offenses are subject to greater pro-delinquency influences than those committing less serious offenses. Of particular interest is the fact that for criminal offenders the distinguishing factors are in the segment in which the offenses generally occur (e.g., auto theft is usually an offense against someone in the City segment), while for CHIN offenders this is not the case (e.g., truancy can be viewed as an offense which is centered in the School segment; runaway as one centered in the Family segment). Thus criminal offenses seem to be associated with the presence of certain pro-delinquency influences fairly relevant to the particular offense. CHIN offenses seem to be associated with the absence of those influences which lead to criminal offenses rather than the presence of pro-delinquency influences which are directly related to the particular offense. However, an exception to this occurs in the case of male offenders in which pro-delinquency influences in one segment lead to offenses more closely associated with other segments.

Summary of Criminal-CHIN Differences: In general delinquents committing criminal offenses can be characterized as being subject to

considerable temptation in the city to engage in illegal activities. Other people in the city often "push them too far". They often hear an attitude expressed which encourages disrespect for law and the agents of law enforcement. People often show a lack of concern for others. Delinquents who engage in CHIN offenses are subject to little direct temptation in the City. The people they encounter are respectful of the law and law enforcement agents and are interested in the welfare of others.

Multiple and First Offense: Delinquents committing their first offense scored consistently higher on Social City Diverters and Individual City Diverters than those committing a number of offenses. A number of differences, some of which are very similar to the present ones, have been reported by other studies. Wattenberg and Quiroz (1953) report that repeaters come from families high on Social Permission and low on Social Prohibition. A later study suggested that repeaters are high on Individual School Permission, Individual Family Permission and Social City Instigation and low on City Diversion and Prohibition (Wattenberg & Quiroz, 1954). It should be noted that the present study also found a difference on Social City Prohibition (see Table 9, p. 71), but this difference did not remain significant when the influence of socio-economic status, stability, family composition, or ethnic group was controlled. Conger and Miller (1966) report that non-repeaters are higher on Individual Family, School and City Prohibitors and lower on Individual City Instigation. Thus the present results do agree with some of the previous findings. However, other work indicates more extensive differences between multiple and first offenders than was found in the present study. The principal

difference between repeaters and non-repeaters seems to be that the latter are better able to find non-delinquent activities to engage in and that the neighborhoods in which they live provide more in the way of opportunities to engage in non-delinquent activities. A principal cause of recidivism seems to be the unavailability of non-delinquent activities and little inclination to engage in those activities which are available.

Summary of Multiple-First Offense Differences: First offenders can be characterized as often taking part in organized recreation and other programs, and in general as being able to find "constructive" activities in which to participate. They also seem to live in areas where there are considerable non-delinquent activities available to them either through organized leisure time activities or through work opportunities.

Multiple offenders are characterized as being unable or unwilling to engage in organized leisure time activities. They are unable to find "constructive" activities in which to participate. They also tend to live in neighborhoods which are lacking in recreational and job opportunities. Thus their immediate environment does not present them with many "constructive" activities.

General Observations

Several general comments can be made concerning the results of the study. First, the usefulness of the various independent variables as bases for the classification of delinquents seems to show considerable variation. In general the use of offender types as opposed to offense types appears to be of greater importance, at least in terms

of the number of differences which were found on the various factor categories. This can be regarded as another indication of a problem which is frequently encountered in employing offenses as the basis for classification of delinquents. The basic difficulty encountered in the use of offense types is that delinquents often do not demonstrate the long term consistency in offense patterns that is often seen in adult offenders (Robin, 1964; and Wattenberg & Faigenbaum, 1953). While a reasonable number of Ss in the present study could be classified according to the various offense dimensions, the lack of differences which was found for many of the classifications may result from the fact that for many of the Ss the classification decision was inaccurate. The particular offense group in which they were placed did not really reflect the long term offense pattern which they were prone to follow. If this is the case a lack of differences among offense groups (as presently designated) on the various factor categories would be expected.

The present findings also suggest considerable variation in the importance of the type of offender classifications. In general the distinction between males and females seems to be of particular importance in that these two types of offenders seem to be subject to quite disparate influences. This would suggest that in future work particular attention should be directed to differences between male and female delinquents. Several distinctions between types of offenders resulted in unexpectedly few differences on the various factor categories. No differences on factor categories were found when a distinction was made between broken and intact homes. This distinction is very frequently given particular emphasis by indivi-

duals directly involved with the handling of delinquents (e.g., juvenile judges, probation counselors, law enforcement officers, etc.).¹³ As suggested in the previous discussion it may very well be that the physical breakup of the family is not the critical factor, but rather that some type of breakdown of relationships within a physically intact family is critical. There is no way of determining from the present data what the situation actually was in the families which were classified as intact. It is conceivable that they could all be regarded as psychologically broken.

Another independent variable distinction which resulted in unexpectedly few differences on the factor categories was the one of socio-economic status. Much previous work has indicated extensive differences among delinquents coming from different socio-economic status levels in metropolitan areas. The limited number of differences found in the present study may reflect a greater integration of the socio-economic levels in small urban areas. Several lines of evidence lend support to this proposition. First, persons directly working with delinquents in small towns seldom indicate socio-economic status differences as important in the causation of delinquency.¹⁴ Second, in an extensive study of adolescents in a small midwestern

¹³ This is indicated in the results of a survey, now in progress, of a large number of agencies which deal with delinquents in the State of Colorado: Child and Youth Services Planning Project, Department of Institutions.

¹⁴ This is also indicated in the survey of agencies in Colorado (see footnote 13).

city, Hollingshead (1961) reports quite a few differences which occur along socio-economic status lines, but at the same time there appears to be a greater degree of closeness among socio-economic status levels than is indicated in large metropolitan areas by Miller (1958), for example. Third, although no evidence bears directly on this point, it would seem that while there are certainly some residential groupings by socio-economic status in small towns, these are not isolated slum ghettos as occur in large cities. Adolescents from all socio-economic levels in small towns attend the same schools, quite often the same centers of recreation and in general participate in the same social milieu of the town. All of these factors would mitigate against the development of independent social class cultures and ways of behaving which are insulated from each other. Thus socio-economic status level may be a much less important distinction in small urban areas than it is in large metropolitan areas.

Within the type of offense classifications several differences in the relative importance of the various offense type distinctions emerged. The group-individual distinction was considerably less important than previous work indicated. No differences on factor category scores were found between individuals who tend to commit offenses alone and those who tend to commit them with others. As noted in the earlier discussion this lack of differences may again be due to the particular sample used in the present study. The distinction between group and individual offenses may represent a quite different thing when applied to delinquents in small towns as when applied to ones in metropolitan areas (where much of the previous work which found differences was conducted). The group-individual

distinction may simply not be a relevant one for delinquents coming from smaller urban areas. It should be noted that organized delinquent gangs, in the metropolitan sense, are not present in the areas in which the present Ss reside.

Two offense type variables emerged as particularly important; criminal-CHIN offenses and multiple-first offenses. These two variables are somewhat different from the other offense type variables which were employed in that they reflect what might be regarded as seriousness of offense, extent of delinquent career, or commitment to a delinquent career. The other offense variables are more concerned with the particular form the given delinquent career seems to be taking. This interpretation suggests that while differences on factor scores do not exist at this point in a criminal career between various specific types of offenses, such differences do occur between delinquents demonstrating varying degrees of commitment to a criminal career. Thus it may be possible to identify those influences which are likely to lead to further or more serious delinquent activity.

Several additional points of general interest should be noted. The distinction in the multiple-factor scheme between individual and social factor sources appears to be a valid one, at least as judged by the fact that in the present study approximately an equal number of significant differences were found for Social factors and Individual factors (6 differences were found on Individual factors and 8 on Social). Thus both types of factors appear to be useful in identifying etiological differences among various types of delinquents.

Results of the present study also suggest that the four segments specified in the multiple-factor framework are all important. A

number of significant differences were found for factors in each of the four segments. Although the number of differences is not equal in each segment, there is not a pronounced tendency for differences to cluster in any one segment (4 significant differences were found for the Peer segment, 3 for the Family, 2 for the School and 5 for the City).

Also significant differences were found for each type (in terms of its causal relationship with the commission of a delinquent act) of factor category. Prohibitors were slightly underrepresented, but again there was no strong tendency for the differences to occur for only one factor type (3 differences were found for Instigators, 4 for Facilitators, 3 for Permitters, 3 for Diverters, and 1 for Prohibitors). Thus each type of factor appears to be important in distinguishing among types of delinquent offenders.

In conclusion, each of the major dimensions of the multiple-factor framework is of critical importance for distinguishing among types of juvenile offenders in terms of etiological influences. That is, the elimination of any one of the three major dimensions would have resulted in the failure to detect at least one of the significant differences which were found in the present study.

Suggestions for Application

The results of the present work could have fairly extensive relevance to the areas of prevention and rehabilitation in a number of ways. The purpose of this discussion is to very briefly indicate several points of application. In the field of prevention a frequent problem which occurs revolves around the development of an adequate

preventive program once a potential delinquent has been identified. The present study suggests one approach to this problem. If the potential delinquent can be classified according to the offender variables which were employed in the present study the various pro- and anti-delinquency influences which are operating in the given case are to some extent known. Thus a preventive program can be designed which would be intended to weaken or strengthen the appropriate influences. A similar approach could be taken in the case of adjudicated delinquents, although in these cases both type of offender and type of offense could be considered. A corrective or rehabilitative program could be designed around the influences known to be important for the given type of offender and given type of offense.

Finally, the present results also suggest a number of broad changes which would have an effect on prevention and rehabilitation. Most of these are of such a nature that they would have to occur on an institutional or agency level. For example, present results suggest that an increase in "constructive" leisure time activities within the City would possibly result in a reduction of recidivism. Of course it would be necessary that the target population be interested and participate in the activities which are provided. A program to interest females in leisure time activities might also serve to reduce female delinquency. In addition an effort by the schools to encourage interest in and identification with the school on the part of lower I.Q. delinquents could result in a reduction of delinquents in this group.

VIII. SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

The general purpose of the present study was to identify differences, in terms of the multiple-factor scheme, among various types of juvenile offenders. The study is conceived as exploratory rather than definitive, intended mainly to provide information as to the utility of the multiple-factor scheme when applied to types of offenders; and to suggest some of the more important dimensions to be used in attempting to classify juvenile offenders.

The results of the study indicate that the multiple-factor scheme is a viable one for distinguishing among types of offenders. Each major dimension of the scheme was found to be of critical importance in identifying differing etiological influences. Several dimensions for classifying delinquents were found to be of particular importance. Differences which remained when other variables were controlled were found when classification was based on each of the following: sex, age, socio-economic status, intelligence, ethnic group membership, criminal-CHIN offense and multiple-first offense.

Several areas requiring additional investigation are suggested by the present study and results. The purpose of this discussion is to briefly indicate several lines of future work. First, the present work has identified differences among types of delinquents in terms of individual factor categories. A "next step" would be to look for differences in terms of patterns of factors. For example, within a given segment is the relative importance (as indicated by the mean scores) of the various factors the same for males and females? Or, is

the relative importance of a given factor across segments the same for young and old delinquents? The answers to such questions would provide considerable information as to the interactive effects of the various factors in the etiology of the types of offenders.

Second, a more detailed cross-classification of Ss would permit controlling for the influence of two or more variables at the same time rather than just one as was done in the present study. Such a procedure would lend considerable support to the importance of those factors which continued to show significant differences among types of offenders. This procedure would require a much larger number of Ss than that available for the present study.

Third, it would be of interest to introduce additional bases for classifying delinquents. Several classification variables are immediately apparent. Classification according to residence in a large metropolitan area as opposed to residence in a small urban area. The inclusion of a group of Ss oriented toward the previously discussed retreatist subculture. The use of a seriousness-nonseriousness type of offense variable, perhaps similar to that employed by Conger and Miller (1966). The use of a psychologically broken home variable as opposed to the physical breakup of the family used in the present study.

Finally, a most useful line of development would be the intensive investigation of a given type of offender employing the multiple-factor scheme. Such a study could take the form proposed by Gartwright and Reuterman (1967). A small group of delinquents classified according to the given variable would be intensively investigated. This would involve accompanying probation counselors on their

pre-hearing investigation, interviewing many individuals who know the given juveniles, and interviewing the juveniles themselves. In short an effort to gather all available information concerning the Ss and classifying it according to the multiple-factor scheme with the purpose of identifying critical factors. Such an approach would produce far more detailed and "rich" information than it is possible to gather through a questionnaire and would permit the inclusion of many more influences than can be reasonably included in a questionnaire. The sifting of the detailed information would lead to the specification of various basically important influences in the etiology of the types of delinquency.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamsen, D. The psychology of crime. New York: Columbia Univer. Press, 1960, p. 118.
- Allensmith, W. Conscience and conflict: The moral force in personality. Child Develop., 1957, 28, 469-476.
- Allensmith, W. The learning of moral standards. In D. R. Miller & G. E. Swanson (Eds.), Inner conflict and defense. New York: Holt, 1960.
- Allport, F. H. The influence of the group upon association and thought. In A. P. Hare, E. F. Borgatta, & R. F. Bales (Eds.), Small groups. New York: Knopf, 1955, pp. 32-33.
- Bacon, Margaret D., Child, I. L., & Barry, H. A. A cross-cultural study of correlates of crime. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1963, 66, 291-300.
- Barker, G. H. & Adams, T. Glue sniffers. Sociol. soc. Res., 1963, 47, 298-310.
- Barnes, H. E. & Teeters, N. K. New horizons in criminology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1959, pp. 180-185, 208.
- Becker, H. S. Social class variations in the teacher-pupil relationship. J. educ. Sociol., 1952, 25, 451-465.
- Bishop, Barbara M. Mother-child interaction and the social behavior of children. In A. P. Hare, E. F. Borgatta & R. F. Bales (Eds.), Small groups. New York: Knopf, 1955, p. 282.
- Bloch, H. A. Crime causation: Research and its application. Fed. Probat., 1957, 21, 11-20.
- Borgatta, E. F. & Bales, R. F. The consistency of subject behavior and the reliability of scoring in interaction process analysis. In A. P. Hare, E. F. Borgatta, & R. F. Bales (Eds.), Small groups. New York: Knopf, 1955, pp. 303-304.
- Bottenberg, R. A. & Ward, J. H. Applied multiple linear regression. Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: Aerospace Medical Division, 1963, pp. 22-48, 126.
- Briar, S. & Piliavin, I. Delinquency, situational inducements, and commitment to conformity. Soc. Probs., 1965, 13, 35-45.

- Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965, pp. 410-412.
- Browning, C. J. Differential impact of family disorganization on male adolescents. Soc. Probs., 1960, 8, 37-44.
- Browning, C. J. Toward a science of delinquency analysis. In Ruth S. Cavan (Ed.), Readings in juvenile delinquency. New York: Lippincott, 1964, pp. 48-49.
- Burgers, R. L. & Akers, R. L. A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. Soc. Probs., 1966, 14, 128-147.
- Burma, J. H. Spanish-speaking groups in the United States. Durham, N.C.: Duke Univer. Press, 1954, pp. 9-10.
- Burt, C. The young delinquent. London: Univer. of London Press, 1965.
- Cartwright, D. S. & Howard, K. I. Psychological assessment of street corner youth: Intelligence. In D. S. Cartwright & K. I. Howard, Personality assessment of street corner youth. Univer. of Chicago, 1960 (mimeo), pp. 5-6.
- Cartwright, D. S. & Howard, K. I. Multivariate analysis of gang delinquency: I. Ecologic influences. Multivar. Behav. Res., 1966, 1, 321-372.
- Cartwright, D. S. & Reuterman, N. A. Toward a theory of middle class delinquency: A research proposal. Univer. of Colorado, 1967 (mimeo), pp. 22-25.
- Cartwright, D. S., Reuterman, N. A. & Vandiver, R. A new multiple-factor approach to delinquency. Univer. of Colorado, 1967 (mimeo), pp. 4-8.
- Cartwright, Rosalind D. Effects of psychotherapy on self-consistency. J. counsel. Psychol., 1957, 4, 15-22.
- Chein, I., et al. The road to H. New York: Basic Books, 1964, pp. 251-275.
- Chein, I. & Rosenfeld, Eva. Juvenile narcotics use. Law & contemp. Probs., 1957, 22, 52-68.
- Clinard, M. B. Sociology of deviant behavior. New York: Rinehart, 1957, p. 195.
- Clinard, M. B. Criminological research. In R. K. Merton, L. Broom, & L. S. Cottrel (Eds.), Sociology today. New York: Basic Books, 1959, p. 525.

- Clinard, M. B. & Wade, A. L. Toward the delineation of vandalism as a sub-type in juvenile delinquency. J. crim. law, criminol., & pol. Sci., 1957, 48, 493-499.
- Cloward, R. A. & Ohlin, L. E. Delinquency and opportunity. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960, pp. 20-21.
- Cohen, A. K. Delinquent boys. New York: Free Press, 1955, pp. 25-26, 113, 164.
- Cohen, A. K. Sociological research in juvenile delinquency. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1957, 27, 781-788.
- Cohen, A. K. Multiple-factor approaches. In M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, & N. Johnston (Eds.), The sociology of crime and delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1962, pp. 78-79.
- Cohen, D. J. Justin and his peers: An experimental analysis of a child's social world. Child Develop., 1962, 33, 705-714.
- Colorado Legislative Council. The children's code. Denver, Colorado, 1967, pp. 3-4.
- Conger, J. J. & Miller, W. C. Personality, social class, and delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1960, pp. 162-166, 167, 173.
- Cronbach, C. J. Essentials of psychological testing. New York: Harper & Row, 1960, p. 104.
- Cooley, W. W. & Lohnes, P. R. Multivariate procedures for the behavioral sciences. New York: Wiley, 1962, pp. 60-62.
- Cooper, R. Comparative analysis of the nature of crime and delinquency in girls as compared to boys. In F. J. Cohen (Ed.), Youth and crime. New York: International Univer. Press, 1957, p. 70.
- Dentler, R. A. & Monroe, L. J. Social correlates of early adolescent theft. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1961, 26, 733-743.
- Deutsch, M. P. The disadvantaged child and the learning process. In F. Riesman, J. Cohen, & A. Pearl (Eds.), Mental health of the poor. New York: Free Press, 1964, pp. 177-185.
- England, R. W. A theory of middle class delinquency. In Ruth S. Cavan (Ed.), Readings in juvenile delinquency. New York: Lippincott, 1964, p. 72.
- Fort, J. P. Herion addiction among young men. Psychiat., 1954, 17, 251-259.

- Gergen, K. J. Interaction goals and personalistic feedback as factors affecting the presentation of self. J. pers. soc. Psychol., 1965, 1, 413-424.
- Gergen, K. J. Personal consistency and the presentation of self. Harvard Univer., 1966 (mimeo), pp. 8, 11-14.
- Gibbons, D. C. Prospects and problems of delinquent typology. Sociol. Inquiry, 1962, 32, 235-244.
- Gibbons, D. C. Problems of causal analysis in criminology: A case illustration. J. res. crime & Delinq., 1966, 3, 47-52.
- Gibbons, J. & Garrity, R. A. Some suggestions for the development of etiological and treatment theory in criminology. Soc. Forces, 1959, 38, 51-61.
- Glaser, D. Criminality, theories and behavioral images. Amer. J. Sociol., 1956, 61, 433-444.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, Eleanor T. One thousand juvenile delinquents. Cambridge: Harvard Univer. Press, 1934.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, Eleanor T. Unraveling juvenile delinquency. Cambridge: Commonwealth Fund, 1950, p. 7.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, Eleanor T. Predicting delinquency and crime. Cambridge: Harvard Univer. Press, 1959, p. 39.
- Goldman, N. A socio-psychological study of school vandalism. Crime & delinq., 1961, 7, 221-230.
- Gordon, R. A., et al. Values and gang delinquency: A study of street-corner groups. Amer. J. Sociol., 1963, 69, 109-128.
- Gottlieb, D. Goal aspirations and goal fulfillments. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1964, 34, 934-941.
- Hartshorne, H. & May, M. A. Studies in deceit. New York: Macmillan, 1930, pp. 107-108.
- Healy, W. The individual delinquent. Boston: Little, Brown, 1915.
- Healy, W. & Bronner, A. F. Delinquents and criminals: Their making and unmaking. New York: Macmillan, 1926, pp. 179, 181.
- Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's youth. New York: Science Editions, 1961, pp. 194-195, 197-198, 290-298.
- Horrocks, J. E. & Gottfried, N. W. Psychological needs and verbally expressed aggression in adolescent delinquent boys. J. Psychol., 1966, 62, 179-194.

- Hotelling, H. The generalization of student's ratio. Ann. of math. Stat., 1931, 2, 360-378.
- Jenkins, R. L. Adaptive and maladaptive delinquency. Nerv. Child., 1955, 11, 9-11.
- Jenkins, R. L. Motivation and frustration in delinquency. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1957, 27, 528-537.
- Jenkins, R. L. & Hewitt, L. Types of personality structure encountered in child guidance clinics. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1944, 14, 84-94.
- Kahl, J. A. & Davis, J. A. A comparison of indexes of Socioeconomic Status. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1955, 20, 317-325.
- Kinch, J. W. Continuities in the study of delinquent types. J. crim. law, criminol., & pol. Sci., 1962a, 53, 323-328.
- Kinch, J. W. Self-conceptions of types of delinquents. Sociol. Inquiry, 1962b, 32, 228-234.
- Korn, R. R. & McCorkle, L. W. Criminology and penology. New York: Holt, 1959, pp. 143, 145.
- Kvaraceus, W. C. Juvenile delinquency and the school. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World, 1945, pp. 75, 97.
- Kvaraceus, W. C. The nature of the problem of juvenile delinquency in the United States. J. Negro Educ., 1959, 28, 191-200.
- Kvaraceus, W. C. & Miller, W. B. Delinquent behavior: Culture and the individual. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1959, pp. 62-77.
- LaPiere, R. T. Attitudes vs. actions. Soc. Forces, 1934, 13, 230-237.
- Lindesmith, A. R. & Dunham, H. W. Some principles of criminal typology. Soc. Forces, 1941, 19, 307-314.
- Luria, Z., Goldwasser, M. & Goldwasser, A. Responses to transgression in stories by Israeli children. Child Develop., 1963, 34, 271-280.
- Luria, L. A., et al. Environmental influences. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1943, 13, 150-161.
- MacIver, R. Social causation. In M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, & N. Johnston (Eds.), The sociology of crime and delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1962, p. 73.

- MacKay, J. R. Problem drinking among juvenile delinquents. Crime & Delinq., 1963, 9, 29-38.
- Martin, J. M. Juvenile vandalism. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1961, pp. 5, 26-27, 31.
- Matza, D. Delinquency and drift. New York: Wiley, 1964, pp. 23-24, 51.
- McCandless, B. R. Children and adolescents. New York: Holt, 1961, pp. 454-466, 470-471.
- McCord, W., McCord, Joan, & Zola, I. K. Origins of crime. New York: Columbia Univer. Press, 1959, pp. 128-135, 172.
- McNemar, Q. Psychological statistics. New York: Wiley, 1962, pp. 167-168.
- Merton, K. Social theory and social structure. Glencoe: Free Press, 1957, p. 177.
- Hiller, W. B. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. J. soc. Issues, 1958, 14, 5-19.
- Monahan, T. P. Family status and delinquency. In M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, & N. Johnston (Eds.), The sociology of crime and delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1962, p. 324.
- Moore, Bernice M. The schools and the problems of delinquency: Research studies and findings. In Ruth S. Cavan (Ed.), Readings in juvenile delinquency. New York: Lippincott, 1964, pp. 184-187.
- Nye, I. Family relationships and delinquent behavior. New York: Wiley, 1958, pp. 4-8, 34, 43, 62-63.
- Pearl, A. Youth in lower class settings. In M. Sherif & Carolyn W. Sherif (Eds.), Problems of youth: Transition to adulthood in a changing world. Chicago: Aldine, 1965, p. 92.
- Quay, H. C., Peterson, D. R. & Consalvi, C. The interpretation of three personality factors in juvenile delinquency. J. consult. Psychol., 1960, 24, 555.
- Rao, C. R. Advanced statistical methods in biometric research. New York: Wiley, 1952, pp. 258-272.
- Redl, F. & Wineman, D. Children who hate. New York: Collier, 1962, p. 64.
- Reiss, A. J. Delinquency as a failure of personal and social controls. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1951, 16, 196-208.

- Reiss, A. J. Social correlates of psychological types of delinquency. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1952, 17, 710-718.
- Reiss, A. J., et al. Occupations and social status. New York: Free Press, 1962, pp. 263-275.
- Reuterman, N. A. A multiple-factor approach to delinquency: Dissertation proposal. Univer. of Colorado, 1967a (mimeo), pp. 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 34-35, 36.
- Reuterman, N. A. An evaluation of selected theories of gang delinquency. Univer. of Colorado, 1967b (mimeo), pp. 174-176.
- Rich, J. M. How social class values affect teacher-pupil relations. J. educ. Sociol., 1960, 33, 355-359.
- Robin, G. D. Gang member delinquency: Its extent, sequency and typology. J. crim. law, criminol., & pol. Sci., 1964, 55, 59-69.
- Robinson, D. & Rohde, S. Two experiments with an anti-semitism poll. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1946, 41, 136-144.
- Robison, Sophia M. Juvenile delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1960, pp. 175-176, 197-198.
- Roebuck, J. B. The Negro numbers man as a criminal type: The construction of a typology. J. crim. law, criminol., & pol. Sci., 1963, 54, 48-60.
- Roebuck, J. B. & Cadwallader, M. L. The Negro armed robber as a criminal type: The construction and application of a typology. Pacif. sociol. Rev., 1961, 4, 21-26.
- Roebuck, J. B. & Johnson, R. C. The jack-of-all-trades offender. Crime & Delinq., 1962a, 8, 172-181.
- Roebuck, J. B. & Johnson, R. C. The Negro drinker and assaulter as a criminal type. Crime & Delinq., 1962b, 8, 21-33.
- Roebuck, J. B. & Johnson, R. C. The "short con" man. Crime & Delinq., 1964, 10, 235-248.
- Savitz, L. Delinquency and migration. In M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, & N. Johnston (Eds.), The sociology of crime and delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1962, p. 203.
- Schuessler, K. F. & Cressey, D. R. Personality characteristics of criminals. In C. B. Vedder, S. Koenig, & R. E. Clark (Eds.), Criminology: A book of readings. New York: Holt, 1953, p. 67.
- Scott, J. F. Two dimensions of delinquent behavior. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1959, 24, 240-243.

- Shaw, C. R. Delinquency areas. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1929, pp. 1, 3-8.
- Shaw, C. R. The natural history of a delinquent career. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1931, pp. 55, 58, 60, 75, 88.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, Carolyn W. Reference groups. New York: Harper, 1964, p. 219.
- Shibutani, T. Reference groups as perspectives. In E. P. Hollander, & R. G. Hunt (Eds.), Current perspectives in social psychology. New York: Oxford Univer. Press, 1963, pp. 103, 105.
- Shinohara, M. & Jenkins, R. L. MMPI study of three types of delinquents. J. clin. Psychol., 1967, 23, 156-163.
- Short, J. F. The sociocultural context of delinquency. N.P.P.A. Journal, 1960, 6, 365-375.
- Short, J. F., Rivera, R., & Marshall, H. Adult-adolescent relations and gang delinquency. Pacif. sociol. Rev., 1964, 7, 59-65.
- Short, J. F. & Stodtbeck, F. L. Group processes and gang delinquency. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1965, pp. 29-32, 61, 228.
- Shulman, H. M. Intelligence and delinquency. In C. B. Vedder (Ed.), The juvenile offender. Garden City: Doubleday, 1954, p. 133.
- Spiegel, I. Racketville, slumtown and haulberg. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 8-12, 126-128.
- Stein, K. B., Gough, H. G., & Sarbin, T. R. The dimensionality of the CPI socialization scale and an empirically derived typology among delinquent and non-delinquent boys. Multivar. Behav. Res., 1966, 1, 197-208.
- Stendler, C. A study of some socio-moral judgements in junior high school children. Child Develop., 1949, 20, 15-28.
- Sutherland, E. H. & Cressey, D. R. Principles of criminology. New York: Lippincott, 1955, pp. 61, 71, 114.
- Tannenbaum, F. Crime and the community. New York: Ginn, 1938, pp. 66-67.
- Thomas, W. I. The behavior pattern and the situation. In E. H. Volkart (Ed.), Social behavior and personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to theory and social research. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951, p. 68.
- Thomas, W. I. The definition of the situation. In L. A. Coser & B. Rosenberg (Eds.), Sociological theory. New York: MacMillan, 1964, pp. 233-234.

- Thorndike, E. L. The elements of psychology. New York: A. G. Sailer, 1907, p. 207.
- Thorndike, E. L. Selected writings from a connectionist's psychology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949, pp. 109-111.
- Thrasher, F. M. The gang as a symptom of community disorganization. J. appl. Sociol., 1926, 11, 3-20.
- Thrasher, F. M. The gang. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1963, p. 65.
- Toby, J. The differential impact of family disorganization. In M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, & N. Johnston (Eds.), The sociology of crime and delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1962, p. 334.
- Toby, R. Contemporary society. New York: Wiley, 1964, p. 162.
- Tyerman, M. J. A research into truancy. Brit. J. educ. Psychol., 1958, 28, 217-225.
- Vedder, C. B. Juvenile offenders. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1963, pp. 34-38, 51-57.
- Vold, G. B. Theoretical criminology. New York: Oxford Univer. Press, 1958, pp. 313-314.
- Volkart, E. H. Introduction: Social behavior and the defined situation. In E. H. Volkart (Ed.), Social behavior and personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to theory and social research. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951, p. 12.
- Wattenberg, W. W. & Balistreri, J. J. Automobile theft: A "favored-group" delinquency. In C. B. Vedder (Ed.), The juvenile offender. Garden City: Doubleday, 1954, p. 60.
- Wattenberg, W. W. & Balistreri, J. J. Gang membership and juvenile misconduct. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1966, 15, 744-752.
- Wattenberg, W. W. & Faigenbaum, D. Patterns of delinquency. J. clin. Psychol., 1953, 9, 78-81.
- Wattenberg, W. W. & Quiroz, F. Follow-up study of ten-year-old boys with police records. J. consult. Psychol., 1953, 17, 309-313.
- Wattenberg, W. W. & Quiroz, F. A study of twelve-year-old recidivists. J. clin. Psychol., 1954, 10, 61-65.
- Wattenberg, W. W. & Saunders, F. Sex differences among juvenile offenders. Sociol. soc. Res., 1954, 39, 24-31.
- Whyte, W. F. Street corner society. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1955, p. 19.

Wilkins, L. T. Social deviance. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965, pp. 36-37.

Wolfgang, M. E., Savitz, L., & Johnston, N. The sociology of crime and delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1962, p. 70.

Zimmering, P., et al. Herion addiction in adolescent boys. J. nerv. ment. Dis., 1951, 114, 19-34.

APPENDIX A
REPORTED DELINQUENCY SCALE

In this section think about your actions
during the past year

How frequently have you gone to parties where under-age people were drinking beer, wine or liquor?

How often have you gotten into places of public entertainment without paying the proper fee?

How many times have you driven or been in an automobile going more than 20 mph over the posted speed limit?

How frequently have you cut classes you should have attended?

On how many occasions have you tried to evade the police?

How many times have you used bad language in public places?

How many times have you copied portions of ideas or published materials without acknowledging the author?

How many times have you taken little things (worth less than \$2.00) that did not belong to you?

How frequently have you been trespassing?

How many times have you taken things from stores without paying for them or without even making arrangements to pay?

APPENDIX B
EXPERIENCE SURVEY II ITEMS
AND RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY COEFFICIENTS

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Social Peer Instigators</u>		
.514	.312	How many times during the past year has any kid pushed you a little too far?
.790	.175	How many times during the past year has a friend tried to show you any dirty pictures or dirty movies?
.691	.320	On how many occasions during the past year have any of your friends offered you a drink?
.689	.578	How many times during the past year have your friends wanted you to go with them for a "night on the town"?
.510	.276	During the past year has some kid had it in for you?

<u>Social Peer Facilitators</u>		
.686	.217	How often during the past year have any kids left personal belongings lying around?
.718	.247	How frequently during the past year have any of your friends taken chances and gotten away with it?
.630	.297	How many times during the past year have any of your friends told you they wouldn't rat on you if you took chances?
.729	.156	On how many occasions during the past year has a friend shown you how to get some new kind of "kick"?
.514	.163	How often during the past year have any of your friends mentioned that a lot of people don't bother to lock their homes when they go out?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social Peer Permittors

.618	.354	On how many occasions during the past year have your friends seen movies which show how unfair adults are to kids?
.540	.202	How many times during the past year have you and your friends agreed that most people are not interested in or concerned about others?
.486	.309	On how many occasions during the past year have your friends watched any T.V. programs which bring out the rebel in young people?
.478	.321	How often during the past year have you heard any of your friends say that what they do with their lives is nobody else's business?
.449	.188	How often during the past year have you heard any of your friends say that nobody gives a damn about them?

Social Peer Diverters

.614	-.058	How many times during the past year have any of your friends asked you to help out on some work he was required to do?
.615	-.101	How frequently during the past year has any of your friends invited you to his home to meet his folks?
.571	-.060	On how many occasions during the past year has one of your friends suggested joining some city recreation program?
.693	-.072	On how many occasions during the past year have you and your friends engaged in sports activities?
.484	-.076	On how many occasions during the past year have any of your friends suggested that you all join a club like the YMCA?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social Peer Prohibitors

.757	-.140	During the past year has any of your friends ever told you he had decided to become a policeman, lawyer, doctor, nurse or teacher?
.719	-.182	How often during the past year have any of your friends asked you to go to church with them?
.666	-.103	How many times during the past year have any of your friends left a fun party because they had to get home on time?
.712	-.091	During the past year have any of your friends ever asked to meet your parents?
.583	-.074	How frequently during the past year has one of your friends mentioned that one of his teachers was a "good guy"?

Social Family Instigators

.651	.102	How many times during the past year has someone in your family tried to get you high?
.739	.145	How frequently during the past year has a parent, relative, or guardian made you very angry?
.589	.334	How often during the past year have you heard any of your parents or relatives or guardian say that smart ones get away with things?
.464	.152	During the past year has a relative or member of your family had it in for you?
.446	.171	How many times has someone at home challenged or dared you to do something quite dangerous?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social Family Facilitators

.683	.357	How frequently during the past year have any of your parents, relatives or guardian made it easy for you to goof off?
.653	.214	How often during the past year has any parent, relative or guardian left money or liquor lying around the house?
.766	.139	How many times during the past year has a relative or member of your family taken you to a bar or nightclub?
.778	.175	On how many occasions during the past year has a relative or member of your family gotten away with something illegal?
.532	.245	On how many occasions during the past year has a parent, relative or guardian shown he will back you up against the school or other authorities?

Social Family Permittors

.682	.232	How many times during the past year have you been told at home that most people are out to get all they can?
.580	.202	How often during the past year has a parent, relative or guardian said that kids nowadays often get a rough break from many adults?
.551	.277	How frequently during the past year has some relative or member of your family said that "wheels" (politicians, cops, etc.) in the city are crooked?
.733	.219	On how many occasions during the past year has a relative or someone in your family said that cops are stupid?
.557	.382	How often during the past year has some relative or member of your family said that the "wheels" should mind their own business and quit trying to run everybody's lives?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social Family Diverters

.638	-.123	How frequently during the past year has anyone at home asked you to do routine chores around the house?
.828	-.163	How frequently during the past year has your family done enjoyable things together, such as a family outing?
.759	-.091	How often during the past year have you spent an evening at home with your family?
.812	-.089	On how many occasions during the past year have you been made responsible for some necessary family activity (for example, taking care of brothers and sisters, cutting grass, etc.)?
.704	-.106	How many times during the past year have you taken part in planning some event for your family (for example, buying a T.V., planning vacation activities, etc.)?

Social Family Prohibitors

.769	-.046	How often during the past year have your parents threatened to punish you?
.609	-.033	How many times during the past year have your parents, relatives or guardian made it clear what they expect of you?
.809	-.063	How frequently during the past year have your parents, relatives or guardian been firm with you about keeping better hours?
.599	-.039	How many times during the past year has a parent, relative or guardian told you not to hang around with kids that get in trouble?
.551	-.037	How often during the past year have your parents told you to respect the police?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social School Instigators

.629	.237	How frequently during the past year have any of the teachers in your school been unfair to you?
.684	.385	How frequently during the past year have other kids in school encouraged you to take chances?
.516	.260	How often during the past year have other kids in school had it in for you?
.484	.173	How often during the past year have you learned something in school which helped you to get away with things?
.438	.264	During the past year has any teacher in your school even had it in for you?

Social School Facilitators

.699	.232	How many times during the past year have kids in your school told you they wouldn't rat on you if you were to take chances?
.729	.216	How frequently during the past year have kids in your school left their books or other personal things lying around?
.627	.219	How often during the past year have teachers left their personal belongings lying around?
.720	.301	On how many occasions in the past year have kids been left alone without a teacher in shop, lab or similar classrooms?
.757	.166	How many times during the past year has someone in school told you how to get a new "kick"?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social School Permittors

.641	.334	How many times during the past year has a teacher failed to notice kids in your class taking chances?
.781	.228	How many times during the past year have the kids in your school said that teachers just don't give a damn about anything?
.607	.140	How frequently during the past year have kids in your school said that teachers are not interested in the problems of their students?
.486	.347	How often in the past year has a teacher failed to enforce school rules?
.422	.309	How many times during the past year has a teacher suggested that it is best to avoid getting involved in the problems of others?

Social School Diverters

.647	-.113	On how many occasions during the past year has one of your teachers helped you with school work after classes?
.626	-.078	How often during the past year have you been assigned school homework which has taken you a large part of an evening to do?
.592	-.101	How many times during the past year has the school mentioned interesting after-hours activities?
.596	-.037	How many times during the past year has the school offered or told you about opportunities to earn some money?
.680	-.110	How frequently during the past year has a teacher asked you to help out?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social School Prohibitors

.651	-.081	How often during the past year have kids in school said that some cops are pretty good guys?
.531	-.036	On how many occasions during the past year have members of the police force visited one of your classes or extra-curricular clubs to give a talk?
.520	-.031	On how many occasions during the past year has any teacher won your respect or admiration?
.493	-.098	How often during the past year has a teacher praised the police or other authorities?
.547	-.027	How frequently during the past year have teachers told you to stay away from kids who get in trouble?

Social City Instigators

.737	.272	How many times during the past year has anybody in town tried to tempt you with easy money or with a new "kick"?
.762	.142	How many times during the past year has anybody in town tried to show or sell you dirty pictures?
.690	.184	How frequently during the past year have newspapers in your town printed any crime stories that were really interesting?
.633	.217	How many times during the past year has someone in the city pushed you a little too far?
.763	.337	How often during the past year has anyone in your city tried to sell you beer or liquor?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Social City Facilitators</u>		
.507	.249	How often during the past year have you heard someone in your city say that with the number of people on the streets nowadays it is hard to keep track of anyone?
.602	.339	How frequently during the past year has someone on your street said that people who break the law get a lot of help from other people?
.707	.334	How often during the past year have you seen people leave stuff in unlocked cars?
.552	.141	During the past year have you lived in or had occasion to visit a pretty "rough" neighborhood?
.597	.377	How often during the past year have you heard people in your city say how easy it would be to walk off with a lot of stuff in the stores?

<u>Social City Permittors</u>		
.642	.259	How frequently during the past year have you heard any people in your city say they think most cops are no good?
.530	.327	On how many occasions during the past year have you seen people in your city ignore others who need help?
.630	.362	On how many occasions during the past year has any adult on your street said that young people should do just whatever they want to do?
.567	.176	How frequently in the past year have you heard some adult on your street say that he doesn't care what happens to other people?
.470	.188	How often during the past year have you heard people in your city say they wouldn't complain to the law about something because it is too much trouble?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Social City Diverters</u>		
.721	-.019	How many times during the past year have there been any good job opportunities for people like you in your city?
.529	-.029	How many times during the past year has some adult (aside from your family) on your street asked you to help him with some work?
.540	-.038	How frequently during the past year has your city provided educational programs (museum tours, etc.) which are not connected with schools?
.663	-.107	How many times during the past year have you had a chance to join some organization like the Boy Scouts, YMCA, a church youth group, etc.?
.544	-.028	How often during the past year has there been a place around your street to go after school where it is very unlikely that you will get into trouble?

<u>Social City Prohibitors</u>		
.578	-.097	How often during the past year have the police done a good job in your city?
.597	-.141	How many times during the past year have you heard people on your street say that in time even the "perfect" crimes are solved?
.647	-.146	How often during the past year have you read stories in the newspapers about crimes being solved because of tips the police get?
.518	-.031	On how many occasions during the past year have people on your street co-operated with police in solving a crime?
.459	-.073	How often during the past year have you heard people in your city say that the police do an awfully good job nowadays with all the modern, scientific equipment they have?

Social City Diverters

.721 -.019 How many times during the past year have there been any good job opportunities for people like you in your city?

.529 -.029 How many times during the past year has some adult (aside from your family) on your street asked you to help him with some work?

.540 -.038 How frequently during the past year has your city provided educational programs (museum tours, etc.) which are not connected with schools?

.663 -.107 How many times during the past year have you had a chance to join some organization like the Boy Scouts, YMCA, a church youth group, etc.?

.544 -.028 How often during the past year has there been a place around your street to go after school where it is very unlikely that you will get into trouble?

Social City Prohibitors

.578 -.097 How often during the past year have the police done a good job in your city?

.597 -.141 How many times during the past year have you heard people on your street say that in time even the "perfect" crimes are solved?

.647 -.146 How often during the past year have you read stories in the newspapers about crimes being solved because of tips the police get?

.518 -.031 On how many occasions during the past year have people on your street co-operated with police in solving a crime?

.459 -.073 How often during the past year have you heard people in your city say that the police do an awfully good job nowadays with all the modern, scientific equipment they have?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Individual Peer Instigators</u>		
.764	.248	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to do almost <u>anything</u> to make the others respect you?
.606	.351	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to show other kids how a cool guy would act?
.804	.307	How often during the past year have you wanted things like some of your friends have?
.679	.409	How many times during the past year have you been jealous of what some of your friends have?
.704	.301	How often during the past year have you wished that more of the kids liked you?

<u>Individual Peer Facilitators</u>		
.662	.382	How often during the past year have you shown that nobody had better get in your way?
.698	.350	On how many occasions during the past year have you shown that you can do things without people noticing?
.650	.355	How often during the past year has something one of your friends said or done made you think how stupid most people are?
.676	.223	On how many occasions during the past year have you kept cool in a situation when your friends were getting excited?
.618	.438	How often during the past year have you gotten away with things with other kids?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual Peer Permitters

.743	.450	How frequently during the past year have there been times when you went along with your friends just because you had nothing better to do?
.662	.166	On how many occasions during the past year have you done things which your friends thought were really stupid?
.703	.346	How frequently during the past year have you been so mad at some kid that you couldn't control yourself?
.580	.316	How frequently during the past year have you taken chances for no reason at all?
.519	.204	How many times during the past year have you made mistakes in choosing your friends?

Individual Peer Diverters

.770	-.148	On how many occasions during the past year have you been able to get your friends to join with you in some club activities, like the Boy Scouts, YMCA, church groups, etc?
.677	-.063	How many times during the past year have you offered to help a friend on some work that he was required to do?
.769	-.047	How many times during the past year have you and your friends been really busy making or doing something constructive together?
.595	-.031	On how many occasions during the past year have you enjoyed time spent with your friends in worthwhile activities?
.742	-.019	How frequently during the past year have you tried to get a job which one of your friends told you about?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual Peer Prohibitors

.705	-.022	How many times during the past year have you thought that you and your friends ought to plan for your future as adults?
.660	-.034	How many times during the past year have you planned things that you and your friends could do which would be helpful to the community?
.587	-.056	How often during the past year have you thought about how you can help any of your friends grow up?
.504	-.017	How often during the past year have you done some worthwhile thing because you thought your friends would approve of it?
.723	-.017	How many times during the past year have you tried to stop a fight?

Individual Family Indicators

.722	.136	How frequently during the past year have you felt like smashing things up at home?
.632	.378	How many times during the past year have you wanted to do almost anything to break the monotony at home?
.636	.282	How many times during the past year have you wanted to do something that would make the members of your family pay a little more attention to you?
.610	.173	On how many occasions during the past year have you looked for trouble so you could get even with someone at home?
.521	.182	How many times during the past year have you wanted to take a chance to show the members of your family what a smart guy you really are?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Individual Family Facilitators</u>		
.699	.178	How often during the last year have you been able to play one parent, relative or guardian against another or against an older brother or sister?
.695	.213	How often during the past year have you been clever enough to lie to your parents, relatives or guardian and get away with it?
.602	.208	How often during the past year have you been able to stay cool and keep a straight face under pressure at home?
.675	.239	How many times during the past year have you really told off some member of your family?
.642	.308	How often during the past year have you been able to keep your parents from finding out what you've been doing when you were out at night?

<u>Individual Family Permittors</u>		
.643	.219	How frequently during the past year have you been just plain "tee'd-off" with things at home?
.710	.235	How frequently during the past year have there been times at home when you felt so mad you couldn't control yourself?
.636	.376	How frequently during the past year have there been times at home when you had a lot of spare time to kill?
.749	.224	On how many occasions during the past year have you felt that you couldn't stand staying at home for one more minute?
.749	.176	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to tell your parents, relatives or guardian to butt out of your business?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel.	Val.	
<u>Individual Family Diverters</u>		
.683	-.177	How many times during the past year have you enjoyed being at home?
.740	-.161	How many times during the past year have you been able to find enough work to keep yourself busy around the house?
.819	-.148	How many times during the past year have you offered to do additional chores at home?
.635	-.156	How many times during the past year at home, have you found good ways of making use of your spare time?
.749	-.183	How often during the past year have you found interesting things to do at home?

<u>Individual Family Prohibitors</u>		
.851	-.226	On how many occasions during the past year have you wanted to go to church with your family?
.700	-.016	How many times during the past year have you decided to really work hard to try to be as successful as some member of your family?
.484	-.016	How often during the past year have you been afraid of being punished by your parents?
.513	-.119	How often during the past year have you wanted to tell your family where you're going and who with?
.844	-.026	On how many occasions during the past year have you really been able to talk about your problems with your parents, relatives or guardian?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Individual School Instigators</u>		
.761	.262	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to show the kids in school what a smart guy you are?
.732	.323	How many times during the past year have you wanted things like other kids in school have?
.665	.415	On how many occasions during the past year have you wanted to show the kids in school how tough you are?
.713	.341	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to show the kids in school how to really get some kicks out of life?
.756	.283	How many times during the past year have you wanted to show a teacher that you don't have to take gas from anyone?

<u>Individual School Facilitators</u>		
.808	.352	During the past year how often have you ditched school and gotten away with it?
.748	.420	How frequently during the past year have you thought that you are smarter than other kids in school even though some of them get better grades?
.645	.385	On how many occasions during the past year have you found that you can often outsmart other kids in school?
.607	.158	How often during the past year have you found places in school where you could hide out for long periods of time during the day?
.566	.348	How often during the past year have you found that you can get away with things in school when other kids get caught?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual School Permittors

.660	.257	How many times during the past year have you thought that some teachers are not so smart?
.742	.408	During the past year have you ever felt that school was a waste of time?
.716	.377	How often during the past year have you felt that you couldn't stand another day of school?
.589	.218	How frequently during the past year have you argued with a teacher or someone like that just to make him look bad?
.698	.219	How frequently during the past year have you been so mad at someone in school that you couldn't control yourself?

Individual School Diverters

.732	-.097	During the past year were there days when once you'd gotten to school you were glad to be there?
.569	-.116	How many times during the past year have you become really interested in finding out more about something a teacher said in school?
.574	-.129	How many times during the past year have you enjoyed doing a good job on some work that was required at school?
.662	-.226	How many times during the past year have you stayed after regular school hours to do some extra work?
.690	-.112	On how many occasions during the past year have you participated in some school sponsored sports activity outside of regular school hours?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel.	Val.	
<u>Individual School Prohibitors</u>		
.709	-.166	How often during the past year have you seen school as a means of improving yourself?
.664	-.044	How often during the past year have you thought about what you can do for your school?
.511	-.146	On how many occasions during the past year have you wanted to be like one of your teachers?
.513	-.088	How many times during the past year have you thought of school as a way to later success?
.614	-.072	How often during the past year have you decided to really try to do better in school?

<u>Individual City Instigators</u>		
.709	.272	How frequently during the past year have you felt like smashing things up?
.765	.413	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to be very important?
.588	.446	How often during the past year have you wanted to show people that you don't have to take anything from anyone?
.656	.291	How many times during the past year have you wanted to show people that you really are somebody important?
.828	.261	How often during the past year have you wanted things like other people on your street have?

Individual School Prohibitors

.709	-.166	How often during the past year have you seen school as a means of improving yourself?
.664	-.044	How often during the past year have you thought about what you can do for your school?
.511	-.146	On how many occasions during the past year have you wanted to be like one of your teachers?
.513	-.088	How many times during the past year have you thought of school as a way to later success?
.614	-.072	How often during the past year have you decided to really try to do better in school?

Individual City Instigators

.709	.272	How frequently during the past year have you felt like smashing things up?
.765	.413	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to be very important?
.588	.446	How often during the past year have you wanted to show people that you don't have to take anything from anyone?
.656	.291	How many times during the past year have you wanted to show people that you really are somebody important?
.828	.261	How often during the past year have you wanted things like other people on your street have?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel.	Val.	
<u>Individual City Facilitators</u>		
.588	.235	How many times during the past year have you been able to keep cool when someone in town accused you of something?
.589	.204	How often during the past year have you noticed a way to get into a locked building?
.584	.235	How frequently during the past year have you thought how easy it is to blend into the crowd downtown?
.688	.449	How many times during the past year have you thought of yourself as being cool enough to outsmart most other people in your city?
.687	.373	How many times during the past year have you thought that the people on your street must be awfully stupid?

<u>Individual City Permitters</u>		
.729	.161	How often during the past year have you gotten so mad at someone in a store that you couldn't control yourself?
.629	.414	How often during the past year have you thought something like this: "Who cares? I've got nothing to lose!"?
.737	.262	How many times during the past year has it seemed like a lot of people were working together against you?
.604	.196	How many times during the past year have you gotten so mad at someone on the street that you couldn't control yourself?
.553	.337	How often during the past year have you been walking along a crowded street and thought something like: "None of these people give a damn what I do!"?

APPENDIX B (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual City Diverters

.606	-.067	During the past year have you ever taken part in an educational program outside of school, such as tutoring help, extension courses, etc.?
.625	-.112	How frequently during the past year have you taken time to help out one of your neighbors?
.717	-.078	How many times during the past year have you found interesting, worthwhile things to do around your street?
.640	-.068	How often during the past year have you attended any exhibits, programs, etc., sponsored by your city?
.534	-.064	How many times during the past year have you thought of starting some hobby because of something someone on your street has said or done?

Individual City Prohibitors

.715	-.231	How often during the past year have you thought that cops must really be pretty smart to solve a lot of crimes?
.612	-.081	How often during the past year have you thought that most people in your city are really concerned about preventing crime?
.483	-.068	On how many occasions during the past year have you thought that people who break the law don't get away with it?
.512	-.073	How many times during the past year have you done things that would help your city?
.719	-.056	During the past year have any of the crimes you hear about in your city made you feel disgusted?

APPENDIX C

FORM COMPLETED BY PROBATION DEPARTMENTS

Name _____ S No. _____

City _____ State _____

Sex: M F Age _____ Now attending _____ Jr. High _____ Sr. High _____
elementary school _____

Father's occupation _____ Father's Income _____

Mother's occupation _____ Mother's Income _____

I.Q. _____ If not known estimate below average (less than 90),
average (91-110), or above average (greater than 110).Has the child changed residence in the last year? Yes No ;
If yes, when _____Check which of the following the child was living with at the time of
the most recent offense:

Both natural parents _____

Natural father, stepmother due to
death _____Natural father, stepmother due to
divorce _____Natural mother, stepfather due to
death _____Natural mother, stepfather due to
divorce _____

Natural father only due to death _____

Natural father only due to
divorce _____

Natural mother only due to death _____

Natural mother only due to
divorce _____Natural father only due to
abandonment _____Natural mother only due to
abandonment _____If broken home, when did
this occur _____If parent child is living
with has remarried, when
did this occur _____

APPENDIX C (cont.)

Relatives or adopted _____

Other (specify) _____

Ages of brothers living at home are _____

Ages of brothers gone from home are _____

Ages of sisters living at home are _____

Ages of sisters gone from home are _____

Ethnic group: white _____ Negro _____ Spanish American _____

other (specify) _____

Please list below by type all of the official offenses which the child has committed. List in reverse order starting with the most recent offense. Place the date of the offense in the second column. If the offense was committed by a group, place a "G" in the third column. If committed alone, place an "I". If the victim was present, place a "P" in the fourth column. If not present place an "A".

	Date	G-I	P-A
1.	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____	_____
11.	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX D
EXPERIENCE SURVEY I ITEMS
AND RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY COEFFICIENTS

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Social Peer Instigators</u>		
.737	.305	How often during the past year have you gone with your crowd and done things just because they were doing them.
.145	.166	How frequently during the past year have you done things you would not have done except that other kids suggested them?
.790	.175	How many times during the past year has a friend tried to show you any dirty pictures or dirty movies?
.691	.320	On how many occasions during the past year have any of your friends offered you a drink?
.514	.312	How many times during the past year has any kid pushed you a little too far?

<u>Social Peer Facilitators</u>		
.686	.217	How often during the past year have any kids left personal belongings lying around?
.471	.100	On how many occasions during the past year have any of your close friends moved away to another city or to another part of the city?
.718	.247	How frequently during the past year have any of your friends taken chances and gotten away with it?
.630	.297	How many times during the past year have any of your friends told you they wouldn't rat on you if you took chances?
.729	.156	On how many occasions during the past year has a friend shown you how to get some new kind of "kick"?

CONTINUED

3 OF 6

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social Peer Permittors

.486	.309	On how many occasions during the past year have your friends watched any T.V. programs which bring out the rebel in young people?
.478	.321	How often during the past year have you heard any of your friends say that what they do with their lives is nobody else's business?
.365	.209	On how many occasions during the past year have any of your friends pointed out that young people should do just whatever they want to do?
.449	.188	How often during the past year have you heard any of your friends say that nobody gives a damn about them?
.296	.205	How frequently during the past year have you come across kids who just don't care what happens to other people?

Social Peer Diverters

.780	-.039	How many times during the past year has your "gang" planned any worthwhile activities?
.614	-.058	How many times during the past year have any of your friends asked you to help out on some work he was required to do?
.615	-.101	How frequently during the past year has any of your friends invited you to his home to meet his folks?
.484	-.076	On how many occasions during the past year have any of your friends suggested that you all join a club like the YMCA?
.759	.102	On how many occasions during the past year have your friends suggested forming a group for sports activities?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social Peer Prohibitors

.757	-.140	During the past year has any of your friends ever told you he had decided to become a policeman, lawyer, doctor, nurse or teacher?
.325	-.087	How often during the past year have any of your friends refused to take chances?
.719	-.182	How often during the past year have any of your friends asked you to go to church with them?
.666	-.103	How many times during the past year have any of your friends left a fun party because they had to get home on time?
.712	-.091	During the past year have any of your friends ever asked to meet your parents?

Social Family Instigators

.651	.102	How many times during the past year has someone in your family tried to get you high?
.739	.145	How frequently during the past year has a parent, relative or guardian made you very angry?
.446	.227	How many times during the past year has someone at home challenged or dared you to do something quite dangerous?
.589	.334	How often during the past year have you heard any of your parents or relatives or guardian say that smart ones get away with things?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Social Family Facilitators</u>		
.683	.357	How frequently during the past year have any of your parents, relatives or guardian made it easy for you to goof off?
.653	.214	How often during the past year has any parent, relative or guardian left money or liquor lying around the house?
.532	.245	On how many occasions during the past year has a parent, relative or guardian shown he will back you up against school or other authorities?
.371	.370	How often during the past year has a parent, relative or guardian let you have your own way?

<u>Social Family Permittors</u>		
.507	.089	How many times during the past year has a parent, relative or guardian expressed the opinion that you can't fight authority?
.515	.047	How many times during the past year have your parents, relatives or guardian been too busy to worry about you?
.682	.232	How many times during the past year have you been told at home that most people are out to get all they can?
.634	.087	How frequently during the past year has a parent, relative or guardian told you that what you do outside the home is your own business?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.Social Family Diverters

.568	-.047	On how many occasions during the past year has any member of your family asked you to help them make something new or fix something up?
.638	-.123	How frequently during the past year has anyone at home asked you to do routine chores around the house?
.828	-.163	How frequently during the past year has your family done enjoyable things together, such as a family outing?
.562	.010	How frequently during the past year has your family made it possible for you to do your homework?

Social Family Prohibitors

.609	-.033	How many times during the past year have your parents, relatives or guardian made it clear what they expect of you?
.809	-.063	How frequently during the past year have your parents, relatives or guardian been firm with you about keeping better hours?
.645	.083	How frequently during the past year have your parents, relatives or guardian asked where you go or where you've been?
.781	.091	How frequently during the past year have your parents, relatives or guardian asked you to tell them about your friends?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social School Instigators

- | | | |
|------|------|---|
| .629 | .237 | How frequently during the past year have any of the teachers in your school been unfair to you? |
| .438 | .264 | During the past year has any teacher in your school ever had it in for you? |
| .298 | .236 | How often during the past year has any kid in your school dared you to make trouble? |

Social School Facilitators

- | | | |
|------|------|---|
| .699 | .232 | How many times during the past year have kids in your school told you they wouldn't rat on you if you were to take chances? |
| .729 | .216 | How frequently during the past year have kids in your school left their books or other personal things lying around? |
| .757 | .166 | How many times during the past year have any kids in your school shown you how to get some new kind of "kick"? |

Social School Permittors

- | | | |
|------|------|---|
| .641 | .334 | How many times during the past year has a teacher failed to notice kids in your class taking chances? |
| .781 | .228 | How many times during the past year have the kids in your school said that teachers just don't give a damn about anything? |
| .407 | .138 | During the past year have you ever heard a teacher express an opinion that whatever happens outside of his class is none of his business? |

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Social School Diverters

.379	.021	How often during the past year has the school arranged any after-hours activities that are fun?
.680	-.110	How frequently during the past year has a teacher asked you to help out?
.596	-.037	How many times during the past year has the school offered or told you about opportunities to earn some money?

Social School Prohibitors

.583	.104	How many times during the past year have teachers trusted you to do the right thing?
.505	.071	How frequently during the past year have the teachers in your school been firm with the students?
.520	-.031	On how many occasions during the past year has any teacher won your respect or admiration?

Social City Instigators

.690	.184	How frequently during the past year have newspapers in your town printed any crime stories that were really interesting?
.737	.272	How many times during the past year has anybody in town tried to tempt you with easy money or with a new "kick"?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

<u>Rel.</u>	<u>Val.</u>	
<u>Social City Facilitators</u>		
.552	.141	During the past year have you lived in or had occasion to visit a pretty "rough" neighborhood?
.605	.103	How often during the past year have there been any crimes committed on your street?

<u>Social City Permitters</u>		
.401	.317	How frequently during the past year have you met people in your city who have the attitude: "Why should I worry about it? It's none of my business"?
.642	.259	How frequently during the past year have you heard any people in your city say they think most cops are no good?

<u>Social City Diverters</u>		
.501	.093	How often during the past year has your city organized some good recreation programs for young people?
.721	-.019	How many times during the past year have there been any good job opportunities for people like you in your city?

<u>Social City Prohibitors</u>		
.639	.111	How often during the past year have you read stories in the newspapers about people being sent to prison as punishment for their crimes?
.578	-.097	How often during the past year have the police done a good job in your city?

Social City Facilitators

.552	.141	During the past year have you lived in or had occasion to visit a pretty "rough" neighborhood?
------	------	--

.605	.103	How often during the past year have there been any crimes committed on your street?
------	------	---

Social City Permitters

.401	.317	How frequently during the past year have you met people in your city who have the attitude: "Why should I worry about it? It's none of my business"?
------	------	--

.642	.259	How frequently during the past year have you heard any people in your city say they think most cops are no good?
------	------	--

Social City Diverters

.501	.093	How often during the past year has your city organized some good recreation programs for young people?
------	------	--

.721	-.019	How many times during the past year have there been any good job opportunities for people like you in your city?
------	-------	--

Social City Prohibitors

.639	.111	How often during the past year have you read stories in the newspapers about people being sent to prison as punishment for their crimes?
------	------	--

.578	-.097	How often during the past year have the police done a good job in your city?
------	-------	--

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual Peer Instigators

.768	.248	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to do almost <u>anything</u> to make the others respect you?
.679	.409	How many times during the past year have you been jealous of what some of your friends have?
.708	.146	How many times during the past year have you wanted to tell your friends about some exciting thing you have done?
.704	.301	How often during the past year have you wished that more of the kids liked you?
.645	.402	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to really get even with some kid?

Individual Peer Facilitators

.662	.382	How often during the past year have you shown that nobody had better get in your way?
.698	.350	On how many occasions during the past year have you shown that you can do things without people noticing?
.609	.402	On how many occasions during the past year have you and your friends felt that you could get away with almost anything?
.765	.196	On how many occasions during the past year have you found personal belongings that other kids have left lying around?
.390	.263	On how many occasions during the past year have you and your friends put things in some secret place you had found?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual Peer Permitters

.519	.204	How many times during the past year have you made mistakes in choosing your friends?
.580	.316	How frequently during the past year have you taken chances for no reason at all?
.743	.450	How frequently during the past year have there been times when you went along with your friends just because you had nothing better to do?
.637	.352	How frequently during the past year have you thought that you were smart enough to get away with things that most kids could not get away with?
.703	.346	How frequently during the past year have you been so mad at some kid that you couldn't control yourself?

Individual Peer Diverters

.770	-.148	On how many occasions during the past year have you been able to get your friends to join with you in some club activities, like the Boy Scouts, YMCA, church groups, etc.?
.769	-.047	How many times during the past year have you and your friends been really busy making or doing something constructive together?
.595	-.031	On how many occasions during the past year have you enjoyed time spent with your friends in worthwhile activities?
.782	.043	On how many occasions during the past year have you been so wrapped up in a book or hobby that you hated to leave when your friends called for you?
.677	-.063	How many times during the past year have you offered to help a friend on some work that he was required to do?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual Peer Prohibitors

.705	-.082	How many times during the past year have you thought that you and your friends ought to plan for your future as adults?
.540	.052	How many times during the past year have you thought that friends ought to work together to help others?
.723	-.017	How many times during the past year have you tried to stop a fight?
.660	-.034	How many times during the past year have you planned things that you and your friends could do which would be helpful to the community?
.587	-.056	How often during the past year have you thought about how you can help any of your friends grow up?

Individual Family Instigators

.618	.251	On how many occasions during the past year have you wanted to get away from home?
.722	.136	How frequently during the past year have you felt like smashing things up at home?
.632	.378	How many times during the past year have you wanted to do almost anything to break the monotony at home?
.717	.128	How frequently during the past year have you felt that you aren't worth much to anyone at home?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual Family Facilitators

- | | | |
|------|------|---|
| .803 | .301 | How many times during the past year have you felt crowded at home, cramped, closed in: like you need more space of your very own? |
| .695 | .213 | How often during the past year have you been clever enough to lie to your parents, relatives or guardian and get away with it? |
| .699 | .178 | How often during the past year have you been able to play one parent, relative or guardian against another or against an older brother or sister? |
| .602 | .208 | How often during the past year have you been able to stay cool and keep a straight face under pressure at home? |

Individual Family Permittors

- | | | |
|------|------|--|
| .749 | .176 | How frequently during the past year have you wanted to tell your parents, relatives or guardians to butt out of your business? |
| .643 | .219 | How frequently during the past year have you been just plain "tee'd-off" with things at home? |
| .710 | .235 | How frequently during the past year have there been times at home when you felt so mad you couldn't control yourself? |
| .636 | .376 | How frequently during the past year have there been times at home when you had a lot of spare time to kill? |

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel.	Val.	
<u>Individual Family Diverters</u>		
.683	-.177	How many times during the past year have you enjoyed being at home?
.740	-.161	How many times during the past year have you been able to find enough work to keep yourself busy around the house?
.819	-.148	How many times during the past year have you offered to do additional chores at home?
.635	-.156	How many times during the past year at home, have you found good ways of making use of your spare time?

<u>Individual Family Prohibitors</u>		
.703	.037	How often during the past year have you gotten pleasure from doing a good job on some work that was required at home?
.844	-.026	On how many occasions during the past year have you really been able to talk about your problems with your parents, relatives or guardian?
.851	-.226	On how many occasions during the past year have you wanted to go to church with your family?
.513	-.119	How often during the past year have you wanted to tell your family where you're going and who with?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel.	Val.	
<u>Individual School Instigators</u>		
.616	.219	How many times during the past year have you been so mad at teachers in school that you just had to do something?
.542	.254	How often during the past year have you wanted to prove to the other kids at school that you are really somebody?
.623	.170	During the past year have you ever felt that, despite all your efforts, you'd never get anywhere in school?

<u>Individual School Facilitators</u>		
.808	.352	During the past year how often have you ditched school and gotten away with it?
.607	.158	How often during the past year have you found places in school where you could hide out for long periods of time during the day?
.418	.382	How frequently during the past year have you been able to outsmart the teacher or other authority in your school even under pressure?

<u>Individual School Permitters</u>		
.660	.257	How many times during the past year have you thought that some teachers are not so smart?
.742	.408	During the past year have you ever felt that school was a waste of time?
.589	.218	How frequently during the past year have you argued with a teacher or someone like that just to make him look bad?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual School Diverters

.732	-.097	During the past year were there days when once you'd gotten to school you were glad to be there?
.569	-.116	How many times during the past year have you become really interested in finding out more about something a teacher said in school?
.574	-.129	How many times during the past year have you enjoyed doing a good job on some work that was required at school?

Individual School Prohibitors

.664	-.044	How often during the past year have you thought about what you can do for your school?
.748	.042	How often during the past year have you tried to win the approval of a teacher?
.709	-.166	How often during the past year have you seen school as a means of improving yourself?

Individual City Instigators

.709	.272	How frequently during the past year have you felt like smashing things up?
.765	.413	How frequently during the past year have you wanted to be very important?

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Rel. Val.

Individual City Facilitators

.398	.317	On how many occasions during the past year have you found any new short cuts to get home fast without being seen?
.376	.186	How often during the past year have you been able to find places in your city where you could have a hide-out?

Individual City Permittors

.688	.460	How many times during the past year have you thought of yourself as being cool enough to outsmart most other people in your city?
.629	.414	How often during the past year have you thought something like this: "Who cares! I've got nothing to lose!"?

Individual City Diverters

.657	.152	How often during the past year have you used the city facilities to play tennis or basketball or some other active game like that just because you enjoy it?
.606	-.067	During the past year have you ever taken part in an educational program outside of school, such as tutoring help, extension courses, etc.?

Individual City Prohibitors

.512	-.073	How many times during the past year have you done things that would help your city?
.719	-.056	During the past year have any of the crimes you hear about in your city made you feel disgusted?

APPENDIX E: DETAILED TABLES FOR ANALYSES

TABLE 10

Means and Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Stable
and Unstable Delinquents for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>					
<u>Stable (N=112)</u>			<u>Unstable (N=22)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	2.97	1.45	SPI	2.95	1.61
SPF	2.71	1.46	SPF	2.84	1.54
SPPe	2.91	1.46	SPPe	3.14	1.88
SPD	2.16	1.29	SPD	2.44	1.49
SPPr	2.36	1.36	SPPr	2.34	1.84
IPI	2.56	1.57	IPI	2.35	1.50
IPF	2.13	1.23	IPF	2.35	1.68
IPPe	2.47	1.30	IPPe	2.04	1.43
IPD	2.48	1.48	IPD	2.23	1.31
IPPr	2.03	1.29	IPPr	2.27	1.74

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.93$; $F_{10/123} = 0.93$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>					
<u>Stable (N=112)</u>			<u>Unstable (N=22)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.52	0.91	SFI	1.92	1.27
SFF	1.98	1.22	SFF	2.13	1.85
SFPe	1.94	1.24	SFPe	2.21	1.84
SFD	4.27	1.59	SFD	4.20	1.33
SFPr	4.45	1.69	SFPr	4.50	1.70
IFI	2.32	1.49	IFI	2.58	1.65
IFF	2.44	1.32	IFF	2.78	1.43
IFPe	2.99	1.67	IFPe	3.47	1.81
IFD	3.26	1.64	IFD	2.64	1.45
IFPr	2.85	1.66	IFPr	2.76	1.11

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.95$; $F_{10/123} = 0.66$; $p > .05$

TABLE 10 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>					
<u>Stable (N=112)</u>			<u>Unstable (N=22)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.36	1.67	SSI	2.43	1.42
SSF	2.94	1.66	SSF	2.51	1.61
SSPe	2.88	1.65	SSPe	2.75	1.51
SSD	2.35	1.55	SSD	1.89	1.30
SSPr	2.90	1.76	SSPr	3.06	1.27
ISI	2.11	1.44	ISI	2.03	1.42
ISF	1.69	1.25	ISF	1.90	1.42
ISPe	2.34	1.44	ISPe	2.01	1.56
ISD	2.79	1.72	ISD	2.40	1.42
ISPr	2.52	1.61	ISPr	2.51	1.40

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.92$; $F_{10/123} = 1.01$; $p > .05$

<u>City Segment</u>					
<u>Stable (N=112)</u>			<u>Unstable (N=22)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	2.25	1.77	SCI	2.21	1.23
SCF	2.14	1.54	SCF	2.54	1.67
SCPe	2.93	1.98	SCPe	2.93	1.64
SCD	2.09	1.64	SCD	1.87	1.28
SCPr	3.45	2.18	SCPr	3.36	1.76
ICI	2.34	1.38	ICI	2.43	1.60
ICF	1.76	1.56	ICF	2.02	1.64
ICPe	1.65	1.21	ICPe	1.77	1.38
ICD	1.90	1.58	ICD	1.25	1.04
ICPr	2.16	1.52	ICPr	2.08	1.17

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.95$; $F_{10/123} = 0.68$; $p > .05$

TABLE 11

Means and Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Delinquents Coming from Families Composed of Both Natural Parents, One Step-parent and One Natural Parent, or One Parent for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>								
<u>Natural Parents (N=96)</u>			<u>Step-parent (N=22)</u>			<u>One Parent (N=35)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	3.08	1.54	SPI	3.19	1.78	SPI	2.93	1.29
SPF	2.20	1.55	SPF	2.69	1.78	SPF	2.56	1.40
SPPe	3.03	1.49	SPPe	2.88	1.71	SPPe	2.93	1.67
SPD	2.18	1.30	SPD	2.15	1.18	SPD	2.28	1.29
SPPr	2.36	1.44	SPPr	2.17	1.46	SPPr	2.47	1.36
IPI	2.59	1.54	IPI	2.34	1.38	IPI	2.35	1.73
IPF	2.24	1.24	IPF	2.44	1.95	IPF	2.22	1.07
IPPe	2.56	1.32	IPPe	2.08	1.43	IPPe	2.58	1.33
IPD	2.44	1.43	IPD	2.07	1.21	IPD	2.35	1.32
IPPr	2.03	1.39	IPPr	2.01	1.12	IPPr	1.89	1.32

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.90$; $F_{20/282} = 0.79$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>								
<u>Natural Parents (N=96)</u>			<u>Step-parent (N=22)</u>			<u>One Parent (N=35)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.53	0.89	SFI	1.69	1.28	SFI	1.62	1.12
SFF	1.97	1.13	SFF	2.50	1.89	SFF	2.12	1.36
SFFe	2.04	1.27	SFFe	2.03	1.88	SFFe	2.04	1.32
SFD	4.30	1.45	SFD	4.37	1.44	SFD	4.10	1.73
SFPr	4.63	1.68	SFPr	4.10	1.49	SFPr	4.07	1.72
IFI	2.47	1.56	IFI	2.02	1.60	IFI	2.30	1.42
IFF	2.62	1.36	IFF	2.56	1.59	IFF	2.57	1.21
IFPe	3.06	1.69	IFPe	3.35	1.95	IFPe	3.25	1.82
IFD	3.15	1.60	IFD	3.06	1.23	IFD	3.12	1.73
IFPr	2.70	1.50	IFPr	2.60	1.17	IFPr	3.03	1.96

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.87$; $F_{20/282} = 1.01$; $p > .05$

TABLE 11 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>								
<u>Natural Parents</u> (N=96)			<u>Step-parent</u> (N=22)			<u>One Parent</u> (N=35)		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.31	1.64	SSI	2.20	1.49	SSI	2.66	1.80
SSF	3.09	1.81	SSF	2.70	1.53	SSF	2.72	1.65
SSPe	3.11	1.78	SSPe	2.49	1.09	SSPe	2.80	1.60
SSD	2.42	1.51	SSD	2.16	1.12	SSD	2.05	1.54
SSPr	2.95	1.74	SSPr	3.23	1.54	SSPr	2.74	1.68
ISI	2.04	1.44	ISI	2.17	1.83	ISI	2.18	1.47
ISF	1.79	1.28	ISF	1.67	1.47	ISF	1.99	1.22
ISPe	2.40	1.48	ISPe	2.18	1.45	ISPe	2.62	1.60
ISD	2.67	1.78	ISD	2.70	1.40	ISD	2.35	1.49
ISPr	2.44	1.68	ISPr	2.06	1.07	ISPr	2.50	1.40

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.84$; $F_{20/282} = 1.30$; $p > .05$

<u>City Segment</u>								
<u>Natural Parents</u> (N=96)			<u>Step-parent</u> (N=22)			<u>One Parent</u> (N=35)		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	2.42	1.87	SCI	1.75	1.36	SCI	2.16	1.73
SCF	2.21	1.53	SCF	2.22	1.60	SCF	2.69	1.99
SCPe	3.22	2.04	SCPe	2.49	1.74	SCPe	2.87	1.95
SCD	2.13	1.55	SCD	1.88	1.77	SCD	1.81	1.16
SCPr	3.49	2.16	SCPr	3.33	2.11	SCPr	2.89	1.77
ICI	2.54	1.54	ICI	1.79	1.24	ICI	2.67	1.27
ICF	1.71	1.50	ICF	1.66	1.68	ICF	2.36	1.40
ICPe	1.78	1.45	ICPe	1.73	1.18	ICPe	1.90	1.29
ICD	1.86	1.47	ICD	1.64	1.36	ICD	1.85	1.98
ICPr	2.10	1.50	ICPr	2.02	1.22	ICPr	2.16	1.62

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.86$; $F_{20/282} = 1.07$; $p > .05$

TABLE 12

Means, Standard Deviations, and F-ratios of Males and Females
for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>					
<u>Males (N=125)</u>			<u>Females (N=36)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	3.03	1.46	SPI	3.02	1.75
SPF	2.70	1.45	SPF	3.10	1.83
SPPe	2.88	1.49	SPPe	3.33	1.92
SPD	2.23	1.33	SPD	2.11	1.16
SPPr	2.25	1.42	SPPr	2.76	1.44
IPI	2.49	1.52	IPI	2.55	1.70
IPF	2.04	1.27	IPF	2.62	1.46
IPPe	2.39	1.27	IPPe	2.60	1.56
IPD	2.35	1.38	IPD	2.42	1.40
IPPr	1.96	1.31	IPPr	2.08	1.44

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.91$; $F_{10/150} = 1.50$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>					
<u>Males (N=125)</u>			<u>Females (N=36)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.48	0.97	SFI	1.85	1.09
SFF	2.02	1.32	SFF	1.99	1.38
SFPe	2.00	1.39	SFPe	2.03	1.24
SFD	4.28	1.48	SFD	4.18	1.70
SFPr	4.43	1.67	SFPr	4.41	1.81
IFI	2.23	1.42	IFI	2.84	1.87
IFF	2.41	1.32	IFF	2.95	1.42
IFPe	2.80	1.58	IFPe	4.19	1.92
IFD	3.11	1.51	IFD	3.17	1.96
IFPr	2.74	1.57	IFPr	2.80	1.75

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.84$; $F_{10/150} = 2.84$; $p < .01$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.96$; $F_{5/155} = 1.11$; $p > .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.89$; $F_{5/155} = 4.28$; $p < .01$

TABLE 12 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>					
<u>Males (N=125)</u>			<u>Females (N=36)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.41	1.70	SSI	1.97	1.41
SSF	2.91	1.73	SSF	2.90	1.73
SSPe	2.91	1.69	SSPe	2.84	1.67
SSD	2.28	1.53	SSD	2.28	1.20
SSPr	3.04	1.67	SSPr	2.77	1.79
ISI	1.97	1.38	ISI	2.51	1.81
ISF	1.64	1.17	ISF	2.22	1.54
ISPe	2.26	1.51	ISPe	2.71	1.47
ISD	2.68	1.69	ISD	2.36	1.52
ISPr	2.52	1.57	ISPr	2.10	1.38

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.87$; $F_{10/150} = 2.16$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.97$; $F_{5/155} = 0.77$; $p > .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.93$; $F_{5/155} = 2.32$; $p < .05$

<u>City Segment</u>					
<u>Males (N=125)</u>			<u>Females (N=36)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	2.32	1.74	SCI	2.09	1.79
SCF	2.18	1.61	SCF	2.54	1.78
SCPe	3.14	1.95	SCPe	2.53	1.92
SCD	2.07	1.50	SCD	1.87	1.64
SCPr	3.53	2.12	SCPr	3.01	2.05
ICI	2.41	1.44	ICI	2.51	1.59
ICF	1.72	1.59	ICF	1.96	1.29
ICPe	1.62	1.29	ICPe	2.21	1.54
ICD	2.00	1.62	ICD	1.20	1.24
ICPr	2.08	1.50	ICPr	2.09	1.36

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.85$; $F_{10/150} = 2.64$; $p < .01$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.96$; $F_{5/155} = 1.36$; $p > .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.91$; $F_{5/155} = 3.17$; $p < .05$

TABLE 13

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and Sex on All Individual Family Factors

Factor		IFI	IFF	IFPe	IFD	IFPr
Delinq/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.23	2.41	2.80	3.11	2.74
	S.D.	1.42	1.32	1.58	1.51	1.57
Non-delinq/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.10	1.98	2.05	2.68	3.80
	S.D.	1.47	1.42	1.15	1.54	1.68
Delinq/Female	$\bar{X}$	2.84	2.97	4.19	3.17	2.80
	S.D.	1.87	1.42	1.92	1.96	1.75
Non-delinq/Female	$\bar{X}$	2.13	1.95	2.24	3.12	4.42
	S.D.	1.28	1.52	1.37	1.89	1.71
R^2_{FM}		.028	.035	.053	.098	.116
R^2_{RM}		.000	.003	.028	.044	.058
$F_{2/483}$		7.00	8.00	6.00	14.21	15.26
p		p<.01	p<.001	p<.01	p<.001	p<.001

TABLE 14

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and Sex on All Individual School Factors

Factor		ISI	ISF	ISPe	ISD	ISPr
Delinq/Male	$\bar{X}$	1.97	1.64	2.26	2.68	2.52
	S.D.	1.38	1.17	1.51	1.69	1.57
Non-delinq/Male	$\bar{X}$	3.32	1.80	1.70	2.14	2.65
	S.D.	1.54	1.33	1.39	1.38	1.46
Delinq/Female	$\bar{X}$	2.51	2.22	2.71	2.36	2.10
	S.D.	1.81	1.54	1.47	1.52	1.38
Non-delinq/Female	$\bar{X}$	4.07	1.57	1.27	2.28	3.00
	S.D.	1.55	1.36	1.11	1.49	1.42
R^2_{FM}		.035	.047	.011	.018	.057
R^2_{RM}		.002	.009	.003	.005	.012
$F_{2/453}$		8.00	9.50	2.00	3.00	11.00
p		p<.001	p<.001	p>.05	p>.05	p<.001

TABLE 15

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and Sex on All Individual City Factors

Factor		ICI	ICF	ICPe	ICD	ICPr
Delinq/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.41	1.72	1.62	2.00	2.08
	S.D.	1.44	1.59	1.29	1.62	1.50
Non-delinq/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.96	2.41	2.02	1.44	3.09
	S.D.	1.61	1.52	1.22	1.15	1.28
Delinq/Female	$\bar{X}$	2.51	1.96	2.21	1.20	2.09
	S.D.	1.59	1.29	1.54	1.24	1.36
Non-delinq/Female	$\bar{X}$	3.32	2.44	1.65	1.39	2.54
	S.D.	1.70	1.58	1.05	1.37	1.40
R^2_{FM}		.002	.015	.029	.027	.038
R^2_{RM}		.000	.004	.000	.001	.014
$F_{2/453}$		0.55	2.50	7.30	6.40	6.00
p		p>.05	p>.05	p<.001	p<.01	p<.01

TABLE 16
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Male and Female
Delinquents on Individual Family Factors

Factor		IFI	IFF	IFPe	IFD	IFPr
Male	$\bar{X}$	2.23	2.41	2.80	3.11	2.74
	S.D.	1.42	1.32	1.58	1.51	1.57
Female	$\bar{X}$	2.84	2.97	4.19	3.17	2.80
	S.D.	1.87	1.42	1.92	1.96	1.75
R^2_{FM}		.023	.029	.110	.0003	.0003
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/159}$		3.83	4.83	20.00	0.50	0.50
p		p>.05	p<.05	p<.001	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 17

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Male and Female
Deinquents on Individual School Factors

Factor		ISI	ISF	ISPr
Male	$\bar{X}$	1.97	1.64	2.52
	S.D.	1.38	1.17	1.57
Female	$\bar{X}$	2.51	2.22	2.10
	S.D.	1.81	1.54	1.38
R^2_{FM}		.022	.036	.013
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/159}$		3.66	6.00	2.11
p		p>.05	p<.05	p>.05

TABLE 18

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Male and Female
Delinquents on Individual City Factors

Factor		ICPe	ICD	ICPr
Male	$\bar{X}$	1.62	2.00	2.08
	S.D.	1.29	1.62	1.50
Female	$\bar{X}$	2.21	1.20	2.09
	S.D.	1.54	1.24	1.36
R_{FM}^2		.032	.045	.000
R_{RM}^2		.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/159}$		5.23	7.50	0.00
p		p<.05	p<.01	p>.05

TABLE 19
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Sex and Age Groups of Delinquents

Factor		IFF	IFPe	ISF	ICPe	ICD
Male/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.34	2.76	1.45	1.77	1.98
	S.D.	1.46	1.55	1.17	1.39	1.75
Female/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.82	4.03	1.77	2.23	0.95
	S.D.	1.19	1.89	1.14	1.39	0.98
Male/Old	$\bar{X}$	2.50	2.83	1.85	1.37	2.03
	S.D.	1.14	1.59	1.13	1.13	1.44
Female/Old	$\bar{X}$	3.13	4.34	2.67	2.19	1.46
	S.D.	1.56	1.88	1.71	1.64	1.38
R^2_{FM}		.035	.112	.082	.042	.051
R^2_{RM}		.006	.002	.041	.007	.002
$F_{2/157}$		2.41	9.16	3.23	2.91	4.08
p		p>.05	p<.001	p<.05	p>.05	p<.05

TABLE 20
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Sex and Socio-economic Groups of Delinquents

Factor		IFF	IFPe	ISF	ICPe	ICD
Male/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.18	2.45	1.49	1.58	2.15
	S.D.	1.17	1.45	1.00	1.26	1.89
Female/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.12	2.97	1.51	1.72	0.85
	S.D.	1.02	1.88	0.67	1.34	1.00
Male/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.65	3.04	1.73	1.73	2.04
	S.D.	1.38	1.67	1.24	1.34	1.32
Female/Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.22	4.84	2.18	2.48	1.28
	S.D.	1.48	1.80	1.35	1.74	1.03
Male/High	$\bar{X}$	2.57	2.95	1.62	1.43	1.89
	S.D.	1.47	1.53	1.29	0.85	1.62
Female/High	$\bar{X}$	3.29	4.16	2.95	2.05	1.60
	S.D.	1.20	1.84	2.12	1.14	1.74
R^2_{FM}		.072	.163	.077	.048	.054
R^2_{RM}		.047	.060	.024	.014	.001
$F_{3/139}$		1.19	5.07	2.83	1.64	2.81
p		p>.05	p<.01	p<.05	p>.05	p<.05

TABLE 21

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Sex and IQ Groups of Delinquents

Factor		IFF	IFPe	ISF	ICPe	ICD
Male/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.75	1.81	1.16	0.94	1.37
	S.D.	1.16	1.21	0.96	1.00	1.28
Female/Low	$\bar{X}$	3.04	4.41	1.36	2.79	0.99
	S.D.	1.50	1.53	0.90	1.70	0.88
Male/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.58	2.96	1.75	1.96	2.07
	S.D.	1.45	1.65	1.25	1.28	1.58
Female/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.46	3.51	2.42	1.73	1.34
	S.D.	1.24	2.04	1.72	1.20	1.48
Male/High	$\bar{X}$	2.46	2.92	1.61	1.27	2.30
	S.D.	0.92	1.22	0.96	1.27	1.81
Female/High	$\bar{X}$	3.68	4.96	2.86	2.30	1.24
	S.D.	1.16	1.66	1.32	1.50	1.08
R^2_{FM}		.058	.135	.089	.098	.081
R^2_{RM}		.009	.013	.013	.025	.012
$F_{3/149}$		2.66	6.66	4.16	4.00	3.83
p		p>.05	p<.01	p<.01	p<.01	p<.05

TABLE 22
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Sex and Stability Groups of Delinquents

Factor		IFF	IFPe	ISF	ICPe	ICD
Male/Stab.	$\bar{X}$	2.39	2.79	1.59	1.56	2.07
	S.D.	1.34	1.61	1.19	1.21	1.59
Female/Stab.	$\bar{X}$	2.61	3.65	2.01	1.92	1.33
	S.D.	1.23	1.68	1.35	1.12	1.35
Male/Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	2.71	3.07	1.71	1.69	2.31
	S.D.	1.52	1.53	1.12	1.31	1.46
Female/Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	3.12	5.25	2.76	2.15	0.97
	S.D.	0.43	1.66	1.98	1.44	0.72
R^2_{FM}		.012	.080	.057	.015	.076
R^2_{RM}		.009	.011	.004	.001	.025
$F_{2/130}$		0.19	4.79	3.63	0.95	3.59
p		p>.05	p<.01	p<.05	p>.05	p<.05

TABLE 23
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Sex and Family Composition Groups of Delinquents

Factor		IFF	IFPe	ISF	ICPe	ICD
Male/Nat. Parents	$\bar{X}$	2.49	2.75	1.66	1.61	2.01
	S.D.	1.31	1.53	1.19	1.30	1.41
Female/Nat. Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.00	4.23	2.25	2.27	0.96
	S.D.	1.36	1.72	1.49	1.61	0.98
Male/Step-Parents	$\bar{X}$	2.33	2.69	1.56	1.27	2.59
	S.D.	1.52	1.62	1.10	0.87	1.56
Female/Step-Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.16	5.10	1.97	2.95	1.78
	S.D.	1.47	1.46	2.06	1.53	1.69
Male/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.34	2.93	1.81	1.92	2.10
	S.D.	1.13	1.60	1.16	1.16	2.09
Female/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	3.23	4.19	2.52	1.87	1.11
	S.D.	1.13	1.97	1.18	1.53	1.16
R^2_{FM}		.045	.158	.067	.074	.086
R^2_{RM}		.000	.009	.007	.005	.021
$F_{3/151}$		2.50	8.33	3.27	3.83	3.66
p		p>.05	p<.001	p<.05	p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 24
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Sex and Ethnic Groups of Delinquents

Factor		IFF	IFPe	ISF	ICPe	ICD
Male/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.44	2.89	1.66	1.61	2.01
	S.D.	1.34	1.65	1.19	1.26	1.51
Female/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	3.07	4.48	2.41	2.23	1.33
	S.D.	1.49	1.94	1.65	1.63	1.24
Male/S-A	$\bar{X}$	2.28	2.33	1.53	1.70	1.99
	S.D.	1.23	1.01	1.02	1.38	2.06
Female/S-A	$\bar{X}$	2.64	3.16	1.57	2.15	0.76
	S.D.	0.92	1.26	0.62	1.05	1.05
R^2_{FM}		.035	.143	.054	.033	.050
R^2_{RM}		.003	.020	.007	.000	.003
$F_{2/157}$		2.66	10.16	4.00	2.75	3.83
p		p>.05	p<.001	p<.05	p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 25
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Sex and Multiple-First Offense Groups

Factor		IFF	IFPe	ISF	ICPe	ICD
Male/Mult.	$\bar{X}$	2.21	3.01	1.65	1.58	2.39
	S.D.	1.83	1.58	1.24	1.15	1.73
Female/Mult.	$\bar{X}$	2.67	5.22	3.13	2.95	1.60
	S.D.	1.72	1.70	1.87	1.85	1.49
Male/First	$\bar{X}$	1.62	2.62	1.63	1.65	1.69
	S.D.	1.43	1.55	1.11	1.38	1.44
Female/First	$\bar{X}$	2.01	3.67	1.76	1.84	1.00
	S.D.	1.61	1.77	1.05	1.16	1.01
R^2_{FH}		.021	.155	.078	.021	.304
R^2_{RM}		.001	.020	.008	.001	.053
$F_{2/157}$		1.58	12.73	5.75	1.58	28.10
p		p>.05	p<.001	p<.01	p>.05	p<.001

TABLE 26

Means, Standard Deviations, and F-ratios of Young
and Old Delinquents for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>					
<u>Old (N=77)</u>			<u>Young (N=84)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	3.39	1.48	SPI	2.69	1.49
SPF	3.11	1.60	SPF	2.50	1.43
SPPe	3.03	1.42	SPPe	2.93	1.75
SPD	2.13	1.24	SPD	2.27	1.34
SPPr	2.28	1.41	SPPr	2.44	1.46
IPI	2.33	1.49	IPI	2.62	1.61
IPF	2.24	1.39	IPF	2.11	1.28
IPPe	2.45	1.37	IPPe	2.43	1.32
IPD	2.37	1.35	IPD	2.36	1.42
IPPr	1.97	1.17	IPPr	2.00	1.47

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.86$; $F_{10/150} = 2.34$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.91$; $F_{5/155} = 2.89$; $p < .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.98$; $F_{5/155} = 0.60$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>					
<u>Old (N=77)</u>			<u>Young (N=84)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.49	0.85	SFI	1.63	1.13
SFF	2.19	1.25	SFF	1.85	1.39
SFPe	2.07	1.29	SFPe	1.96	1.42
SFD	4.31	1.54	SFD	4.20	1.52
SFPr	4.46	1.57	SFPr	4.40	1.82
IFI	2.53	1.68	IFI	2.19	1.41
IFF	2.64	1.27	IFF	2.45	1.44
IFPe	3.18	1.79	IFPe	3.04	1.73
IFD	3.21	1.49	IFD	3.04	1.73
IFPr	2.66	1.36	IFPr	2.84	1.80

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.93$; $F_{10/150} = 1.19$; $p > .05$

TABLE 26 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>					
<u>Old (N=77)</u>			<u>Young (N=84)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.24	1.60	SSI	2.38	1.69
SSF	3.10	1.74	SSF	2.73	1.70
SSPe	2.84	1.55	SSPe	2.93	1.80
SSD	2.43	1.49	SSD	2.14	1.43
SSPr	2.99	1.50	SSPr	2.98	1.86
ISI	2.01	1.55	ISI	2.17	1.46
ISF	2.01	1.33	ISF	1.54	1.20
ISPe	2.20	1.37	ISPe	2.51	1.61
ISD	2.63	1.62	ISD	2.59	1.69
ISPr	2.46	1.33	ISPr	2.40	1.71

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.88$; $F_{10/150} = 2.05$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.96$; $F_{5/155} = 1.18$; $p > .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.92$; $F_{5/155} = 2.56$; $p < .05$

<u>City Segment</u>					
<u>Old (N=77)</u>			<u>Young (N=84)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	2.44	1.77	SCI	2.12	1.72
SCF	2.26	1.56	SCF	2.26	1.74
SCPe	2.98	1.92	SCPe	3.03	2.00
SCD	1.90	1.41	SCD	2.15	1.63
SCPr	3.79	2.10	SCPr	3.06	2.06
ICI	2.43	1.54	ICI	2.43	1.41
ICF	1.52	1.38	ICF	2.00	1.62
ICPe	1.61	1.30	ICPe	1.89	1.41
ICD	1.89	1.47	ICD	1.77	1.68
ICPr	2.10	1.45	ICPr	2.07	1.49

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.90$; $F_{10/150} = 1.71$; $p > .05$

TABLE 27

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and Age on All Social Peer Factors

Factor		SPI	SPF	SPPe	SPD	SPPr
Delinq/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.69	2.50	2.93	2.27	2.44
	S.D.	1.49	1.43	1.75	1.34	1.46
Non-delinq/Young	$\bar{X}$	1.80	2.58	2.43	2.40	2.50
	S.D.	1.32	1.39	1.46	1.26	1.50
Delinq/Old	$\bar{X}$	3.39	3.11	3.03	2.13	2.28
	S.D.	1.48	1.60	1.42	1.24	1.41
Non-delinq/Old	$\bar{X}$	2.62	2.64	3.30	2.71	2.84
	S.D.	1.61	1.49	1.60	1.20	1.45
R^2_{FM}		.101	.024	.032	.024	.017
R^2_{RM}		.084	.011	.032	.001	.001
$F_{2/453}$		4.25	3.25	0.00	5.50	4.00
p		p<.05	p<.05	p>.05	p<.01	p<.05

TABLE 28

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and Age on All Individual School Factors

Factor		ISI	ISF	ISPe	ISD	ISPr
Delinq/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.17	1.54	2.51	2.59	2.40
	S.D.	1.46	1.20	1.61	1.69	1.71
Non-delinq/Young	$\bar{X}$	3.67	1.62	1.29	2.22	2.78
	S.D.	1.56	1.33	1.07	1.39	1.36
Delinq/Old	$\bar{X}$	2.01	2.01	2.20	2.63	2.46
	S.D.	1.55	1.33	1.37	1.62	1.33
Non-delinq/Old	$\bar{X}$	3.87	1.78	1.90	2.19	2.99
	S.D.	1.67	1.37	1.56	1.56	1.64
R^2_{FM}		.020	.043	.008	.009	.066
R^2_{RM}		.001	.043	.001	.001	.003
$F_{2/453}$		4.50	0.00	1.75	2.00	15.50
p		p<.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p<.001

TABLE 29
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Young and Old Delinquents on Social Peer Factors

Factor		SPI	SPF	SPD	SPPr
Young	$\bar{X}$	2.69	2.50	2.27	2.44
	S.D.	1.49	1.43	1.34	1.46
Old	$\bar{X}$	3.39	3.11	2.13	2.28
	S.D.	1.48	1.60	1.24	1.41
R^2_{FM}		.057	.042	.002	.002
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000
F _{1/159}		9.50	7.33	0.33	0.33
p		p<.01	p<.01	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 30
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Young and Old Delinquents on Individual School Factors

Factor		ISI	ISPr
Young	$\bar{X}$	2.17	2.40
	S.D.	1.46	1.71
Old	$\bar{X}$	2.01	2.46
	S.D.	1.55	1.33
R^2_{FM}		.004	.000
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000
$F_{1/159}$		0.66	0.00
p		p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 31
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Age and Sex Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPI	SPF
Young/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.69	2.44
	S.D.	1.48	1.37
Old/Male	$\bar{X}$	3.42	3.00
	S.D.	1.32	1.48
Young/Female	$\bar{X}$	2.62	2.60
	S.D.	1.35	1.45
Old/Female	$\bar{X}$	3.41	3.60
	S.D.	1.96	1.98
R^2_{FM}		.055	.047
R^2_{RM}		.000	.007
$F_{2/157}$		4.58	3.33
p		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 32
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Age and Socio-economic Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPI	SPF
Young/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.60	2.43
	S.D.	1.68	1.41
Old/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.77	2.60
	S.D.	1.24	1.54
Young/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.84	2.46
	S.D.	1.24	1.41
Old/Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.46	3.42
	S.D.	1.47	1.47
Young/High	$\bar{X}$	2.60	2.65
	S.D.	1.37	1.37
Old/High	$\bar{X}$	3.69	3.65
	S.D.	1.11	1.28
R^2_{FM}		.072	.122
R^2_{RM}		.016	.029
$F_{3/139}$		2.83	4.92
p		p<.05	p<.01

TABLE 33
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Age and IQ Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPI	SPF
Young/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.48	2.13
	S.D.	0.94	1.10
Old/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.97	2.88
	S.D.	1.71	1.59
Young/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.56	2.77
	S.D.	1.34	1.57
Old/Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.21	3.56
	S.D.	1.77	1.55
Young/High	$\bar{X}$	3.06	2.97
	S.D.	1.43	1.25
Old/High	$\bar{X}$	3.31	3.64
	S.D.	1.24	1.22
R^2_{FM}		.078	.068
R^2_{RM}		.014	.013
$F_{3/149}$		3.52	2.90
p		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 34
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Age and Stability Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPI	SPF
Young/Stable	$\bar{X}$	2.59	2.33
	S.D.	1.28	1.21
Old/Stable	$\bar{X}$	3.44	3.19
	S.D.	1.49	1.57
Young/Unstable	$\bar{X}$	2.80	2.72
	S.D.	1.13	1.79
Old/Unstable	$\bar{X}$	3.07	3.00
	S.D.	1.85	1.04
R^2_{FM}		.065	.062
R^2_{RM}		.006	.001
$F_{2/130}$		4.09	4.16
p		p < .05	p < .05

TABLE 35
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Age and Family Composition Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPI	SPF
Young/Nat. Parents	$\bar{X}$	2.59	2.51
	S.D.	1.34	1.30
Old/Nat. Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.50	3.27
	S.D.	1.57	1.64
Young/Step-Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.06	2.48
	S.D.	1.83	1.57
Old/Step-Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.38	3.00
	S.D.	1.58	1.90
Young/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.68	2.34
	S.D.	1.37	1.43
Old/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	3.35	2.92
	S.D.	0.95	1.23
R^2_{FM}		.059	.067
R^2_{RM}		.003	.009
$F_{3/147}$		2.92	3.06
p		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 36
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's, and F Values
for Age and Ethnic Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPI	SPF
Young/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.80	2.54
	S.D.	1.48	1.46
Old/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	3.43	3.13
	S.D.	1.52	1.62
Young/S-A	$\bar{X}$	2.30	2.25
	S.D.	1.31	1.10
Old/S-A	$\bar{X}$	3.27	3.25
	S.D.	1.15	1.65
R^2_{FM}		.088	.078
R^2_{RM}		.020	.031
$F_{2/157}$		5.85	3.66
p		p<.01	p<.05

TABLE 37
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Age and Multiple-First Offense Groups

Factor		SPI	SPF
Young/First	$\bar{X}$	2.87	2.55
	S.D.	1.50	1.45
Old/First	$\bar{X}$	3.47	3.21
	S.D.	1.54	1.80
Young/Mult.	$\bar{X}$	2.54	2.42
	S.D.	1.41	1.34
Old/Mult.	$\bar{X}$	3.37	3.09
	S.D.	1.44	1.44
R^2_{FM}		.088	.060
R^2_{RM}		.006	.003
$F_{2/157}$		6.94	4.83
p		p<.01	p<.01

TABLE 38

Means, Standard Deviations, and F-ratios of Socio-economic Status Levels of Delinquents for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>								
<u>Low SES (N=55)</u>			<u>Medium SES (N=61)</u>			<u>High SES (N=29)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	2.67	1.51	SPI	3.10	1.39	SPI	3.27	1.35
SPF	2.37	1.48	SPF	2.87	1.53	SPF	3.27	1.43
SPPe	2.40	1.49	SPPe	3.53	1.69	SPPe	2.89	1.19
SPD	2.22	1.41	SPD	2.28	1.33	SPD	2.20	1.11
SPPr	2.23	1.61	SPPr	2.50	1.34	SPPr	2.56	1.35
IPI	2.54	1.78	IPI	2.53	1.43	IPI	2.24	1.47
IPF	1.86	1.30	IPF	2.32	1.30	IPF	2.41	1.45
IPPe	2.25	1.29	IPPe	2.48	1.28	IPPe	2.45	1.43
IPD	2.29	1.42	IPD	2.41	1.48	IPD	2.58	1.42
IPPr	1.68	1.16	IPPr	2.11	1.42	IPPr	2.36	1.42

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.78$; $F_{20/266} = 1.74$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.84$; $F_{10/276} = 2.49$; $p < .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.90$; $F_{10/276} = 1.51$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>								
<u>Low SES (N=55)</u>			<u>Medium SES (N=61)</u>			<u>High SES (N=29)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.45	1.09	SFI	1.56	1.03	SFI	1.61	0.74
SFF	1.76	1.33	SFF	2.10	1.38	SFF	2.31	1.37
SFPe	2.01	1.61	SFPe	1.92	1.19	SFPe	2.28	1.35
SFD	4.39	1.69	SFD	4.11	1.38	SFD	4.57	1.53
SFPr	4.17	1.69	SFPr	4.53	1.69	SFPr	4.66	1.89
IFI	1.89	1.27	IFI	2.61	1.70	IFI	2.69	1.49
IFF	2.17	1.16	IFF	2.79	1.44	IFF	2.77	1.46
IFPe	2.54	1.56	IFPe	3.48	1.88	IFPe	3.29	1.74
IFD	3.18	1.62	IFD	3.16	1.68	IFD	3.09	1.65
IFPr	2.89	1.84	IFPr	2.77	1.57	IFPr	2.66	1.57

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.84$; $F_{20/266} = 1.17$; $p > .05$

CONTINUED

4 OF 6

TABLE 38 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>								
<u>Low SES (N=55)</u>			<u>Medium SES (N=61)</u>			<u>High SES (N=29)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	1.99	1.29	SSI	2.37	1.74	SSI	2.36	1.49
SSF	2.53	1.67	SSF	3.13	1.76	SSF	3.15	1.59
SSPe	2.73	1.57	SSPe	2.90	1.80	SSPe	3.02	1.68
SSD	2.06	1.36	SSD	2.59	1.56	SSD	2.27	1.55
SSPr	2.80	1.69	SSPr	3.12	1.74	SSPr	3.19	1.74
ISI	1.94	1.44	ISI	2.26	1.51	ISI	1.91	1.46
ISF	1.50	0.96	ISF	1.84	1.30	ISF	1.99	1.70
ISPe	2.14	1.52	ISPe	2.49	1.41	ISPe	2.06	1.31
ISD	2.59	1.66	ISD	2.66	1.76	ISD	2.79	1.57
ISPr	2.23	1.38	ISPr	2.61	1.76	ISPr	2.69	1.52

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.87$; $F_{20/266} = 0.95$; $p > .05$

<u>City Segment</u>								
<u>Low SES (N=55)</u>			<u>Medium SES (N=61)</u>			<u>High SES (N=29)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	1.94	1.51	SCI	2.50	1.81	SCI	2.39	1.84
SCF	1.97	1.57	SCF	2.55	1.71	SCF	2.34	1.58
SCPe	2.73	1.84	SCPe	3.00	2.12	SCPe	2.41	1.99
SCD	1.89	1.49	SCD	2.09	1.28	SCD	2.51	1.95
SCPr	2.36	2.12	SCPr	3.33	2.09	SCPr	3.76	2.03
ICI	2.21	1.40	ICI	2.62	1.52	ICI	2.57	1.45
ICF	1.65	1.58	ICF	1.80	1.37	ICF	1.87	1.69
ICPe	1.60	1.29	ICPe	1.92	1.50	ICPe	1.60	1.00
ICD	1.94	1.86	ICD	1.85	1.31	ICD	1.81	1.69
ICPr	2.02	1.45	ICPr	2.19	1.50	ICPr	2.14	1.47

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.89$; $F_{20/266} = 0.78$; $p > .05$

TABLE 39

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and Socio-economic Level on All Social Peer Factors

Factor		SPI	SPF	SPPe	SPD	SPPr
Delinq/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.67	2.37	2.40	2.22	2.23
	S.D.	1.51	1.48	1.49	1.41	1.61
Non-delinq/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.93	2.68	2.88	2.41	2.81
	S.D.	1.46	1.55	1.55	1.14	1.47
Delinq/Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.10	2.87	3.53	2.28	2.50
	S.D.	1.39	1.53	1.69	1.33	1.34
Non-delinq/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.20	2.64	2.63	2.55	2.66
	S.D.	1.54	1.39	1.55	1.35	1.53
Delinq/High	$\bar{X}$	3.27	3.27	2.89	2.20	2.56
	S.D.	1.37	1.43	1.19	1.11	1.35
Non-delinq/High	$\bar{X}$	1.71	2.42	2.42	2.58	2.02
	S.D.	1.07	1.19	1.62	1.12	1.23
R^2_{FM}		.099	.023	.054	.013	.026
R^2_{RM}		.005	.001	.007	.001	.011
$F_{3/428}$		15.50	3.08	7.08	1.74	2.50
p		p<.001	p<.05	p<.001	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 40

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Low, Medium
and High Socio-economic Status Delinquents on Social Peer Factors

Factor		SPI	SPF	SPPe
Low	$\bar{X}$	2.67	2.37	2.40
	S.D.	1.51	1.48	1.49
Medium	$\bar{X}$	3.10	2.87	3.53
	S.D.	2.87	1.53	2.28
High	$\bar{X}$	3.27	3.27	2.89
	S.D.	1.37	1.43	1.19
R^2_{FM}		.016	.029	.082
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000
$F_{2/142}$		1.16	2.13	6.40
p		p>.05	p>.05	p<.01

TABLE 41

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Socio-economic Status and Sex Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPPe	Factor		SPPe
Low/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.37	Low/Female	$\bar{X}$	2.55
	S.D.	1.48		S.D.	1.47
Med./Male	$\bar{X}$	3.45	Med./Female	$\bar{X}$	3.77
	S.D.	1.50		S.D.	2.10
High/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.93	High/Female	$\bar{X}$	2.77
	S.D.	1.12		S.D.	1.30

$$R_{FM}^2 = .084; R_{RM}^2 = .014; F_{4/132} = 2.53; p < .05$$

TABLE 42

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Socio-economic Status and Age Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPPe	Factor		SPPe
Low/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.26	Low/Old	$\bar{X}$	2.58
	S.D.	1.60		S.D.	1.29
Med./Young	$\bar{X}$	3.51	Med./Old	$\bar{X}$	3.55
	S.D.	1.94		S.D.	1.23
High/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.98	High/Old	$\bar{X}$	2.83
	S.D.	1.16		S.D.	1.18

$$R_{FM}^2 = .078; R_{RM}^2 = .000; F_{4/132} = 2.82; p < .05$$

TABLE 43

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Socio-economic Status and I.Q. Groups of Delinquents

Factor	SPPe	Factor	SPPe	Factor	SPPe
Low/Low	$\bar{X}$ 2.23 S.D. 1.19	Low/Med.	$\bar{X}$ 2.34 S.D. 1.52	Low/High	$\bar{X}$ 2.64 S.D. 1.61
Med./Low	$\bar{X}$ 2.91 S.D. 1.72	Med./Med.	$\bar{X}$ 3.62 S.D. 1.68	Med./High	$\bar{X}$ 3.82 S.D. 1.52
High/Low	$\bar{X}$ 2.84 S.D. 1.52	High/Med.	$\bar{X}$ 2.77 S.D. 1.53	High/High	$\bar{X}$ 2.89 S.D. 1.54

$$R_{FM}^2 = .136; R_{RM}^2 = .005; F_{6/131} = 3.25; p < .01$$

TABLE 44

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Socio-economic Status and Stability Groups of Delinquents

Factor	SPPe	Factor	SPPe
Low/Stab.	$\bar{X}$ 2.30 S.D. 1.32	Low/Unstab.	$\bar{X}$ 1.67 S.D. 0.75
Med./Stab.	$\bar{X}$ 3.28 S.D. 1.56	Med./Unstab.	$\bar{X}$ 4.07 S.D. 1.43
High/Stab.	$\bar{X}$ 3.01 S.D. 1.45	High/Unstab.	$\bar{X}$ 3.00 S.D. 1.91

$$R_{FM}^2 = .084; R_{RM}^2 = .003; F_{4/120} = 2.46; p < .05$$

TABLE 45

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Socio-economic Status
and Family Composition Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPPe	Factor		SPPe	Factor		SPPe
	$\bar{X}$	2.39		$\bar{X}$	2.68		$\bar{X}$	2.67
Low/Both			Low/Step-			Low/One		
Parents	S.D.	1.39	Parent	S.D.	1.45	Parent	S.D.	1.65
	$\bar{X}$	3.51		$\bar{X}$	3.14		$\bar{X}$	3.35
Med./Both			Med./Step-			Med./One		
Parents	S.D.	1.45	Parent	S.D.	1.90	Parent	S.D.	1.88
	$\bar{X}$	2.80		$\bar{X}$	2.95		$\bar{X}$	2.90
High/Both			High/Step-			High/One		
Parents	S.D.	1.50	Parent	S.D.	1.50	Parent	S.D.	1.55

$R^2_{FM} = .094$; $R^2_{RM} = .001$; $F_{6/129} = 2.21$; $p < .05$

TABLE 46

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Socio-economic Status Levels and Multiple-First Offense Groups

Factor		SPPe	Factor		SPPe
	$\bar{X}$	2.68		$\bar{X}$	2.21
Low/First			Low/Mult.		
	S.D.	1.39		S.D.	1.51
	$\bar{X}$	3.43		$\bar{X}$	3.59
Med./First			Med./Mult.		
	S.D.	1.67		S.D.	1.67
	$\bar{X}$	3.05		$\bar{X}$	2.76
High/First			High/Mult.		
	S.D.	1.09		S.D.	1.22

$R^2_{FM} = .136$; $R^2_{RM} = .001$; $F_{3/139} = 7.25$; $p < .001$

TABLE 47

Means, Standard Deviations, and F-ratios of Low, Medium and High I.Q. Delinquents for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>								
<u>Low (N=29)</u>			<u>Medium (N=87)</u>			<u>High (N=39)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	2.44	1.40	SPI	3.14	1.62	SPI	3.33	1.30
SPF	2.10	1.53	SPF	2.86	1.59	SPF	3.19	1.36
SPPe	2.67	1.46	SPPe	3.08	1.68	SPPe	2.98	1.57
SPD	2.06	1.29	SPD	2.24	1.43	SPD	2.20	1.08
SPPr	2.45	1.43	SPPr	2.33	1.57	SPPr	2.35	1.19
IPI	2.23	1.77	IPI	2.71	1.60	IPI	2.18	1.22
IPF	1.90	1.22	IPF	2.87	1.46	IPF	2.38	1.14
IPPe	2.30	1.36	IPPe	2.55	1.38	IPPe	2.43	1.30
IPD	1.87	1.06	IPD	2.37	1.47	IPD	2.71	1.38
IPPr	1.55	1.07	IPPr	2.02	1.36	IPPr	2.17	1.38

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.82$; $F_{20/286} = 1.68$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.92$; $F_{10/296} = 1.22$; $p > .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.90$; $F_{10/296} = 1.52$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>								
<u>Low (N=29)</u>			<u>Medium (N=87)</u>			<u>High (N=39)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.44	0.84	SFI	1.61	1.09	SFI	1.54	0.97
SFF	1.47	1.12	SFF	1.95	1.37	SFF	2.52	1.26
SFFe	1.57	1.00	SFFe	2.28	1.50	SFFe	1.73	1.18
SFD	3.76	1.40	SFD	4.38	1.59	SFD	4.35	1.50
SFPr	4.03	1.56	SFPr	4.46	1.78	SFPr	4.68	1.67
IFI	2.01	1.82	IFI	2.58	1.59	IFI	2.33	1.35
IFF	2.24	1.47	IFF	2.56	1.42	IFF	2.77	1.13
IFPe	2.80	1.87	IFPe	3.05	1.75	IFPe	3.44	1.64
IFD	2.52	1.28	IFD	3.19	1.63	IFD	3.37	1.68
IFPr	2.05	1.36	IFPr	2.80	1.59	IFPr	3.05	1.60

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.77$; $F_{20/286} = 1.96$; $p < .01$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.84$; $F_{10/296} = 2.62$; $p < .01$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.89$; $F_{10/296} = 1.91$; $p < .05$

TABLE 47 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>								
<u>Low (N=29)</u>			<u>Medium (N=87)</u>			<u>High (N=39)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.03	1.51	SSI	2.38	1.67	SSI	2.38	1.68
SSF	2.41	1.90	SSF	2.96	1.76	SSF	3.28	1.43
SSPe	2.39	1.66	SSPe	2.97	1.60	SSPe	3.08	1.86
SSD	1.86	1.02	SSD	2.22	1.52	SSD	2.67	1.60
SSPr	2.07	1.24	SSPr	3.23	1.71	SSPr	3.10	1.75
ISI	2.05	1.70	ISI	2.27	1.49	ISI	1.70	1.32
ISF	1.24	0.96	ISF	1.86	1.37	ISF	1.93	1.21
ISPe	2.44	1.74	ISPe	2.43	1.53	ISPe	2.17	1.31
ISD	1.95	1.24	ISD	2.61	1.81	ISD	2.98	1.53
SSPr	1.57	1.09	SSPr	2.41	1.48	SSPr	3.03	1.71

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.73$; $F_{20/286} = 2.48$; $p < .01$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.89$; $F_{10/296} = 1.70$; $p < .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.81$; $F_{10/296} = 3.33$; $p < .001$

<u>City Segment</u>								
<u>Low (N=29)</u>			<u>Medium (N=87)</u>			<u>High (N=39)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	1.67	1.23	SCI	2.42	1.85	SCI	2.46	1.84
SCF	1.96	1.45	SCF	2.38	1.76	SCF	2.27	1.60
SCPe	2.80	2.10	SCPe	3.31	1.93	SCPe	2.60	1.95
SCD	1.41	0.96	SCD	2.16	1.64	SCD	2.31	1.58
SCPr	2.54	1.74	SCPr	3.70	2.12	SCPr	3.38	2.15
ICI	2.14	1.59	ICI	2.49	1.33	ICI	2.47	1.63
ICF	1.41	1.46	ICF	1.94	1.64	ICF	1.76	1.33
ICPe	1.64	1.62	ICPe	1.92	1.28	ICPe	1.53	1.42
ICD	1.22	1.17	ICD	1.94	1.60	ICD	2.03	1.74
ICPr	1.36	1.16	ICPr	2.20	1.50	ICPr	2.32	1.52

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.85$; $F_{20/286} = 1.22$; $p > .05$

TABLE 48

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and IQ Level on All Social Family Factors

Factor		SFI	SFF	SFPe	SFD	SFPr
Delinq/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.44	1.47	1.57	3.76	4.03
	S.D.	0.84	1.12	1.00	1.40	1.56
Non-delinq/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.67	1.83	2.03	5.08	4.26
	S.D.	1.31	1.14	1.29	1.50	1.90
Delinq/Med.	$\bar{X}$	1.61	1.95	2.28	4.38	4.46
	S.D.	1.09	1.37	1.50	1.59	1.78
Non-delinq/Med.	$\bar{X}$	1.58	1.65	1.64	5.14	4.41
	S.D.	1.19	1.10	1.17	1.42	1.81
Delinq/High	$\bar{X}$	1.54	2.52	1.73	4.35	4.68
	S.D.	0.97	1.26	1.18	1.50	1.67
Non-delinq/High	$\bar{X}$	1.28	1.68	1.59	5.20	4.22
	S.D.	0.91	0.93	1.24	1.44	1.75
R^2_{FM}		.016	.057	.052	.101	.009
R^2_{RM}		.014	.007	.011	.002	.002
$F_{3/433}$		0.27	7.90	6.47	16.50	1.04
p		p>.05	p<.01	p<.01	p<.001	p>.05

TABLE 49

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and IQ Levels on All Individual Family Factors

Factor		IFI	IFF	IFPe	IFD	IFPr
Delinq/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.01	2.24	2.80	2.52	2.05
	S.D.	1.82	1.47	1.87	1.28	1.36
Non-delinq/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.98	1.98	2.18	2.74	3.87
	S.D.	1.56	1.58	1.29	1.67	1.76
Delinq/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.58	2.56	3.05	3.19	2.80
	S.D.	1.59	1.42	1.75	1.63	1.59
Non-delinq/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.02	2.02	2.25	2.94	4.20
	S.D.	1.53	1.53	1.34	1.85	1.74
Delinq/High	$\bar{X}$	2.33	2.77	3.44	3.37	3.05
	S.D.	1.35	1.13	1.64	1.68	1.60
Non-delinq/High	$\bar{X}$	1.94	1.94	2.10	3.15	4.32
	S.D.	1.34	1.35	1.20	1.74	1.69
R^2_{FM}		.025	.028	.008	.112	.127
R^2_{RM}		.004	.001	.001	.004	.006
$F_{3/433}$		3.18	4.09	1.04	18.00	20.15
p		p<.05	p<.01	p>.05	p<.001	p<.001

TABLE 50

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and IQ Levels on All Individual School Factors

Factor		ISI	ISF	ISPe	ISD	ISPr
Delinq/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.05	1.24	2.44	1.95	1.57
	S.D.	1.70	0.96	1.74	1.24	1.09
Non-delinq/Low	$\bar{X}$	3.47	1.68	1.54	2.11	2.57
	S.D.	1.53	1.37	1.39	1.51	1.51
Delinq/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.27	1.86	2.43	2.61	2.41
	S.D.	1.49	1.37	1.53	1.81	1.48
Non-delinq/Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.81	1.72	1.55	2.32	2.70
	S.D.	1.68	1.39	1.36	1.51	1.44
Delinq/High	$\bar{X}$	1.70	1.93	2.17	2.98	3.03
	S.D.	1.32	1.21	1.31	1.53	1.71
Non-delinq/High	$\bar{X}$	3.78	1.64	1.40	2.20	3.24
	S.D.	1.51	1.33	1.06	1.31	1.34
R^2_{FM}		.034	.029	.005	.050	.088
R^2_{RM}		.011	.004	.005	.032	.014
$F_{3/433}$		3.18	3.63	0.00	2.85	11.42
p		p<.05	p<.05	p>.05	p<.05	p<.001

TABLE 51
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Low, Medium
and High IQ Delinquents on Social Family Factors

Factor		SFF	SFPe	SFD
Low	$\bar{X}$	1.47	1.57	3.76
	S.D.	1.12	1.00	1.40
Medium	$\bar{X}$	1.95	2.28	4.38
	S.D.	1.37	1.50	1.59
High	$\bar{X}$	2.52	1.73	4.35
	S.D.	1.26	1.18	1.50
R^2_{FM}		.052	.064	.010
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000
$F_{2/152}$		4.26	5.24	0.78
p		p<.05	p<.01	p>.05

TABLE 52
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Low, Medium
and High IQ Delinquents on Individual Family Factors

Factor		IFI	IFF	IFD	IFPr
Low	$\bar{X}$	2.01	2.24	2.52	2.05
	S.D.	1.82	1.47	1.28	1.36
Medium	$\bar{X}$	2.58	2.56	3.19	2.80
	S.D.	1.59	1.42	1.63	1.59
High	$\bar{X}$	2.33	2.77	3.37	3.05
	S.D.	1.35	1.13	1.68	1.60
R^2_{FM}		.015	.009	.012	.018
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{2/152}$		1.09	0.70	0.95	1.40
p		p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 53
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Low, Medium
and High IQ Delinquents on Individual School Factors

Factor		ISI	ISF	ISD	ISPr
Low	$\bar{X}$	2.05	1.24	1.95	1.57
	S.D.	1.70	0.96	1.24	1.09
Medium	$\bar{X}$	2.27	1.86	2.61	2.41
	S.D.	1.49	1.37	1.81	1.48
High	$\bar{X}$	1.70	1.93	2.98	3.03
	S.D.	1.32	1.21	1.53	1.71
R^2_{FM}		.041	.013	.020	.054
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{2/152}$		3.14	1.00	1.56	4.42
p		p<.05	p>.05	p>.05	p<.05

TABLE 54
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for IQ Level and Sex Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SFF	SFPe	ISI	ISPr
Low/Male	$\bar{X}$	1.51	1.29	1.35	1.72
	S.D.	1.99	0.88	0.89	0.98
Med./Male	$\bar{X}$	2.00	2.31	2.21	2.44
	S.D.	1.39	1.53	1.40	1.50
High/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.31	1.69	1.74	3.04
	S.D.	1.14	1.11	1.42	1.82
Low/Female	$\bar{X}$	1.42	2.04	3.20	1.33
	S.D.	0.93	0.95	1.99	1.18
Med./Female	$\bar{X}$	1.68	2.14	2.59	2.27
	S.D.	1.19	1.31	1.82	1.33
High/Female	$\bar{X}$	3.10	1.84	1.62	2.70
	S.D.	1.36	1.33	0.93	1.17
R^2_{FM}		.080	.056	.092	.092
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.022	.013
$F_{4/149}$		3.27	2.22	2.91	3.22
p		p<.05	p>.05	p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 55
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for IQ Level and Age Group of Delinquents

Factor		SFF	SFPe	ISI	ISPr
Low/Young	$\bar{X}$	1.44	1.40	1.88	1.48
	S.D.	1.19	0.97	1.29	0.96
Med./Young	$\bar{X}$	1.81	2.19	2.22	2.25
	S.D.	1.50	1.55	1.45	1.58
High/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.17	1.91	2.26	3.52
	S.D.	1.00	1.26	1.43	1.98
Low/Old	$\bar{X}$	1.52	1.82	2.29	1.70
	S.D.	0.97	0.94	2.08	1.21
Med./Old	$\bar{X}$	2.11	2.38	2.34	2.60
	S.D.	1.16	1.42	1.52	1.31
High/Old	$\bar{X}$	2.81	1.57	1.23	2.61
	S.D.	1.36	1.06	0.95	1.25
R^2_{FH}		.082	.052	.068	.097
R^2_{RH}		.021	.003	.004	.000
$F^2_{4/149}$		2.46	1.93	2.58	4.03
p		p<.05	p>.05	p<.05	p<.01

TABLE 56

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for IQ Level
and Socio-economic Status Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SFF	SFPe	ISI	ISPr
Low/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.31	1.59	1.58	1.76
	S.D.	1.05	1.02	1.35	1.15
Med./Low	$\bar{X}$	1.77	2.33	2.18	2.30
	S.D.	1.51	1.89	1.48	1.41
High/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.08	1.61	1.40	2.40
	S.D.	0.77	1.30	1.09	1.47
Low/Med.	$\bar{X}$	1.39	1.56	2.48	1.35
	S.D.	1.21	1.06	2.06	1.08
Med./Med.	$\bar{X}$	1.97	2.13	2.33	2.66
	S.D.	1.25	1.18	1.30	1.68
High/Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.12	1.61	1.89	3.40
	S.D.	1.27	1.17	1.43	1.82
Low/High	$\bar{X}$	1.99	1.95	1.86	2.40
	S.D.	1.37	1.39	1.28	1.57
Med./High	$\bar{X}$	2.01	1.99	1.92	2.48
	S.D.	1.42	1.56	1.33	1.53
High/High	$\bar{X}$	2.05	1.95	1.88	2.51
	S.D.	1.33	1.39	1.28	1.58
R_{FM}^2		.106	.065	.043	.140
R_{RM}^2		.014	.012	.014	.009
$F_{6/131}$		2.25	1.24	0.65	3.37
p		p<.05	p>.05	p>.05	p<.01

TABLE 57
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for IQ Level
and Stability Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SFF	SFPe	ISI	ISPr
Low/Stable	$\bar{X}$	1.50	1.53	1.72	1.57
	S.D.	0.90	0.91	1.20	1.04
Med./Stable	$\bar{X}$	1.93	2.21	2.32	2.48
	S.D.	1.25	1.35	1.51	1.48
High/Stable	$\bar{X}$	2.47	1.67	1.87	3.42
	S.D.	1.21	1.08	1.27	1.78
Low/Unstable	$\bar{X}$	1.86	1.27	1.73	2.23
	S.D.	1.83	1.06	0.85	0.93
Med./Unstable	$\bar{X}$	2.01	2.78	2.61	2.76
	S.D.	1.98	2.07	1.42	1.52
High/Unstable	$\bar{X}$	2.82	1.55	0.79	1.76
	S.D.	1.25	1.04	0.78	0.80
R^2_{FM}		.076	.083	.080	.101
R^2_{RM}		.002	.005	.000	.000
$F_{4/125}$		2.53	2.67	2.74	3.50
p		p<.05	p<.05	p<.05	p<.01

TABLE 58

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for IQ Level
and Family Composition Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SFF	SFPe	ISI	ISPr
Low/Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	1.53	1.72	2.67	1.11
	S.D.	0.89	0.84	2.13	0.67
Med./Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	1.86	2.24	1.95	2.25
	S.D.	1.11	1.43	1.22	1.50
High/Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	2.87	1.97	1.78	2.33
	S.D.	1.31	1.36	1.40	1.55
Low/Step- parent	$\bar{X}$	1.88	1.48	1.68	1.52
	S.D.	0.75	0.42	0.65	0.60
Med./Step- parent	$\bar{X}$	2.58	2.70	2.99	2.14
	S.D.	2.28	2.23	2.03	1.27
High/Step- parent	$\bar{X}$	2.88	1.99	2.02	2.38
	S.D.	1.31	1.36	1.41	1.54
Low/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	1.61	1.78	1.72	2.08
	S.D.	1.41	1.29	0.95	1.44
Med./One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.05	2.21	2.56	2.40
	S.D.	1.24	1.26	1.57	1.40
High/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.87	2.00	1.98	2.81
	S.D.	1.34	1.39	1.41	1.55
R^2_{FM}		.103	.068	.088	.141
R^2_{RM}		.017	.000	.001	.009
$F_{6/138}$		2.23	1.68	2.19	3.43
p		p<.05	p>.05	p<.05	p<.01

TABLE 59
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for IQ Level
and Multiple-First Offense Groups

Factor		SFF	SFPe	ISI	ISPr
Low/First	$\bar{X}$	1.92	1.63	2.15	1.46
	S.D.	1.34	1.01	1.49	1.31
Med./First	$\bar{X}$	2.17	2.10	2.49	2.49
	S.D.	1.53	1.35	1.61	1.48
High/First	$\bar{X}$	2.62	1.74	1.80	3.10
	S.D.	1.23	1.21	1.38	1.78
Low/Mult.	$\bar{X}$	1.27	1.32	2.01	1.62
	S.D.	0.91	1.08	1.74	0.95
Med./Mult.	$\bar{X}$	1.78	2.34	2.11	2.35
	S.D.	1.19	1.85	1.37	1.47
High/Mult.	$\bar{X}$	2.40	1.62	1.60	2.95
	S.D.	1.26	1.23	1.21	1.60
R^2_{FM}		.107	.051	.043	.087
R^2_{RM}		.031	.011	.005	.002
$F_{3/149}$		4.66	2.21	1.96	4.63
p		p<.01	p>.05	p>.05	p<.01

TABLE 60

Means, Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Anglo and Spanish-American Delinquents for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>					
<u>Anglo (N=132)</u>			<u>Spanish-American (N=29)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	3.12	1.54	SPI	2.57	1.36
SPF	2.85	1.58	SPF	2.53	1.38
SPPe	3.11	1.62	SPPe	2.38	1.34
SPD	2.22	1.29	SPD	2.10	1.31
SPPr	2.28	1.38	SPPr	2.76	1.65
IPI	2.42	1.53	IPI	2.74	1.66
IPF	2.18	1.37	IPF	2.13	1.16
IPPe	2.41	1.34	IPPe	2.59	1.37
IPD	2.39	1.42	IPD	2.27	1.19
IPPr	2.03	1.35	IPPr	1.76	1.23

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.87$; $F_{10/150} = 2.20$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.92$; $F_{5/155} = 2.58$; $p < .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.98$; $F_{5/155} = 0.62$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>					
<u>Anglo (N=132)</u>			<u>Spanish-American (N=29)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.54	1.00	SFI	1.66	1.05
SFF	2.09	1.36	SFF	1.68	1.12
SFPe	1.94	1.36	SFPe	2.35	1.31
SFD	4.30	1.51	SFD	4.05	1.59
SFPr	4.44	1.74	SFPr	4.36	1.50
IFI	2.54	1.62	IFI	1.73	1.11
IFF	2.58	1.40	IFF	2.37	1.18
IFPe	3.23	1.84	IFPe	2.56	1.17
IFD	3.10	1.60	IFD	3.21	1.73
IFPr	2.67	1.56	IFPr	3.09	1.77

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.85$; $F_{10/150} = 2.59$; $p < .01$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.95$; $F_{5/155} = 1.68$; $p > .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.94$; $F_{5/155} = 2.32$; $p < .05$

TABLE 60 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>					
<u>Anglo (N=132)</u>			<u>Spanish-American (N=29)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.38	1.71	SSI	2.00	1.29
SSF	2.94	1.73	SSF	2.75	1.73
SSPe	2.91	1.72	SSPe	2.79	1.54
SSD	2.33	1.52	SSD	2.07	1.19
SSPr	3.00	1.68	SSPr	2.88	1.78
ISI	2.12	1.53	ISI	1.97	1.39
ISF	1.82	1.34	ISF	1.54	0.95
ISPe	2.33	1.53	ISPe	2.51	1.38
ISD	2.68	1.60	ISD	2.27	1.86
ISPr	2.53	1.55	ISPr	1.96	1.41

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.96$; $F_{10/150} = 0.64$; $p > .05$

<u>City Segment</u>					
<u>Anglo (N=132)</u>			<u>Spanish-American (N=29)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	2.36	1.80	SCI	1.86	1.43
SCF	2.27	1.65	SCF	2.22	1.67
SCPe	3.00	1.99	SCPe	3.02	1.85
SCD	2.08	1.57	SCD	1.80	1.33
SCPr	3.45	2.11	SCPr	3.22	2.13
ICI	2.46	1.53	ICI	2.28	1.15
ICF	1.76	1.49	ICF	1.82	1.71
ICPe	1.74	1.37	ICPe	1.82	1.33
ICD	1.86	1.49	ICD	1.65	1.95
ICPr	2.09	1.46	ICPr	2.05	1.50

Soc. & Inc.: $\Lambda = 0.97$; $F_{10/150} = 0.49$; $p > .05$

TABLE 61
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and Ethnic Group on All Social Peer Factors

Factor		SPI	SPF	SPPe	SPD	SPPr
Delinq/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	3.12	2.85	3.11	2.22	2.28
	S.D.	1.54	1.58	1.62	1.29	1.38
Non-delinq/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.04	2.58	2.68	2.43	2.48
	S.D.	1.41	1.97	1.54	1.54	1.45
Delinq/S-A	$\bar{X}$	2.57	2.53	2.38	2.10	2.76
	S.D.	1.36	1.38	1.34	1.31	1.65
Non-delinq/S-A ^a	$\bar{X}$	2.09	2.75	2.91	2.87	3.33
	S.D.	1.74	1.58	1.66	1.30	1.56
R^2_{FM}		.096	.007	.021	.026	.045
R^2_{RM}		.001	.000	.001	.004	.029
$F_{2/448}$		23.75	1.59	4.76	5.23	3.81
p		p<.001	p>.05	p<.01	p<.01	p<.05

TABLE 62

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Delinquency Status
and Ethnic Group on All Individual Family Factors

Factor		IFI	IFF	IFPe	IFD	IFPr
Delinq/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.54	2.58	3.23	3.10	2.67
	S.D.	1.62	1.40	1.84	1.60	1.56
Non-delinq/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.13	2.03	2.18	2.99	4.09
	S.D.	1.49	1.49	1.26	1.73	1.71
Delinq/S-A	$\bar{X}$	1.73	2.37	2.56	3.21	3.09
	S.D.	1.11	1.18	1.17	1.73	1.77
Non-delinq/S-A	$\bar{X}$	1.60	1.60	2.04	2.64	4.52
	S.D.	1.30	1.31	1.39	1.92	1.75
R^2_{FM}		.045	.023	.016	.089	.104
R^2_{RM}		.017	.001	.009	.003	.009
$F_{2/448}$		6.66	5.23	1.70	21.50	23.75
p		p<.01	p<.01	p>.05	p<.001	p<.001

TABLE 63

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Anglo and Spanish Delinquents on Social Peer Factors

Factor		SPI	SPPe	SPD	SPPr
Anglo	$\bar{X}$	3.12	3.11	2.22	2.28
	S.D.	1.54	1.62	1.29	1.38
Spanish	$\bar{X}$	2.57	2.38	2.10	2.76
	S.D.	1.36	1.34	1.31	1.65
R^2_{FM}		.020	.031	.001	.016
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/159}$		3.27	5.16	0.16	2.62
p		p>.05	p<.05	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 64

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Anglo and Spanish Delinquents on Individual Family Factors

Factor		IFI	IFF	IFD	IFPr
Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.54	2.58	3.10	2.67
	S.D.	1.62	1.40	1.60	1.56
Spanish	$\bar{X}$	1.73	2.37	3.21	3.09
	S.D.	1.11	1.18	1.73	1.77
R^2_{FM}		.037	.003	.000	.010
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/159}$		6.16	0.48	0.00	1.63
p		p<.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 65
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Ethnic and Sex Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPPe	IFI
Anglo/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.99	2.43
	S.D.	1.49	1.50
Spanish/Male	$\bar{X}$	2.34	1.50
	S.D.	1.35	0.83
Anglo/Female	$\bar{X}$	3.57	2.98
	S.D.	1.97	1.93
Spanish/Female	$\bar{X}$	2.47	2.35
	S.D.	1.24	1.41
R_{FM}^2		.068	.078
R_{RM}^2		.014	.023
$F_{2/157}$		3.38	4.74
p		p<.05	p<.01

TABLE 66
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Ethnic and Age Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPPe	IFI
Anglo/Young	$\bar{X}$	3.21	2.41
	S.D.	1.80	1.47
Spanish/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.11	1.67
	S.D.	1.26	1.14
Anglo/Old	$\bar{X}$	3.42	2.59
	S.D.	1.43	1.69
Spanish/Old	$\bar{X}$	3.07	1.89
	S.D.	1.23	0.92
R^2_{FM}		.045	.051
R^2_{RM}		.000	.005
$F_{2/157}$		3.62	3.64
p		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 67

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Ethnic and Stability Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPPe	IFI
Anglo/Stable	$\bar{X}$	3.06	2.45
	S.D.	1.46	1.54
Spanish/Stable	$\bar{X}$	3.16	2.48
	S.D.	1.92	1.47
Anglo/Unstable	$\bar{X}$	2.34	1.86
	S.D.	1.24	1.15
Spanish/Unstable	$\bar{X}$	2.38	1.07
	S.D.	0.30	0.32
R^2_{FM}		.053	.056
R^2_{RM}		.003	.000
$F_{2/130}$		3.47	3.94
p		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 68
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Ethnic and Family Composition Groups of Delinquents

Factor		SPPe	IFI
Anglo/Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.20	2.60
	S.D.	1.45	1.59
Spanish/Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	2.20	1.83
	S.D.	1.31	1.13
Anglo/Step- parent	$\bar{X}$	3.40	1.88
	S.D.	1.78	1.63
Spanish/Step- parent	$\bar{X}$	2.80	2.90
	S.D.	0.43	0.53
Anglo/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	3.06	2.58
	S.D.	1.68	1.42
Spanish/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.50	1.35
	S.D.	1.44	0.83
R^2_{FM}		.053	.059
R^2_{RM}		.001	.003
$F_{3/147}$		2.70	2.90
p		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 69
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Ethnic and Multiple-First Offense Groups

Factor		SPPe	IFI
Anglo/First	$\bar{X}$	3.03	2.59
	S.D.	1.60	1.72
Spanish/First	$\bar{X}$	2.04	1.73
	S.D.	1.40	0.60
Anglo/Mult.	$\bar{X}$	3.17	2.43
	S.D.	1.63	1.48
Spanish/Mult.	$\bar{X}$	2.03	1.73
	S.D.	1.13	1.27
R^2_{FM}		.060	.048
R^2_{RM}		.001	.003
$F_{2/157}$		5.00	3.75
p		p<.01	p<.05

TABLE 70

Means, Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Criminal-Conflict-Mixed Offense Types for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

Peer Segment								
Criminal (N=22)			Conflict (N=7)			Mixed (N=37)		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	2.75	1.28	SPI	2.43	1.50	SPI	3.25	1.65
SPF	2.74	1.44	SPF	2.97	1.36	SPF	2.77	1.52
SPPe	2.83	1.55	SPPe	2.71	0.96	SPPe	3.03	1.77
SPD	2.44	1.25	SPD	2.28	1.16	SPD	1.91	1.26
SPPr	1.70	1.03	SPPr	2.46	1.63	SPPr	2.23	1.37
IPI	3.17	1.62	IPI	1.77	1.02	IPI	2.28	1.60
IPF	1.97	1.12	IPF	1.80	0.89	IPF	2.02	1.34
IPPe	2.44	1.30	IPPe	1.97	1.42	IPPe	2.56	1.35
IPD	2.38	1.26	IPD	2.11	1.21	IPD	2.30	1.28
IPPr	1.96	1.58	IPPr	1.97	1.01	IPPr	2.03	1.21

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.65$; $F_{20/108} = 1.27$; $p > .05$

Family Segment								
Criminal (N=22)			Conflict (N=7)			Mixed (N=37)		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.44	1.08	SFI	1.65	1.13	SFI	1.18	0.64
SFF	1.72	1.47	SFF	2.11	1.02	SFF	1.88	1.13
SFPe	1.74	1.35	SFPe	2.26	0.82	SFPe	1.76	1.09
SFD	4.16	1.64	SFD	3.86	1.35	SFD	3.97	1.45
SFPr	4.46	1.79	SFPr	3.46	1.30	SFPr	4.21	1.74
IFI	2.15	1.24	IFI	2.23	0.99	IFI	2.23	1.66
IFF	2.13	1.36	IFF	2.56	1.37	IFF	2.13	1.27
IFPe	2.51	1.37	IFPe	3.23	1.53	IFPe	2.44	1.53
IFD	3.55	1.59	IFD	2.75	1.10	IFD	2.84	1.35
IFPr	2.89	1.59	IFPr	2.23	0.79	IFPr	2.59	1.53

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.77$; $F_{20/108} = 0.73$; $p > .05$

TABLE 70 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>								
<u>Criminal (N=22)</u>			<u>Conflict (N=7)</u>			<u>Mixed (N=37)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.43	1.81	SSI	2.27	1.75	SSI	2.29	1.91
SSF	3.12	2.04	SSF	3.43	2.03	SSF	2.86	1.82
SSPe	2.82	1.92	SSPe	2.12	0.63	SSPe	2.81	1.92
SSD	2.62	1.81	SSD	2.11	1.22	SSD	2.07	1.26
SSPr	3.11	1.89	SSPr	2.60	1.37	SSPr	3.04	1.70
ISI	2.02	1.07	ISI	1.35	0.97	ISI	1.87	1.63
ISF	1.57	1.15	ISF	1.74	1.03	ISF	1.62	1.07
ISPe	2.00	1.33	ISPe	1.91	1.14	ISPe	2.25	1.52
ISD	3.15	1.73	ISD	1.91	0.78	ISD	2.28	1.55
ISPr	2.68	1.89	ISPr	2.66	1.04	ISPr	2.30	1.42

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.76$; $F_{20/108} = 0.78$; $p > .05$

<u>City Segment</u>								
<u>Criminal (N=22)</u>			<u>Conflict (N=7)</u>			<u>Mixed (N=37)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	3.15	1.99	SCI	1.88	1.71	SCI	2.40	1.82
SCF	2.71	1.91	SCF	1.20	1.01	SCF	2.01	1.34
SCPe	3.42	2.39	SCPe	2.90	1.90	SCPe	2.88	1.74
SCD	1.74	1.13	SCD	2.06	0.88	SCD	1.68	1.32
SCPr	3.69	2.32	SCPr	2.98	1.56	SCPr	3.27	2.04
ICI	2.65	1.43	ICI	3.23	0.71	ICI	2.12	1.66
ICF	2.00	1.78	ICF	1.81	0.96	ICF	1.26	1.09
ICPe	1.78	1.33	ICPe	2.11	1.60	ICPe	1.44	1.39
ICD	2.17	1.58	ICD	2.13	2.17	ICD	1.39	1.12
ICPr	2.34	1.62	ICPr	2.23	1.27	ICPr	1.80	1.47

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.70$; $F_{20/108} = 1.06$; $p > .05$

TABLE 71

Means, Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Victim Present-Victim Absent-Mixed Offense Types for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>								
<u>Victim Present (N=14)</u>			<u>Victim Absent (N=33)</u>			<u>Mixed (N=15)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	2.11	1.20	SPI	3.22	1.41	SPI	3.24	1.69
SPF	2.13	1.40	SPF	2.93	1.33	SPF	2.81	1.59
SPPe	2.26	1.38	SPPe	3.14	1.80	SPPe	3.05	1.28
SPD	1.90	1.16	SPD	2.37	1.32	SPD	1.93	1.20
SPPr	1.60	1.19	SPPr	2.28	1.33	SPPr	2.23	1.39
IPI	1.97	1.62	IPI	2.82	1.55	IPI	2.64	1.78
IPF	1.53	0.92	IPF	1.92	1.17	IPF	2.37	1.25
IPPe	1.83	1.09	IPPe	2.67	1.40	IPPe	2.60	1.21
IPD	1.96	1.22	IPD	2.60	1.31	IPD	2.13	1.08
IPPr	1.76	1.21	IPPr	2.31	1.45	IPPr	1.65	1.05

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.74$; $F_{20/100} = 0.81$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>								
<u>Victim Present (N=14)</u>			<u>Victim Absent (N=33)</u>			<u>Mixed (N=15)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.44	0.97	SFI	1.39	0.94	SFI	1.07	0.66
SFF	1.28	1.01	SFF	2.12	1.28	SFF	1.75	1.06
SFPe	1.47	0.95	SFPe	1.86	1.31	SFPe	1.95	0.94
SFD	3.23	1.66	SFD	4.39	1.34	SFD	3.73	1.51
SFPr	3.25	1.44	SFPr	4.64	1.70	SFPr	4.17	1.66
IFI	1.47	0.97	IFI	2.57	1.36	IFI	2.12	1.75
IFF	1.68	0.98	IFF	2.39	1.37	IFF	2.30	1.31
IFPe	2.10	1.33	IFPe	2.80	1.54	IFPe	2.69	1.51
IFD	3.12	1.34	IFD	3.11	1.57	IFD	3.07	1.34
IFPr	2.47	0.70	IFPr	3.01	1.76	IFPr	2.34	1.17

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.63$; $F_{20/100} = 1.32$; $p > .05$

TABLE 71 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>								
<u>Victim Present (N=14)</u>			<u>Victim Absent (N=33)</u>			<u>Mixed (N=15)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	1.66	1.34	SSI	2.79	2.04	SSI	2.16	1.62
SSF	2.02	1.13	SSF	3.47	2.04	SSF	3.02	1.97
SSPe	1.84	1.07	SSPe	3.19	1.99	SSPe	2.91	1.86
SSD	2.13	1.39	SSD	2.59	1.61	SSD	1.79	1.06
SSPr	2.43	1.55	SSPr	3.47	1.78	SSPr	2.62	1.57
ISI	1.51	0.78	ISI	2.10	1.44	ISI	2.00	1.70
ISF	1.49	1.33	ISF	1.50	1.07	ISF	1.98	0.74
ISPe	1.85	1.15	ISPe	2.23	1.61	ISPe	2.34	1.32
ISD	2.57	1.58	ISD	2.89	1.77	ISD	1.98	1.09
ISPr	2.50	1.34	ISPr	2.81	1.77	ISPr	1.91	1.10

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.72$; $F_{20/100} = 0.89$; $p > .05$

<u>City Segment</u>								
<u>Victim Present (N=14)</u>			<u>Victim Absent (N=33)</u>			<u>Mixed (N=15)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	1.74	0.83	SCI	3.16	2.08	SCI	2.17	1.92
SCF	1.94	1.40	SCF	1.95	1.64	SCF	2.47	1.66
SCPe	2.31	2.04	SCPe	3.45	2.03	SCPe	2.90	1.94
SCD	1.53	0.96	SCD	1.86	1.41	SCD	1.59	0.99
SCPr	2.95	2.24	SCPr	3.87	2.22	SCPr	2.84	1.54
ICI	2.44	1.78	ICI	2.44	1.23	ICI	2.56	1.96
ICF	1.69	1.53	ICF	1.52	1.52	ICF	1.43	0.84
ICPe	1.38	0.89	ICPe	1.76	1.63	ICPe	1.85	1.26
ICD	1.83	1.46	ICD	1.93	1.62	ICD	1.05	0.70
ICPr	1.53	1.15	ICPr	2.38	1.75	ICPr	1.89	1.13

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.68$; $F_{20/100} = 1.05$; $p > .05$

TABLE 72

Means, Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Group and Individual Offense Types for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>					
<u>Group (N=56)</u>			<u>Individual (N=27)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	3.02	1.36	SPI	2.68	1.50
SPF	2.72	1.34	SPF	2.64	1.49
SPPe	3.00	1.52	SPPe	2.81	1.87
SPD	2.10	1.18	SPD	2.00	1.32
SPPr	2.16	1.24	SPPr	2.30	1.69
IPI	2.50	1.54	IPI	2.30	1.73
IPF	2.01	1.24	IPF	2.09	1.31
IPPe	2.47	1.27	IPPe	2.16	1.41
IPD	2.27	1.30	IPD	2.24	1.42
IPPr	2.05	1.35	IPPr	1.78	1.13

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.95$; $F_{10/72} = 0.34$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>					
<u>Group (N=56)</u>			<u>Individual (N=27)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.42	0.85	SFI	1.55	0.99
SFF	2.03	1.25	SFF	1.50	1.11
SFPe	1.76	1.17	SFPe	1.62	0.93
SFD	4.06	1.34	SFD	3.77	1.59
SFPr	4.15	1.54	SFPr	4.16	1.81
IFI	2.26	1.30	IFI	2.32	1.57
IFF	2.38	1.15	IFF	2.27	1.32
IFPe	2.72	1.39	IFPe	3.25	2.05
IFD	3.20	1.49	IFD	2.83	1.84
IFPr	2.84	1.48	IFPr	2.47	1.65

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.89$; $F_{10/72} = 0.88$; $p > .05$

TABLE 72 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>					
<u>Group (N=56)</u>			<u>Individual (N=27)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.37	1.77	SSI	1.51	1.21
SSF	3.05	1.65	SSF	2.38	1.76
SSPe	2.66	1.67	SSPe	2.30	1.43
SSD	2.24	1.44	SSD	1.92	1.25
SSPr	2.72	1.66	SSPr	2.73	1.75
ISI	1.87	1.27	ISI	2.09	1.61
ISF	1.62	0.98	ISF	1.71	1.34
ISPe	2.27	1.43	ISPe	1.92	1.17
ISD	2.71	1.59	ISD	2.10	1.50
ISPr	2.56	1.56	ISPr	2.28	1.28
Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.76$; $F_{10/72} = 2.27$; $p < .05$					
Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.91$; $F_{5/77} = 1.53$; $p > .05$					
Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.86$; $F_{5/77} = 2.53$; $p < .05$					
<u>City Segment</u>					
<u>Group (N=56)</u>			<u>Individual (N=27)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	2.41	1.89	SCI	1.98	1.74
SCF	1.88	1.35	SCF	2.08	1.35
SCPe	2.84	1.95	SCPe	2.15	1.38
SCD	1.59	1.08	SCD	2.08	1.59
SCPr	3.17	2.15	SCPr	3.06	2.01
ICI	2.37	1.45	ICI	2.49	1.39
ICF	1.56	1.28	ICF	1.70	1.44
ICPe	1.56	1.24	ICPe	1.94	1.42
ICD	1.49	1.35	ICD	1.48	1.57
ICPr	2.10	1.51	ICPr	1.80	1.15
Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.83$; $F_{10/72} = 1.41$; $p > .05$					

TABLE 73

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Group and Individual
Offense Types on All Individual School Factors

Factor		ISI	ISF	ISPe	ISD	ISPr
Group	$\bar{X}$	1.87	1.12	2.27	2.71	2.56
	S.D.	1.27	0.98	1.43	1.59	1.56
Individual	$\bar{X}$	2.09	1.71	1.92	2.10	2.28
	S.D.	1.61	1.34	1.17	1.50	1.28
R^2_{FM}		.006	.001	.015	.032	.008
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/81}$		0.46	0.07	1.36	2.91	0.61
p		p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 74

Means, Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Utilitarian-
Non-utilitarian and Mixed Offense Types for
Multivariate Analyses of Variance

Peer Segment								
Utilitarian (N=21)			Non-utilitarian (N=18)			Mixed (N=27)		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	2.76	1.31	SPI	2.81	1.41	SPI	3.30	1.74
SPF	2.72	1.48	SPF	3.12	1.23	SPF	2.60	1.59
SPPe	2.80	1.58	SPPe	3.25	1.82	SPPe	2.81	1.52
SPD	2.48	1.27	SPD	2.09	1.21	SPD	1.89	1.25
SPPr	1.75	1.02	SPPr	2.65	1.56	SPPr	1.94	1.23
IPI	3.11	1.64	IPI	1.84	1.00	IPI	2.52	1.78
IPF	1.88	1.06	IPF	2.17	1.41	IPF	1.93	1.22
IPPe	2.36	1.29	IPPe	1.99	1.18	IPPe	2.84	1.39
IPD	2.33	1.27	IPD	2.40	1.31	IPD	2.23	1.24
IPPr	1.89	1.58	IPPr	2.20	1.21	IPPr	1.95	1.17

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.56$; $F_{20/108} = 1.78$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.71$; $F_{10/118} = 2.19$; $p < .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.74$; $F_{10/118} = 1.94$; $p < .05$

Family Segment								
Utilitarian (N=21)			Non-utilitarian (N=18)			Mixed (N=27)		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.38	1.08	SFI	1.30	0.91	SFI	1.27	0.66
SFF	1.72	1.51	SFF	2.21	1.12	SFF	1.72	1.05
SFPe	1.68	1.35	SFPe	1.84	0.98	SFPe	1.88	1.13
SFD	4.30	1.54	SFD	4.25	1.27	SFD	3.65	1.55
SFPr	4.43	1.32	SFPr	3.92	1.73	SFPr	4.25	1.66
IFI	2.09	1.23	IFI	2.41	1.58	IFI	2.16	1.57
IFF	1.97	1.16	IFF	2.38	1.29	IFF	2.20	1.42
IFPe	2.35	1.19	IFPe	2.85	1.58	IFPe	2.50	1.62
IFD	3.65	1.56	IFD	3.26	1.23	IFD	2.48	1.28
IFPr	2.89	1.63	IFPr	1.84	1.55	IFPr	2.34	1.32

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.66$; $F_{20/108} = 1.25$; $p > .05$

TABLE 74 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>								
<u>Utilitarian (N=21)</u>			<u>Non-utilitarian (N=18)</u>			<u>Mixed (N=27)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.32	1.79	SSI	2.02	1.61	SSI	2.55	2.03
SSF	3.01	2.01	SSF	3.06	1.77	SSF	2.98	1.95
SSPe	2.67	1.83	SSPe	2.92	1.68	SSPe	2.68	1.95
SSD	2.53	1.80	SSD	2.26	1.35	SSD	2.05	1.25
SSPr	3.02	1.89	SSPr	3.62	1.84	SSPr	2.61	1.41
ISI	1.97	1.08	ISI	1.64	1.34	ISI	1.94	1.67
ISF	1.53	1.17	ISF	1.63	1.16	ISF	1.67	0.98
ISPe	1.89	1.26	ISPe	2.13	1.10	ISPe	2.33	1.70
ISD	3.22	1.74	ISD	2.41	1.62	ISD	2.08	1.32
ISPr	2.64	1.93	ISPr	2.63	1.53	ISPr	2.22	1.24

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.71$; $F_{20/108} = 0.99$; $p > .05$

<u>City Segment</u>								
<u>Utilitarian (N=21)</u>			<u>Non-utilitarian (N=18)</u>			<u>Mixed (N=27)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	3.06	1.99	SCI	1.99	1.58	SCI	2.64	1.95
SCF	2.55	1.80	SCF	1.52	1.16	SCF	2.28	1.55
SCPe	3.30	2.38	SCPe	3.03	1.43	SCPe	2.90	2.01
SCD	1.68	1.12	SCD	1.80	1.07	SCD	1.74	1.39
SCPr	3.70	2.37	SCPr	3.85	1.84	SCPr	2.81	1.92
ICI	2.61	1.46	ICI	2.55	1.43	ICI	2.17	1.70
ICF	1.81	1.58	ICF	1.54	1.17	ICF	1.39	1.35
ICPe	1.62	1.15	ICPe	1.90	1.66	ICPe	1.45	1.39
ICD	2.15	1.62	ICD	1.57	1.77	ICD	1.50	0.95
ICPr	2.31	1.65	ICPr	2.27	1.62	ICPr	1.64	1.27

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.64$; $F_{20/108} = 1.36$; $p > .05$

TABLE 75
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Utilitarian, Non-utilitarian
and Mixed Offense Types on All Social Peer Factors

Factor		SPI	SPF	SPPe	SPD	SPPr
Utilt.	$\bar{X}$	2.76	2.72	2.80	2.48	1.75
	S.D.	1.31	1.48	1.58	1.27	1.02
Non-Utilt.	$\bar{X}$	2.81	3.12	3.25	2.09	2.65
	S.D.	1.41	1.23	1.82	1.21	1.56
Mixed	$\bar{X}$	3.30	2.60	2.81	1.89	1.94
	S.D.	1.74	1.59	1.52	1.25	1.23
R^2_{FM}		.025	.024	.014	.032	.064
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{2/63}$		0.85	0.81	0.50	1.16	2.27
p		p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 76

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Utilitarian, Non-utilitarian and Mixed Offense Types on All Individual Peer Factors

Factor		IPi	IPF	IPPe	IPD	IPPr
Utilt.	$\bar{X}$	3.11	1.88	2.36	2.33	1.89
	S.D.	1.64	1.06	1.29	1.27	1.58
Non-Utilt.	$\bar{X}$	1.84	2.17	1.99	2.40	2.20
	S.D.	1.00	1.41	1.18	1.31	1.21
Mixed	$\bar{X}$	2.52	1.93	2.84	2.23	1.95
	S.D.	1.78	1.22	1.39	1.24	1.17
R^2_{FM}		.077	.002	.101	.002	.006
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{2/63}$		2.77	0.06	3.71	0.06	0.18
p		p>.05	p>.05	p<.05	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 77
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Utilitarian-
Non-utilitarian-Mixed Offenses and Age Groups

Factor		IPPe	Factor		IPPe
Utilt./Young	$\bar{X}$	1.88	Utilt./Old	$\bar{X}$	3.00
	S.D.	1.03		S.D.	1.24
Non-utilt./Young	$\bar{X}$	2.17	Non-utilt./Old	$\bar{X}$	1.84
	S.D.	1.30		S.D.	0.99
Mixed/Young	$\bar{X}$	2.91	Mixed/Old	$\bar{X}$	2.75
	S.D.	1.45		S.D.	1.29

$R^2_{FM} = .041$; $R^2_{RM} = .001$; $F_{4/60} = 0.66$; $p > .05$

TABLE 78

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Utilitarian-
Non-utilitarian-Mixed Offenses and Socio-economic Status Groups

Factor		IPPe
Utilt./Low	$\bar{X}$	2.28
	S.D.	1.30
Non-utilt./Low	$\bar{X}$	2.10
	S.D.	0.92
Mixed/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.67
	S.D.	0.71
Utilt./Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.22
	S.D.	1.24
Non-utilt./Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.32
	S.D.	1.46
Mixed/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.93
	S.D.	1.31
Utilt./High	$\bar{X}$	2.19
	S.D.	1.20
Non-utilt./High	$\bar{X}$	2.19
	S.D.	1.15
Mixed/High	$\bar{X}$	2.25
	S.D.	1.17

$R^2_{FM} = .080$; $R^2_{RM} = .012$; $F_{6/52} = 0.64$; $p > .05$

TABLE 79

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Utilitarian-
Non-utilitarian-Mixed Offenses and IQ Groups

Factor		IPPe
Utilt./Low	$\bar{X}$	1.80
	S.D.	1.70
Non-utilt./Low	$\bar{X}$	2.33
	S.D.	1.20
Mixed/Low	$\bar{X}$	2.65
	S.D.	1.54
Utilt./Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.44
	S.D.	1.24
Non-utilt./Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.24
	S.D.	1.22
Mixed/Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.77
	S.D.	1.32
Utilt./High	$\bar{X}$	2.48
	S.D.	1.35
Non-utilt./High	$\bar{X}$	2.51
	S.D.	1.32
Mixed/High	$\bar{X}$	2.40
	S.D.	1.31

$R^2_{FM} = .057$; $R^2_{RM} = .004$; $F_{6/53} = 0.47$; $p > .05$

TABLE 80

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Utilitarian-
Non-utilitarian-Mixed Offenses and Stability Groups

Factor		IPPe	Factor		IPPe
Utilt./Stab.	$\bar{X}$	2.47	Utilt./Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	1.87
	S.D.	1.37		S.D.	0.62
Non-utilt./Stab.	$\bar{X}$	2.00	Non-utilt./Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	1.50
	S.D.	1.21		S.D.	0.30
Mixed/Stab.	$\bar{X}$	2.62	Mixed/Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	2.50
	S.D.	1.28		S.D.	1.50

$R^2_{FM} = .053$; $R^2_{RM} = .014$; $F_{4/51} = 0.54$; $p > .05$

TABLE 81

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Utilitarian-
Non-utilitarian-Mixed Offenses and Family Composition Groups

Factor		IPPe
Utilt./Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	2.63
	S.D.	1.23
Non-utilt./Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	2.55
	S.D.	1.57
Mixed/Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.12
	S.D.	1.42
Utilt./Step- parent	$\bar{X}$	1.90
	S.D.	0.30
Non-utilt./Step- parent	$\bar{X}$	1.00
	S.D.	0.24
Mixed/Step- parent	$\bar{X}$	2.53
	S.D.	0.52
Utilt./One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.39
	S.D.	1.32
Non-utilt./One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.41
	S.D.	1.27
Mixed/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.55
	S.D.	1.39

$R^2_{FM} = .108$; $R^2_{RM} = .002$; $F_{6/52} = 1.00$; $p > .05$

TABLE 82

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for Utilitarian-
Non-utilitarian-Mixed Offenses and Ethnic Groups

Factor		IPPe	Factor		IPPe
Utilt./Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.46	Utilt./Spanish	$\bar{X}$	1.80
	S.D.	1.14		S.D.	1.70
Non-utilt./Anglo	$\bar{X}$	1.84	Non-utilt./Spanish	$\bar{X}$	2.50
	S.D.	1.13		S.D.	1.08
Mixed/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.86	Mixed/Spanish	$\bar{X}$	2.72
	S.D.	1.34		S.D.	1.48

$R^2_{FM} = .196$; $R^2_{RM} = .002$; $F_{4/60} = 3.69$; $p < .01$

TABLE 83

Means, Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Criminal-CHIN
Offense Types for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>					
<u>Criminal (N=57)</u>			<u>CHIN (N=27)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	2.88	1.35	SPI	2.72	1.41
SPF	2.76	1.45	SPF	2.58	1.39
SPPe	2.90	1.62	SPPe	2.97	1.67
SPD	2.18	1.26	SPD	1.89	1.07
SPPr	2.12	1.33	SPPr	2.45	1.56
IFI	2.39	1.53	IFI	2.36	1.66
IFF	1.98	1.21	IFF	2.27	1.36
IFPe	2.38	1.34	IFPe	2.32	1.36
IFD	2.34	1.31	IFD	2.10	1.39
IFPr	2.01	1.29	IFPr	1.72	1.11

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.91$; $F_{10/73} = 0.76$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>					
<u>Criminal (N=57)</u>			<u>CHIN (N=27)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.33	0.90	SFI	1.71	0.86
SFF	1.83	1.24	SFF	1.73	1.36
SFFe	1.69	1.12	SFFe	1.63	0.97
SFD	4.05	1.53	SFD	3.96	1.24
SFPr	4.17	1.73	SFPr	4.31	1.47
IFI	2.12	1.34	IFI	2.50	1.53
IFF	2.16	1.28	IFF	2.68	1.20
IFPe	2.51	1.48	IFPe	3.73	1.88
IFD	3.10	1.48	IFD	2.92	1.90
IFPr	2.70	1.50	IFPr	2.58	1.69

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.83$; $F_{10/73} = 1.53$; $p > .05$

CONTINUED

5 OF 6

According to Cooley and Lohnes (1962) the test of the null hypothesis employs Wilks' lambda which is defined as follows:

$$\Lambda = |W| / |T| ,$$

where W is the pooled within-groups deviation score cross-products matrix and T is the total sample deviation score cross-products matrix.

The elements of the W and T matrices are defined as follows:

$$w_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^g \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{N_g} (x_{ikn} - \bar{x}_{ik}) (x_{jkn} - \bar{x}_{jk}) \right\}$$

$$t_{ij} = \sum_{n=1}^N (x_{in} - \bar{x}_i) (x_{jn} - \bar{x}_j) ,$$

where g = number of groups, N_g = number of subjects in group g, and i and j run from 1 to p, where p = the number of variables¹¹ (p. 61).

The symbol |W| denotes the determinant of matrix W; likewise for |T|.

As |T| increases relative to |W| the ratio decreases in size with an accompanying increase in the confidence with which the null hypothesis is rejected. In testing the significance of Λ the F approximation developed by Rao (1952) is used. This is as follows:

$$F_{ms}^{2r} + 2\lambda = \left(\frac{1-y}{y} \right) \left(\frac{ms + 2\lambda}{2r} \right) ,$$

where $s = \sqrt{(p^2 q^2 - 4)/(p^2 + q^2 - 5)}$, $q = g-1$, g = number of groups, p = number of variables; $m = n-(p+q+1)/2$, $n = N-1$, N = total number of subjects; $\lambda = -(pq-2)/4$; $r = pq/2$; and $y = \Lambda^{1/s}$.¹¹

¹¹Where only two subject groups are involved the procedure is to use Hotelling's (1931, pp. 360-378) T^2 which is a generalization of student's t test, and is a special case for which Wilks' lambda is applicable.

For those segments in which a significant F is not obtained the analysis of socio-economic status is stopped at this point. However, if a significant F is obtained for one or more of the segments the second stage of the analysis is undertaken in only those segments for which the null hypothesis is rejected.

Stage Two: The second stage is again an effort to specify where differences on specific types of factors may possibly be found without having to examine each individual factor category. The question here is: "Given that an overall difference on factor scores among low, medium and high social status delinquents exists within a certain segment, is this difference on the social side, the individual side, or in both of these areas?" A multivariate analysis of variance (as described above) on the five types of factors (Instigators, Prohibitors, etc.) on the individual side and on the social side is performed. If the null hypothesis is rejected for one or both of these the third stage of the analysis is undertaken for the area in which differences are indicated.

Stage Three: In the third stage of the analysis interest is directed to three points. First, to insuring that differences on individual factor categories which may be found among types of delinquents are not due simply to general differences existing in all juveniles. Second, to determining for which individual factor categories a difference among types of delinquents exists. Third, to determining whether differences among delinquents classified according to a given independent variable remain when other independent variables are controlled.

Analyses in this stage employ data from both delinquent and non-

delinquent subject groups, and are based on the multiple linear regression techniques developed by Bottenberg and Ward (1963, pp. 22-). In general these techniques involve the comparison of the accuracy of two predictions to the criterion variable (Y), one prediction based on the full model (FM) or the inclusion of the "critical" variable, and the other based on a restricted model (RM) or the exclusion of the "critical" variable (actually the squared multiple correlation coefficients of each equation are compared). In the present study the criterion variable is always the score on some individual factor category. Dummy variables are used to indicate a given subject's position with regard to the relevant independent variable (e.g., assigning a 1 if the subject has a high I.Q. and a 0 otherwise). If the inclusion of the "critical" variable results in significantly better prediction this is regarded as an indication of differences in the mean scores on the criterion variable between the groups classified according to the "critical" variable.

The test for the significance of differences between two squared multiple correlation coefficients uses the F-ratio:

$$F = \frac{(R_{FM}^2 - R_{RM}^2)/(df_1)}{(1 - R_{FM}^2)/(df_2)},$$

where df_1 is the difference between the number of linearly independent vectors in the full model and in the restricted model; and, df_2 is the number of subjects minus the number of linearly independent vectors in the full model.

Additional independent variables can be controlled through the application of dummy variables to cross-classified subjects (e.g., assigning a 1 if the subject has a high I.Q. and is in the high social

status group and a 0 otherwise).

An example of the analyses performed for a given Independent variable will serve to illustrate the analytic procedures. Assuming that the first stage of the analysis indicated an overall difference between high and low I.Q. delinquents with regard to the ten factor categories in the School segment, the second stage of the analysis would then consist of two multivariate analyses of variance; one on the Individual School factors and one on the Social School factors. Assuming that the second stage of the analysis indicated an overall difference between high and low I.Q. delinquents for the five Individual School factor categories, but not for the Social School factors, the third stage of the analysis would consist of the following steps for each of the five Individual School factors (starting with Individual School Instigators): (1) An effort to insure that differences between I.Q. levels are unique to delinquents and do not simply reflect some general difference associated with I.Q. levels for all juveniles. The null hypothesis is that there is no difference between delinquents and non-delinquents in the low I.Q. group and no difference between delinquents and non-delinquents in the high I.Q. group. The following equations would be employed in testing this hypothesis:

$$FM: ISI = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 + a_4X_4 + e_1 \quad ;$$

$$RM: ISI = b_1W_1 + b_2W_2 + e_2$$

where ISI is the vector of scores on Individual School Instigators; X_1 is 1 if low I.Q. delinquent, 0 otherwise; X_2 is 1 if low I.Q. non-delinquent, 0 otherwise; X_3 is 1 of high I.Q. delinquent, 0 otherwise;

X_4 is 1 if high I.Q. non-delinquent, 0 otherwise; W_1 is 1 if low I.Q., 0 otherwise; W_2 is 1 if high I.Q., 0 otherwise; a_1 and b_1 are appropriate regression weights; and e_1 and e_2 are residual vectors, the differences between the predicted values of ISI and the actual values. The F-ratio discussed above would be employed in comparing R_{FM}^2 and R_{RM}^2 .

The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates that delinquents and non-delinquents at the same I.Q. levels have different mean scores on Individual School Instigators, and thus any differences which may be found in this factor category between high and low I.Q. delinquents must be unique to the delinquent subject group. If the above null hypothesis is rejected the next step of the analysis is performed. (2) An effort to determine whether different types of delinquents, in terms of I.Q. levels, differ from each other on Individual School Instigators. The null hypothesis is that high and low I.Q. delinquents do not differ on Individual School Instigators. The following equations would be employed in testing this hypothesis:

$$FM: ISI = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + e_1 \quad ;$$

$$RM: ISI = a_0U + e_2 \quad ,$$

where X_1 is 1 if high I.Q. delinquent, 0 otherwise; X_2 is 1 if low I.Q. delinquent, 0 otherwise; a_i are appropriate regression weights; e_1 and e_2 are residual vectors; and U is a unit vector. It should be noted that in the case where the restricted model contains only the unit vector, U , R_{RM}^2 is arbitrarily defined as 0 (Bottenberg & Ward,

1963, p. 126).¹²

The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates a significant difference in mean scores on Individual School Instigators between high and low I.Q. delinquents. If the above null hypothesis is rejected the third step of this stage of the analysis is undertaken.

(3) An effort to determine whether the difference between I.Q. levels remains when other independent variables are controlled. For illustrative purposes only one variable (sex) will be controlled, although in the actual analysis an effort will be made to control each of the independent variables.

It should be noted, however, that consideration of a number of variables at the same time is severely limited by the sample size; the situation of having an extremely small N in certain of the cross-classified groups very rapidly arises. When no Ss fell into a given group the analyses for the given variables could not be performed.

In controlling for the sex variable the null hypothesis is that high and low I.Q. delinquent males do not differ from each other and that high and low I.Q. delinquent females do not differ from each other. The following equations would be employed in testing this hypothesis:

$$FM: ISI = a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 + a_4X_4 + e_1 \quad ;$$

$$RM: ISI = b_1W_1 + b_2W_2 + e_2 \quad ,$$

¹²

In this case the appropriate F-ratio is as follows:

$$F = \frac{(R_{FM}^2)/df_1}{(1 - R_{FM}^2)/df_2}$$

where X_1 is 1 if low I.Q. female, 0 otherwise; X_2 is 1 if high I.Q. female, 0 otherwise; X_3 is 1 if low I.Q. male, 0 otherwise; X_4 is 1 if high I.Q. male, 0 otherwise; W_1 is 1 if female, 0 otherwise; W_2 is 1 if male, 0 otherwise; a_1 and b_1 are appropriate regression weights; and e_1 and e_2 are residual vectors. The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates that high and low I.Q. delinquents of the same sex have different mean scores on Individual School Instigators, and thus differences between I.Q. levels remain when the sex variable is controlled.

As mentioned previously, other independent variables and combinations of variables can be controlled through procedures similar to those outlined in step three of the third stage of the analysis.

It should be emphasized that stage three of the analysis, as illustrated above, is only for one of the five factor categories which the first two stages of the analysis indicated as potentially important. In actual practice stage three is performed on each of the five factor categories, or in some cases on all ten of the factor categories, depending on the results of stage one and stage two of the analysis.

VI. RESULTS

Due to the complexity and length of the analysis a summary of results for each independent variable is presented in Tables 2 through 9 of this section. Detailed data regarding each step of the analysis is provided in Appendix E. Summary Tables 2 through 9 are to be interpreted in the following manner. The Fact column indicates each of the 40 factor categories. The Seg column refers to stage I of the analysis, a multivariate analysis of variance on the 10 factors in each of the four segments. The Sou column indicates the source of the factor, either Individual or Social, and refers to stage II of the analysis, a multivariate analysis of variance on each of the two factor sources. The DIS column refers to stage III, step one of the analysis, a regression analysis comparing delinquency status within the various groups of the given independent variable. This was done to insure that differences between independent variable groups of delinquents were not simply a reflection of some general differences common to all adolescents (i.e., differences occurred only among delinquents). A lack of significant findings in this column indicates that the independent variable groups of non-delinquents differ in the same manner as the independent variable groups of delinquents. The fifth column indicates the particular independent variable of interest in the given table. This column refers to stage III, step two of the analysis, a comparison of the factor scores of delinquents who differ on the particular independent variable (i.e., types of offenders or types of offenses). The remaining columns indicate the other vari-

ables whose influence has been controlled. These columns refer to stage III, step three of the analysis, a comparison of types of offenders (as determined by the independent variable of interest) within levels of other variables (e.g., male and female delinquents within age levels). The body of the Tables contain indicators of significance levels, at the various stages and steps of the analysis, for the factor or factors in the corresponding row. A blank at a particular point in a Table indicates a lack of significant findings for the particular factor and stage of analysis. An "S" (significant) indicates a significant difference at the .05 probability level. An "H" (highly significant) indicates a significant difference at the .01 probability level. A "V" (very significant) indicates a significant difference at the .001 probability level. Bracketed letters are used to indicate a significant difference, found by a multivariate analysis of variance, on a number of factors.

The Tables should be, in general, read from left to right. This provides a description of results as the analysis progressed from stage I through stage III, step three. A given factor, or set of factors in the two initial stages of the analysis, may fail to reach significance at any point in the analysis. In general, when a significant difference was not obtained, the analysis for that factor (or set of factors) was terminated. The point at which a significant difference was not obtained is indicated by the occurrence of blank spaces as opposed to the significance indicators.

It should also be noted that in the following discussion of results, Table numbers for the relevant detailed Tables given in Appendix E are provided. These detailed Tables present appropriate

means, standard deviations, R^2 's, degrees of freedom, F-ratios and probability levels for each individual analysis which was performed. The results discussion will be confined to a consideration of only those factors for which significant differences have been found in all stages and steps of the analysis (i.e., when other variables are controlled).

Offender Variables

Classification according to type of offender is based on the following: residential mobility, family composition, sex, age, socio-economic status, intelligence and ethnic group membership. A difference between types of offenders, as determined by one of the above variables, is not considered in the following discussion unless it was found to occur regardless of the influence of each of the other variables. In addition, to insure that differences are not due to the extent of delinquency involvement, it was required that they be independent of the number of offenses committed (as measured by the first-multiple offense variable) before they are considered as substantiated results. Besides the multiple-first distinction no control of type of offense was made with regard to the type of offender variables.

Mobility: Stage I of the analysis yielded no significant differences between residentially stable and mobile delinquents in any of the four segments (see Appendix E, Table 10). The analysis of mobility was consequently terminated after stage I.

Family Composition: Again stage I of the analysis indicated no overall significant differences in any segment (see Appendix E, Table 11). Analysis was thus terminated after the first stage.

Sex: A summary of the analysis on sex is contained in Table 2. Significant differences between male and female delinquents, which held up when the influence of other variables was considered, were found for three factors. These factors were Individual Family Permission, Individual School Facilitation, and Individual City Diversion. Females scored consistently higher than males on Individual Family Permitters and Individual School Facilitators. Males scored consistently higher than females on Individual City Diverters. Details of the analyses performed on sex can be found in Tables 12 through 24 in Appendix E.

Age: A summary of the analysis on age is contained in Table 3. Significant differences between young and old delinquents were obtained for the Social Peer Instigators and the Social Peer Facilitators. These differences were independent of the influence of other variables. Older delinquents scored consistently higher than younger on these two factors. Details of the analyses performed on age are contained in Tables 25 through 35 of Appendix E.

Socio-economic Status: A summary of the analyses on socio-economic status levels is contained in Table 4. Significant differences among low, medium and high socio-economic status levels was found for one factor category, Social Peer Permitters. Differences were obtained on this factor regardless of the influence of other variables. Medium socio-economic status delinquents consistently scored highest. The high socio-economic status group scored second highest and the low status group lowest. Detailed results of the analysis on socio-economic status are presented in Tables 36 through 43 of Appendix E.

TABLE 4 (cont.)

Fact	MVA NOV		DIS	SES	Sex	Age	Control for				
	Sec	Sou					IQ	Stb	Fam	M-F	Eth*
SSI											
SSF											
SSPe											
SSD											
SSPr											
ISI											
ISF											
ISPe											
ISD											
ISPr											
SCI											
SCF											
SCPe											
SCD											
SCPr											
ICI											
ICF											
ICPe											
ICD											
ICPr											

*Analysis of socio-economic status within ethnic groups was not performed because no Ss fell into the high socio-economic status-Spanish group.

Intelligence: A summary of the analyses performed on I.Q. levels is contained in Table 5. Significant differences were found for two factor categories, Social Family Facilitators and Individual School Prohibitors. These differences among I.Q. levels remained when the influence of other variables was controlled. One of the controlled variables did, however, have an effect on the direction of the obtained differences. For Social Family Facilitators the relationship was consistent regardless of other factors. The high I.Q. group always scored highest and the low I.Q. group lowest. For Individual School Prohibitors the relationship was also, in general, a positive one (high I.Q.-high mean factor score, low I.Q.-low mean factor score). One exception to this did occur, however. When stability was considered a positive relationship between I.Q. level and mean factor scores was obtained within the stable group. In the unstable group the medium I.Q. level Ss had the highest mean score and the high I.Q. level Ss the lowest. These findings indicate that the relationship between I.Q. and Individual School Prohibition differs depending on whether it occurs in a residentially stable or unstable group of delinquents.

Thus while significant differences among I.Q. levels on Individual School Prohibitors exist regardless of the effects of other variables, it cannot be assumed that these differences are independent of stability. On the contrary the influence of stability was strong enough to, at least partially, change the direction of the relationship between I.Q. level and mean factor scores although the overall significance of the relationship remained.

TABLE 5 (cont.)

Fact	MVANOV		DIS	IQ	Stb	Fam	Control for				M-F	Eth*
	Seq	Sou					Age	Sex	SES			
SSI	H	]										
SSF												
SSPe												
SSD												
SSPr												
ISI		V	S	S	S	S	S	S				
ISF	S											
ISPe	S											
ISD												
ISPr			V	S	H	H	H	S	H	H		
SCI												
SCF												
SCPe												
SCD												
SCPr												
ICI												
ICF												
ICPe												
ICD												
ICPr												

*Analysis of I.Q. levels within ethnic groups was not performed because no Ss fell into the high I.Q. level-Spanish group.

Detailed results of the analyses performed on I.Q. levels are contained in Tables 44 through 55 of Appendix E.

Ethnic: A summary of the analysis on ethnic group membership is presented in Table 6. Significant differences between Anglo and Spanish-American delinquents were found for Social Peer Permittors and Individual Family Instigators. These differences existed regardless of the influence of other variables, although again certain of the controlled variables caused changes in the direction of the relationship between ethnic group membership and mean factor scores. Anglos scored consistently higher than Spanish on Social Peer Permittors. For Individual Family Instigators Anglos also, in general, scored higher than Spanish. The exception to this occurred when family composition was considered. Anglo Ss coming from families containing either both natural parents or one parent scored higher than Spanish Ss from corresponding family types. However, in the S group coming from families including a step-parent, the Spanish Ss scored higher than the Anglo. The fact that the relative magnitudes of the mean factor scores for Anglo and Spanish Ss in the step-parent families are almost directly reversed from the scores of Ss coming from the other two family composition groups suggests that the presence of a step-parent may have a positive effect (in terms of Individual Family Instigation) in Anglo families and a negative effect in Spanish families.

Detailed results of the analyses performed on ethnic group membership are contained in Tables 56 through 64 of Appendix E.

Analyses performed for the offense type variables are essentially the same as those performed for the offender type variables with

TABLE 6 (cont.)

Fact	MVANOV						Control for				
	Seq	Sou	DIS	Eth	Sex	Age	Stb	Fam	M-F	SES*	IQ*
SSI											
SSF											
SSPe											
SSD											
SSPr											
ISI											
ISF											
ISPe											
ISD											
ISPr											
SCI											
SCF											
SCPe											
SCD											
SCPr											
ICI											
ICF											
ICPe											
ICD											
ICPr											

*Analysis of ethnic group within both socio-economic status and I.Q. levels was not performed because no Ss fell into either the Spanish-high socio-economic status group or the Spanish-high I.Q. group.

the one exception being that step one of stage III (the comparison of delinquents and non-delinquents within independent variable categories) of each set of analyses is omitted because presumably the non-delinquents have not committed any offenses. The summary tables of results for the offense type variables are also identical to those of the offender type variables except that the DIS column (delinquency status) is omitted because differences among offense types are, by definition, unique to delinquents.

Offense Variables

A difference between types of offenses was required to occur independently of the influences of the offender variables (sex, age, etc.), and of the influence of extent of delinquency. The latter influence is automatically controlled through the offense classification procedure since this procedure requires the occurrence of a number of offenses before a given individual can be categorized as to offense type. Thus all differences for offense types are for multiple offenses. No control of one offense type on another was performed.

Criminal, Conflict and Mixed Offenses: Stage I of the analysis indicated no significant overall differences in any segment among these three offense types (see Table 65 in Appendix E). Consequently the analysis of these three offense types was terminated after stage I.

Victim Present, Victim Absent and Mixed Offense Types: Again stage I of the analysis indicated a lack of significant overall

differences in any segment (see Table 66 in Appendix E). Thus the analysis was again terminated after stage 1.

Group and Individual Offenses: Stage I of the analysis yielded a significant overall difference for the School segment ($F_{10/72} = 2.27; p < .05$). Stage II of the analysis yielded a significant overall difference for Individual sources within the School segment ($F_{5/77} = 2.53; p < .05$). However, the comparison of group and individual offenses on each Individual School factor indicated a lack of significant differences for any one factor. Thus the analysis on this variable was terminated at that point.

Detailed results of the analyses are presented in Tables 67 and 68 of Appendix E.

Utilitarian, Non-utilitarian and Mixed Offenses: A summary of the results of the analysis on this variable is presented in Table 7. Significant differences among these three offense types were found for Individual Peer Permitters; however, when the influences of other variables were considered the differences disappeared. Details of the analyses for this variable can be found in Tables 69 through 77 of Appendix E.

Criminal and CHIN Offenses: A summary of results of the analysis on this variable is presented in Table 8. Significant differences between criminal and CHIN offenses were found for Social City Instigators and Social City Permitters. Differences on these two factors remained significant when the influence of other variables was controlled; however, certain of the controlled variables had an effect on the direction of the differences. For the Social City Permitters the Ss committing criminal offenses scored consistently higher than those

TABLE 7 (cont.)

Fact	MVANOV					Control for				
	Seq	Sou	Utl	Eth	Age	SES	IQ	Stb	Fam	Sex*
SSI										
SSF										
SSPe										
SSD										
SSPr										
ISI										
ISF										
ISPe										
ISD										
ISPr										
SCI										
SCF										
SCPe										
SCD										
SCPr										
ICI										
ICF										
ICPe										
ICD										
ICPr										

*Analysis of utilitarian-non-utilitarian-mixed offense types within sex group was not performed because no Ss fell into the non-utilitarian-female group.

committing CHIN offenses. For Social City Instigators those committing criminal offenses also generally scored higher; however, this was reversed within the male group. Male CHIN offenders scored higher than male criminal offenders. Details of the analyses on criminal and CHIN offense types are presented in Tables 78 through 87 of Appendix E.

Multiple and First Offenses: A summary of results of the analysis on this variable is presented in Table 9. Significant differences between multiple and first offenses were found for Social City Diverters and Individual City Diverters. These differences remained after the effects of other variables were controlled. For both of the factors Ss committing first offenses scored consistently higher than those committing a number of offenses. Details of the analyses on this variable are presented in Tables 88 through 97 of Appendix E.

VII. DISCUSSION

An important difficulty arises in relating the present results to previous ones because the multiple-factor scheme used in this study is quite different from any prior theoretical bases. Consequently before any comparison of the present and other findings can be made the other findings must be placed in the framework of the multiple-factor scheme. The problem arises in "translating" previous work into the multiple-factor concepts from information provided in study reports. Errors in this "translation" process may result in incorrect identification of other findings in terms of the multiple-factor scheme and thus in misleading comparisons between the present work and prior studies. This cautionary note should be kept in mind when considering the discussion of results.

Offender Variables

Mobility: Previous work regarding residential stability is quite limited. Several studies have suggested a relationship between residential stability and delinquency, although there has been no work directly comparing stable and unstable delinquents. Savitz (1962) reports that stable adolescents evidence a higher delinquency rate than migrants. Redl and Wineman (1962) report extreme mobility in the group of disturbed delinquents they dealt with, and Kvaraceus (1945) reports that mobility is more common among delinquents than among non-delinquents. None of these studies attribute the reported relationships to any particular influence. Nye (1958) maintains that mobility results in a reduction in social controls, particularly in

the Peer and City segments. The present work found no indications of such a reduction of controls among residentially unstable delinquents. Reuteran (1967a) reports that mobile delinquents score higher on Social City Diversion than stable delinquents. The present work does not support this difference.

Family Composition: Considerable work has indicated a relationship between broken homes and delinquency (Barnes & Teeters, 1959; Monahan, 1962; Nye, 1958; Sutherland & Cressey, 1955; and Toby, 1962). This is generally attributed to a reduction in Social Family Prohibitors within broken homes. The relationship between broken homes and delinquency is also generally believed to be differentially affected by the sex of the juvenile. Females in broken homes are believed to experience a greater reduction in Social Family Prohibition than males (Sutherland & Cressey, 1955; and Toby, 1962). No evidence regarding differences among delinquents coming from various types of homes is available. Thus the lack of differences found in the present study cannot be considered in light of other findings, although an earlier study using the multiple-factor scheme also found no differences among delinquents coming from different family situations (Reuteran, 1967a). Two factors should be noted with regard to this lack of differences: First, the present distinction was between physically broken and intact homes, not psychologically broken. The latter type of distinction, encompassing a virtually complete breakdown of relations between parents, may actually be more important than the physical absence of one parent. Second, in the present study interest is focused on juveniles who have already become delinquent. Thus while the influence of broken homes may be important in initially

producing delinquency, once it occurs the influences from different types of home situations may either tend to become similar or, if they do remain different, may become less important.

Sex: Present findings indicate that female delinquents are higher than males on Individual Family Permittors. This result is congruent with previous work. Cooper (1957) suggests that the number of delinquency petitions filed on females for "beyond parental control" may indicate that female delinquents have greater home related problems than males. Kvaraceus (1945) found that family-child conflict was more common for female delinquents than for males. While such conflict itself need not necessarily be considered an Individual Permittor, it could certainly produce a home atmosphere which would make the adolescent unhappy and dissatisfied. Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) found the home situation of females to be more tense with the result that they were more hostile toward the home and felt "picked on" to a greater extent than males.

While the present study resulted in no sex differences for Social Family Instigation, Permission or Diversion, Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) report that female delinquents are more rejected by their parents and that the parents of females give less co-operation to law enforcement agencies. Also females have more chores to do in the home and parents participate more in their recreational activities.

Present results indicate that female delinquents score higher than males on Individual School Facilitation. Prior studies make no mention of differences between males and females for this particular influence. Other studies do, however, report differences on Social

School Diverters and Social School Instigators which were not found in the present one. Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) report that females engage in school sponsored leisure activities to a greater extent than males. Also females have poorer relationships with schoolmates and teachers than males.

The present study found that males score higher than females on Individual City Diverters. Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) and Reuterman (1967a) report similar findings.

Summary of Sex Differences: The brief summary sections provided at the end of the discussion of each independent variable are based on the Experience Survey items used as measures of the various factors on which significant differences were found for the given variable. The summaries are intended to provide a composite characterization of the types of delinquents.

Female delinquents can be characterized as being dissatisfied with their home situation, often angry with the general course of events at home, often feeling that they cannot stand to remain at home and often rejecting of parental interest in their affairs. They also feel that they are smarter than other pupils in school and better able to "get away with" forbidden activities. They have little interest in organized recreation and other types of formalized leisure activities and often are unable to find ways of occupying their time in the neighborhood in which they live.

In contrast, male delinquents are relatively satisfied with their home situation, they are not often angry with events there, and do not have a strong feeling of wanting to escape from home and family. Males do not regard themselves as smarter than their class-

mates in school and do not feel that they are better able to "get away with things". They are more interested in organized recreation and activities and can find ways to occupy their spare time in their immediate neighborhood.

Age: Older delinquents were found to score higher on Social Peer Instigators and Social Peer Facilitators. Reuterman (1967a) reports a similar trend for Facilitators. No other evidence is available from other sources regarding similar differences between younger and older delinquents. One interpretation of the present finding is that the peers of an older delinquent are better able, because of their age, to engage in activities bordering on illegality. They may also be less subject to adult pressures to "get along with your friends" and thus may tend to be more aggressive toward each other. They may also, by virtue of their age and presumably wider experience, be in a better position to provide opportunities to engage in delinquent activity. In addition they may be better integrated into the teen-age culture with its norm of "don't tell adults".

Summary of Age Differences: Older delinquents are characterized by being subject to pressures from peers to engage in "semi-legal" behavior and behavior which is likely to lead to delinquent activities. They are more likely to do things just because their friends do them. Their peers also often "have it in for them" and "push them too far". The peer group of older delinquents appears to provide considerable opportunity (even to the point of specific instruction) for them to engage in delinquent behavior. The peer group members often get away with illegal behavior themselves, and they offer protection to those who violate the law by promising not

to Inform.

Younger delinquents are subject to quite different peer group influences. The pressure to engage in "semi-legal" behavior is low and relationships within the peer group are more harmonious. Little opportunity is provided by the peer group for younger delinquents to engage in illegal activities.

Socio-economic Status: Application of the multiple-factor scheme to socio-economic status levels resulted in significant differences on the Social Peer Permittor factor category. Medium social status level delinquents scored highest, high status level delinquents next highest and the low status group lowest. These results are somewhat unexpected because most previous work on differences among social status levels of delinquents would suggest that in general a negative relationship should exist between any pro-delinquency influence and social status level and a positive relationship for any anti-delinquency influence. Present results indicate a curvilinear relationship with the medium and higher status groups scoring higher on a pro-delinquency influence.

One explanation of the present results is suggested by England (1964). He maintains that middle status delinquents are peer oriented for a longer period of time than are low status ones, and that the middle status reject adult values while lower status reject adult institutions such as school. It may be that the present findings are a result of the rejection of adult values in the middle status peer group. The rejection of the value system of the group of which an individual will soon become a member may lead to a general feeling of alienation. This alienated, rejected feeling on the part

of the peers of the middle social status delinquent may account for the high Social Peer Permittor scores found in the present study. Another consideration in interpreting the present results is that they may be due to the presence of a "hippie" orientation within middle status delinquents. Several of the Social Peer Permittor items are quite similar to certain aspects of the "hippie" value system. This interpretation, however, necessitates two assumptions; first, that elements of the "hippie" culture have penetrated downward to the relatively lower age levels of adolescence, and second, that the "hippie" culture is a more powerful influence in the middle and upper socio-economic levels than in the lower level.

It should be noted that the present findings do not agree with Cohen's (1955) theory of lower and middle status delinquency. Cohen maintains that lower status delinquents encounter a major problem of status deprivation in the contemporary middle status school system. Accordingly lower status delinquents would be expected to evidence greater pro-delinquency factors in the School segment. Cohen postulates that middle status delinquent males on the other hand encounter a major problem in the family because of the female centered socialization process of middle status families. Thus middle status delinquents should score high on pro-delinquency influences in the Family segment. The present results support neither of these propositions.

A number of other differences among socio-economic status levels of delinquents not found in the present study have been reported elsewhere. Short, Rivera and Marshall (1964) report that lower status levels rate teachers, police and adult neighbors less favorably than the middle status group. This would suggest the existence of higher

Instigation in these areas for the lower status group. Reiss (1952) suggests that lower status delinquents show considerable rejection of school. This would suggest the existence of higher instigation and possibly lower individual prohibition. Kvaraceus and Miller (1959) have postulated extensive differences between middle status and lower status in neighborhood and family structure. Thus differences between middle and lower groups on the social factors in these segments would be expected. Toughness is more highly valued among lower status delinquents than middle status (Short & Strodtbeck, 1965), thus individual peer instigation would be expected to be higher among lower status delinquents. Sherif and Sherif (1964) and Hollingshead (1961) report that school and city diversion is greater in the middle status levels than in the lower for both delinquents and non-delinquents. A considerable amount of evidence suggests that pro-delinquency influences in the school should be greater for lower status juveniles (Becker, 1952; Deutsch, 1964; Gottlieb, 1964; McCandless, 1961; Moore, 1964; Pearl, 1965; and Rich, 1960). The present results do not indicate this for delinquents.

Summary of Socio-economic Status Differences: Low socio-economic status delinquents can be characterized as being exposed to very few attitudes permissive of delinquency on the part of their peers. The peer group does not feel that others are not interested in them or that what they do is no one else's concern. Also they are concerned about others. Upper socio-economic status delinquents are exposed to somewhat more alienated attitudes from their peers. The peer group of middle socio-economic status delinquents has a pronounced feeling of alienation. The peer group feels that other

people are not interested in them, or for that matter in anyone, and that what they do is not the concern of anyone else. They themselves have little concern for or interest in others.

Intelligence: Delinquents coming from different I.Q. levels have different mean scores on Social Family Facilitators and Individual School Prohibitors. For Social Family Facilitators a positive relationship exists between mean factor score and I.Q. level. It appears that higher I.Q. delinquents are exposed to greater opportunity in the home or family situation to engage in delinquent behavior. There is an absence of other evidence relevant to this relationship. Reuterman (1967a) reports that low I.Q. delinquents score higher on Individual Family Instigators. This was not found in the present study.

In general for Individual School Prohibitors high I.Q. delinquents score highest and low I.Q. delinquents lowest. This was also found in an earlier study using the multiple-factor scheme (Reuterman, 1967a). However, one exception to this did occur; within the mobile group the medium I.Q. group scored highest and the high I.Q. group lowest. This reversal of mean scores may be a result of the medium I.Q. group having less difficulty integrating themselves into a new school and thus being better able to identify with the school and teachers. The general positive relationship between I.Q. level and Individual School Prohibition is not unexpected. It can probably be regarded as a reflection of a lack of interest in and identification with the school and its authorities due to a higher degree of incompetence and failure.

In an earlier study which employed the present multiple-factor scheme Reuterman (1967) found that low I.Q. delinquents scored higher on Social Peer Facilitators, Individual School Permitters, Social School Facilitators and Individual School Instigators. They also were lower on Individual School Diverters and Individual City Diverters. However, in this study there was no control for the influence of other variables. In the present study a difference was also found on Individual School Instigators (see Table 5, p. 59), but when the influence of socio-economic status and multiple-first offense was controlled the difference disappeared.

Other work on the I.Q. levels of delinquents is mainly concerned with the relationship between I.Q. and type of offense (Cartwright & Howard, 1960; and Shulman, 1954), and thus is not relevant to the present discussion.

Summary of I.Q. Differences: Low I.Q. delinquents can in general be characterized as being exposed to less opportunity to engage in illegal activities in the home or by other members of the family. Parents do not make it easy for them to "get into trouble", do not take them to establishments where they are likely to be able to engage in illegal activities and do not often back them up against other authorities. However, lower I.Q. delinquents are unfavorable to school, and do not identify with the school or teachers there. They do not regard school as a means of achieving their goals.

Medium I.Q. delinquents are exposed to some opportunity to engage in illegal activities by their families. Parents sometimes make it easy for them to "get away with things", and sometimes will back them up against other authorities. Medium I.Q. delinquents

demonstrate some favorableness toward their schools, and identify to a limited degree with the school and its teachers.

The high I.Q. group is exposed to considerable home-related opportunity to engage in delinquent activities. Parents make it relatively easy for them to engage in illegal behavior, often take them to establishments where they are likely to "get into trouble", and are willing to back them up against other authorities. Their parents also often successfully engage in illegal activities and do not conceal these from their children. In the school segment, however, the high I.Q. delinquent demonstrates considerable identification with the school and its teachers. He enjoys school and regards it as a means of achieving his goals.

In conclusion, it should be noted that within the unstable group it is the medium I.Q. delinquent who demonstrates strong identification with and acceptance of school. The high I.Q.-unstable delinquent is the most unfavorable and uncommitted to school.

Ethnic: Differences on factor scores between Anglo and Spanish delinquents occurred for Social Peer Permittors and Individual Family Instigators. For the Permittors Anglo delinquents scored consistently higher than Spanish. Since the Social Peer Permittor factor category largely reflects a feeling of alienation and apartness from others, the observed difference may result from the frequently reported (Burma, 1954; and Robison, 1960) closeness of the Spanish community. Spanish adolescents may be better integrated into the total community than Anglo adolescents. This may result in a feeling that others are concerned and interested in them. It should be noted, however, that the importance of the difference on Peer Permittors is somewhat

uncertain because differences were also found on this factor among socio-economic status levels. No control for the influence of ethnic group membership and socio-economic status on each other was performed because of the absence of high social status-Spanish Ss. Thus some caution should be exercised regarding the value of the obtained differences on this factor.

For Individual Family Instigators Anglo delinquents also scored higher than Spanish. However, in one case, within the step-parent family composition group, the Spanish scored higher on this factor. In general these results seem to reflect the greater family harmony often attributed to Spanish families (Robison, 1960). This family harmony, however, seems to undergo a severe breakdown with the presence of a step-parent, whereas in Anglo families the presence of a step-parent appears to greatly improve family relationships.

Summary of Ethnic Differences: Spanish delinquents seem to be characterized by the absence of feelings of alienation in their immediate peer group. Their friends feel that other people care about and are interested in them, and that they have a responsibility to others regarding their actions. Spanish delinquents are seldom extremely angry at their family, seldom want to get even with their parents or want to impress their parents, and seldom feel a lack of attention from their family.

Anglo delinquents are characterized by being exposed to very alienated attitudes on the part of their friends. They also do not enjoy harmonious relationships with their families. They are often angry at someone at home, often want to get even with someone and often wish they received more attention.

Offense Variables

Criminal, Conflict and Mixed: This distinction is derived from Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) specification of three distinct types of delinquent subcultures; criminal, conflict and retreatist. None of the present Ss fitted the retreatist subculture so this had to be eliminated from the analysis. Cloward and Ohlin suggest a number of differences among the three subcultures, mainly in the area of Social City Facilitation. The criminal subculture is particularly high on Social City Facilitation, especially in having access to instruction and protection through organized adult crime. The conflict subculture is particularly low on this factor.

A number of other studies also suggest various differences among delinquents engaging in these types of offenses. McCord, McCord and Zola (1959) report relationships between various family influences and criminal and conflict offenses. Conger and Miller (1966) report that conflict oriented delinquents are higher on Individual Peer, School and Family Instigation than delinquents engaging in other types of offenses. Spergel (1964) reports that criminal oriented offenders are low on Social Family Diverters and Prohibitors.

A number of studies indicate substantial differences between offenders who engage in retreatist activities and those who engage in either criminal or conflict activities. Chein, et al. (1964) indicate a relationship between family factors and drug usage. A number of other studies report similar findings (Barker & Adams, 1963; Chein & Rosenfeld, 1957; Fort, 1954; and Zimmering, 1951). MacKay (1963) reports similar findings for delinquent problem drinkers. In general retreatist delinquents seem to come from disturbed families

where there is little supervision or discipline. There is a lack of an adequate adult male identification figure and the mother is often domineering and overprotective.

The present results neither support Cloward and Ohlin's position nor do they agree with other studies. No differences between criminal and conflict oriented delinquents were found. It is most unfortunate that no retreatist Ss could be obtained, as the weight of the evidence seems to suggest a high probability of differences on factor scores occurring between drug users and other delinquents.

There are two possible explanations for the lack of differences. First, the conception of specialized delinquent subcultures has been extensively questioned (see Reuterman, 1967b for a review of relevant evidence). The present results lend support to the view that specialized delinquent subcultures of the type proposed by Cloward and Ohlin are not a meaningful distinction.

Second, it is possible that the lack of differences is due to the lack of relevance of Cloward and Ohlin's theory (and much of the other work) to the type of delinquent found in the present study. The Cloward and Ohlin theory was developed with specific reference to organized juvenile gangs in metropolitan areas, and thus many factors contained in the theory may simply not exist in the type of area from which the present Ss were drawn. It is somewhat difficult to imagine the existence of differential access to organized adult crime systems based on the area in which one resides in Boulder, Colorado). The lack of differences between criminal and conflict offenses for the present Ss may, however, serve to suggest limitations for the applicability of the Cloward and Ohlin theory.

Victim Present, Victim Absent, and Mixed: The victim present-victim absent distinction was suggested by several juvenile probation counselors as something which should be looked at more closely. No differences of factor scores were found between the three groups. Since no previous work has focused on this distinction the present lack of differences cannot be considered in light of other evidence. The only conclusion possible at this point is that the victim present-victim absent distinction is probably not a useful one for juvenile probation work.

Group and individual: No differences on specific factors were found between delinquents who tend to commit offenses with others and delinquents who tend to commit offenses alone. This lack of differences is opposed to the results of a number of other studies. Miller (1958) postulates a number of delinquent gang values which would seem to result in a high degree of Peer Instigation. Kinch (1962b) suggests that gang delinquents are exposed to little Prohibition in either the Peer, Family or School areas. Thrasher (1963) notes the importance of the absence of Social City Diverters and Prohibitors in the formation of delinquent gangs. Jenkins and his associates have stressed the importance of low Social Family Prohibition and high Social City Instigation and Facilitation for gang offenders and the importance of high Individual Family Instigation and Permission and low Prohibition for individual offenders (Jenkins, 1955; Jenkins, 1957; Jenkins & Hewitt, 1944; and Shinohara & Jenkins, 1967). Other evidence suggests that gang members are likely to be low on Social Family Diversion and individual offenders high on Individual Family Instigation (Wattenberg & Balistreri, 1966). Also Cartwright and

Howard (1966) report an undersupply of mature adults in gang neighborhoods and an oversupply of young people. Thus the balance of age-groupings in gang areas mitigates against strong social controls by adults.

The lack of differences on factor scores between delinquents who tend to commit offenses alone and those who tend to commit them in the company of others is somewhat unexpected. The indication of extensive differences on a number of factors by previous studies would certainly lead to the expectation of differences in the present study. One explanation of the lack of differences may be that the Ss in the present study come largely from small cities and the suburbs of a large metropolitan area while the Ss in most of the previous studies came from large metropolitan areas. It may well be that in large, heavily populated, urban areas there are extensive differences between group and individual offenders, while in smaller cities such differences do not exist. It is certainly the case that a delinquent gang in Chicago or New York is quite different in many respects from a group of offenders in one of the towns from which the present Ss came. In essence, the present lack of results seems to suggest that the results of studies of urban delinquent gangs are quite limited in their relevance to group offenders outside of the large metropolitan area.

Utilitarian, Non-utilitarian and Mixed: No differences among these three groups were found which continued when the influence of other variables were controlled. Other studies indirectly suggest a number of differences between these types of offenses. Dentler and Monroe (1961) report that theft is related to feelings that the family

is unloving and that the adolescent is treated unfairly. Cross-cultural studies also suggest that theft is related to a feeling of lack of family love (Bacon, Child & Barry, 1963). In contrast, findings regarding car theft as a type of offense indicate no differences between car thieves and other offenders with regard to relationships with and attitudes toward parents (Wattenberg & Balistrieri, 1954). Several studies of vandalism are relevant to the non-utilitarian group as vandalism was one of the offenses included in this group. Goldman (1961) reports that juveniles in schools characterized by considerable vandalism demonstrated little identification with or interest in their school. Martin (1961) reports that vandals came from families characterized by parent-child conflict and hostility more often than juveniles committing other types of offense.

Some work seems to suggest differences between utilitarian and non-utilitarian offenders, other work does not, and in some cases one characteristic is suggested for the utilitarian group by one study and the same characteristic for the non-utilitarian group by another study. Thus considerable confusion exists as to whether differences do occur between delinquents committing these two types of offenses. The present results indicate that differences do not exist when the influences of other variables are controlled.

Criminal and CHIN Offenses: Delinquents engaging in criminal offenses scored higher in general on Social City Instigators and Social City Permitters. On the Instigator factor, however, male CHIN offenders scored higher than criminal offenders. Three previous studies report results relevant to the distinction between criminal and CHIN offenses. Tyerman (1958) reports that truants are high on

TABLE 83 (cont.)

School Segment					
Criminal (N=57)			CHIN (N=27)		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.14	1.67	SSI	1.65	0.98
SSF	2.90	1.83	SSF	2.45	1.29
SSPe	2.58	1.72	SSPe	2.19	1.11
SSD	2.37	1.46	SSD	1.91	1.14
SSPr	3.13	1.75	SSPr	2.14	1.40
ISI	1.77	1.22	ISI	2.32	1.60
ISF	1.53	1.07	ISF	1.78	1.17
ISPe	1.99	1.29	ISPe	2.42	1.34
ISD	2.63	1.60	ISD	2.13	1.46
ISPr	2.56	1.57	ISPr	2.08	1.22

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.77$; $F_{10/73} = 2.14$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.92$; $F_{5/78} = 1.35$; $p > .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.90$; $F_{5/78} = 2.37$; $p < .05$

City Segment					
Criminal (N=57)			CHIN (N=27)		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	2.56	1.82	SCI	1.61	1.51
SCF	2.16	1.56	SCF	1.98	1.26
SCPe	3.05	1.93	SCPe	1.85	1.28
SCD	1.72	1.13	SCD	1.88	1.45
SCPr	3.37	2.06	SCPr	2.54	1.86
ICI	2.43	1.48	ICI	2.53	1.31
ICF	1.61	1.43	ICF	1.92	1.37
ICPe	1.61	1.42	ICPe	1.90	1.20
ICD	1.80	1.51	ICD	1.00	1.07
ICPr	2.17	1.54	ICPr	1.89	1.03

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.75$; $F_{10/73} = 2.39$; $p < .05$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.86$; $F_{5/78} = 2.59$; $p < .05$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.89$; $F_{5/78} = 1.89$; $p > .05$

TABLE 84

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal and CHIN Offense Types on All Individual School Factors

Factor		ISI	ISF	ISPe	ISD	ISPr
Criminal	$\bar{X}$	1.77	1.53	1.99	2.63	2.56
	S.D.	1.22	1.07	1.29	1.60	1.57
CHIN	$\bar{X}$	2.32	1.78	2.42	2.13	2.08
	S.D.	1.60	1.17	1.34	1.46	1.22
R^2_{FM}		.036	.012	.023	.022	.024
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/82}$		3.27	1.02	2.00	1.95	2.05
p		p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 85

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal and CHIN Offense Types on All Social City Factors

Factor		SCI	SCF	SCPe	SCD	SCPr
Criminal	$\bar{X}$	2.56	2.16	3.05	1.72	3.37
	S.D.	1.82	1.56	1.93	1.13	2.06
CHIN	$\bar{X}$	1.61	1.98	1.85	1.88	2.54
	S.D.	1.51	1.26	1.28	1.45	1.86
R^2_{FM}		.065	.003	.095	.004	.037
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/82}$		5.85	0.02	8.87	0.03	3.36
p		p<.05	p>.05	p<.01	p>.05	p>.05

TABLE 86
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal-CHIN Offenses and Sex Groups

Factor		SCI	SCPe
Crim./Male	$\bar{X}$	2.54	3.03
	S.D.	1.82	1.92
CHIN/Male	$\bar{X}$	3.32	2.43
	S.D.	1.90	1.23
Crim./Female	$\bar{X}$	2.60	2.60
	S.D.	0.00	0.00
CHIN/Female	$\bar{X}$	1.12	1.69
	S.D.	0.84	1.22
R^2_{FM}		.177	.110
R^2_{RM}		.002	.017
$F_{2/80}$		8.70	4.18
p		p<.001	p<.05

TABLE 87
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal-CHIN Offenses and Age Groups

Factor		SCI	SCPe
Crim./Young	$\bar{X}$	2.98	3.23
	S.D.	1.92	2.10
CHIN/Young	$\bar{X}$	1.55	1.99
	S.D.	1.28	1.36
Crim./Old	$\bar{X}$	2.69	2.85
	S.D.	1.66	1.64
CHIN/Old	$\bar{X}$	1.70	1.62
	S.D.	1.76	1.02
R^2_{FM}		.094	.085
R^2_{RM}		.016	.000
$F_{2/80}$		3.54	3.81
P		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 88
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal-CHIN Offenses and Socio-economic Status Groups

Factor		SCI	SCPe
Crim./Low	$\bar{X}$	2.79	2.72
	S.D.	1.64	1.89
CHIN/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.47	1.55
	S.D.	1.34	0.86
Crim./Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.02	3.26
	S.D.	1.87	2.03
CHIN/Med.	$\bar{X}$	1.95	1.82
	S.D.	1.74	1.11
Crim./High	$\bar{X}$	2.57	3.37
	S.D.	1.83	1.71
CHIN/High	$\bar{X}$	1.18	1.76
	S.D.	1.03	1.66
R^2_{FH}		.124	.180
R^2_{RM}		.021	.014
$F_{3/74}$		2.98	5.00
p		p<.05	p<.01

TABLE 89
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal-CHIN Offenses and IQ Groups

Factor		SCI	SCPe
Crim./Low	$\bar{X}$	1.68	2.57
	S.D.	0.91	2.06
CHIN/Low	$\bar{X}$	1.20	1.92
	S.D.	0.74	1.47
Crim./Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.74	3.44
	S.D.	1.79	1.93
CHIN/Med.	$\bar{X}$	1.86	2.03
	S.D.	1.85	1.33
Crim./High	$\bar{X}$	3.43	2.64
	S.D.	2.26	1.73
CHIN/High	$\bar{X}$	1.45	1.46
	S.D.	0.89	0.71
R^2_{FM}		.161	.189
R^2_{RM}		.010	.040
$F_{3/74}$		4.81	4.45
p		p<.01	p<.01

TABLE 90
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal-CHIN Offenses and Stability Groups

Factor		SCI	SCPe
Crim./Stab.	$\bar{X}$	2.54	2.88
	S.D.	1.82	2.03
CHIN/Stab.	$\bar{X}$	1.54	1.99
	S.D.	1.58	1.30
Crim./Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	2.86	3.16
	S.D.	1.16	1.52
CHIN/Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	2.00	1.52
	S.D.	1.06	1.08
R^2_{FM}		.234	.243
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000
$F_{2/71}$		11.70	12.10
p		p<.001	p<.001

TABLE 91
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal-CHIN Offenses and Family Composition Groups

Factor		SCI	SCPe
Crim./Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	2.84	3.40
	S.D.	1.76	1.96
CHIN/Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	1.49	2.10
	S.D.	1.60	1.34
Crim./Step- Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.48	2.37
	S.D.	1.84	1.13
CHIN/Step- Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.10	1.85
	S.D.	1.24	1.19
Crim./One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.44	2.89
	S.D.	2.03	2.22
CHIN/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	1.22	1.20
	S.D.	0.80	0.88
R^2_{FH}		.122	.121
R^2_{RH}		.013	.012
$F_{3/71}$		3.00	3.00
p		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 92
Means, S.D.'s R^2 's and F Values
for Criminal-CHIN Offenses and Ethnic Groups

Factor		SCI	SCPe
Crim./Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.68	3.02
	S.D.	1.82	1.86
CHIN/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	1.87	1.78
	S.D.	1.60	1.27
Crim./Spanish	$\bar{X}$	2.04	3.32
	S.D.	1.61	2.13
CHIN/Spanish	$\bar{X}$	0.87	2.07
	S.D.	0.58	1.20
R^2_{FM}		.082	.074
R^2_{RM}		.012	.000
$F_{2/80}$		3.18	3.36
p		p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 93

Means, Standard Deviations and F-ratios of Multiple-First
Offense Types for Multivariate Analyses of Variance

<u>Peer Segment</u>					
<u>First (N=68)</u>			<u>Multiple (N=93)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SPI	3.18	1.56	SPI	2.92	1.49
SPF	2.89	1.69	SPF	2.72	1.44
SPPe	3.03	1.58	SPPe	2.94	1.62
SPD	2.39	1.39	SPD	2.06	1.20
SPPr	2.61	1.48	SPPr	2.18	1.38
IPI	2.49	1.47	IPI	2.48	1.62
IPF	2.32	1.42	IPF	2.07	1.26
IPPe	2.48	1.36	IPPe	2.41	1.33
IPD	2.53	1.49	IPD	2.25	1.29
IPPr	2.07	1.44	IPPr	1.92	1.25

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.96$; $F_{10/150} = 0.65$; $p > .05$

<u>Family Segment</u>					
<u>First (N=68)</u>			<u>Multiple (N=93)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SFI	1.74	1.14	SFI	1.43	0.88
SFF	2.29	1.45	SFF	1.82	1.20
SFPe	2.36	1.58	SFPe	1.76	1.10
SFD	4.59	1.62	SFD	4.00	1.41
SFPPr	4.67	1.75	SFPPr	4.24	1.64
IFI	2.47	1.65	IFI	2.29	1.48
IFF	2.84	1.42	IFF	2.32	1.29
IFPe	3.40	1.82	IFPe	2.89	1.68
IFD	3.25	1.67	IFD	3.02	1.58
IFPr	2.91	1.69	IFPr	2.63	1.54

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.90$; $F_{10/150} = 1.60$; $p > .05$

TABLE 93 (cont.)

<u>School Segment</u>					
<u>First (N=68)</u>			<u>Multiple (N=93)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SSI	2.55	1.61	SSI	2.14	1.66
SSF	2.99	1.69	SSF	2.85	1.75
SSPe	3.32	1.63	SSPe	2.58	1.66
SSD	2.45	1.57	SSD	2.16	1.38
SSPr	3.29	1.69	SSPr	2.76	1.67
ISI	2.22	1.55	ISI	2.00	1.47
ISF	1.91	1.49	ISF	1.66	1.10
ISPe	2.56	1.64	ISPe	2.21	1.39
ISD	2.87	1.74	ISD	2.42	1.56
ISPr	2.52	1.63	ISPr	2.35	1.47

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.92$; $F_{10/150} = 1.28$; $p > .05$

<u>City Segment</u>					
<u>First (N=68)</u>			<u>Multiple (N=93)</u>		
Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Factor	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
SCI	2.22	1.63	SCI	2.31	1.83
SCF	2.47	1.84	SCF	2.11	1.48
SCPe	3.40	2.00	SCPe	2.71	1.88
SCD	2.37	1.77	SCD	1.78	1.27
SCPr	3.79	2.15	SCPr	3.14	2.04
ICI	2.40	1.47	ICI	2.45	1.47
ICF	1.92	1.71	ICF	1.67	1.37
ICPe	1.83	1.41	ICPe	1.71	1.34
ICD	2.25	1.73	ICD	1.52	1.38
ICPr	2.22	1.57	ICPr	1.99	1.38

Soc. & Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.85$; $F_{10/150} = 2.58$; $p < .01$

Soc.: $\Lambda = 0.90$; $F_{5/155} = 3.41$; $p < .01$

Ind.: $\Lambda = 0.93$; $F_{5/155} = 2.32$; $p < .05$

TABLE 94
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Multiple and First Offense Types for All Social City Factors

Factor		SCI	SCF	SCPe	SCD	SCPr
First	$\bar{X}$	2.22	2.47	3.40	2.37	3.79
	S.D.	1.63	1.84	2.00	1.77	2.15
Mult.	$\bar{X}$	2.31	2.11	2.71	1.78	3.14
	S.D.	1.83	1.48	1.88	1.27	2.04
R^2_{FM}		.000	.012	.030	.036	.024
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/159}$		0.00	1.93	4.91	6.00	3.93
P		p>.05	p>.05	p<.05	p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 95
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values for
Multiple and First Offense Types for All Individual City Factors

Factor		ICI	ICF	ICPe	ICD	ICPr
First	$\bar{X}$	2.40	1.92	1.83	2.25	2.22
	S.D.	1.47	1.71	1.41	1.73	1.57
Mult.	$\bar{X}$	2.45	1.67	1.71	1.52	1.99
	S.D.	1.47	1.37	1.34	1.38	1.38
R^2_{FM}		.000	.006	.001	.053	.006
R^2_{RM}		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
$F_{1/159}$		0.00	0.96	0.31	8.98	0.96
P		p>.05	p>.05	p>.05	p<.01	p>.05

TABLE 96
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Multiple-First Offense and Sex Groups

Factor		SCPe	SCD	SCPr	ICD
First/Male	$\bar{X}$	3.36	2.34	3.84	2.39
	S.D.	2.02	1.72	2.18	1.73
Mult./Male	$\bar{X}$	2.96	1.85	3.27	1.69
	S.D.	1.87	1.24	2.01	1.44
First/Female	$\bar{X}$	3.60	2.46	3.55	1.60
	S.D.	1.82	1.93	1.86	1.49
Mult./Female	$\bar{X}$	2.00	1.57	2.74	1.01
	S.D.	1.70	1.34	2.05	1.01
R^2_{FM}		.181	.178	.164	.304
R^2_{RM}		.017	.003	.011	.045
$F_{2/157}$		15.75	16.73	14.34	28.31
p		p<.001	p<.001	p<.001	p<.001

TABLE 97

Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Multiple-First Offense and Age Groups

Factor		SCPe	SCD	SCPr	ICD
First/Young	$\bar{X}$	3.53	2.81	3.66	2.37
	S.D.	2.04	1.73	2.13	1.84
Mult./Young	$\bar{X}$	2.73	1.70	2.68	1.36
	S.D.	1.90	1.39	1.90	1.42
First/Old	$\bar{X}$	3.28	2.95	3.91	2.12
	S.D.	1.93	1.68	2.12	1.59
Mult./Old	$\bar{X}$	2.69	1.87	2.69	1.70
	S.D.	1.84	1.10	1.73	1.29
R^2_{FM}		.024	.043	.078	.053
R^2_{RM}		.000	.003	.032	.008
$F_{2/157}$		1.93	3.33	3.83	3.75
p		p>.05	p<.05	p<.05	p<.05

TABLE 98
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Multiple-First Offense and Socio-economic Status Groups

Factor		SCPe	SCD	SCPr	ICD
First/Low	$\bar{X}$	3.16	2.32	3.64	2.43
	S.D.	1.85	1.69	2.18	1.96
Mult./Low	$\bar{X}$	2.42	1.59	3.16	1.58
	S.D.	1.74	1.23	2.02	1.66
First/Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.28	2.50	3.42	2.09
	S.D.	2.23	1.36	1.89	1.44
Mult./Med.	$\bar{X}$	2.82	1.84	3.28	1.71
	S.D.	2.00	1.15	2.18	1.18
First/High	$\bar{X}$	4.25	2.98	4.52	2.38
	S.D.	1.74	2.47	2.11	1.89
Mult./High	$\bar{X}$	2.72	2.14	3.14	1.35
	S.D.	1.85	1.17	1.65	1.26
R^2_{FM}		.071	.089	.036	.066
R^2_{RM}		.014	.021	.004	.006
$F_{3/139}$		2.87	3.38	1.55	2.98
p		p<.05	p<.05	p>.05	p<.05

TABLE 99
Means, S.D.'s R^2 's and F Values
for Multiple-First Offense and IQ Groups

Factor		SCPe	SCD	SCPr	ICD
First/Low	$\bar{X}$	3.19	1.98	2.93	1.35
	S.D.	1.69	1.15	1.33	1.00
Mult./Low	$\bar{X}$	2.62	1.15	2.36	1.16
	S.D.	2.19	0.70	1.83	1.21
First/Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.73	2.24	4.07	2.29
	S.D.	1.90	1.83	2.20	1.71
Mult./Med.	$\bar{X}$	3.00	2.10	3.43	1.69
	S.D.	1.88	1.45	1.99	1.44
First/High	$\bar{X}$	3.07	2.92	3.84	2.70
	S.D.	2.19	1.76	2.18	1.85
Mult./High	$\bar{X}$	2.11	1.67	2.90	1.32
	S.D.	1.46	0.95	1.94	1.22
R^2_{FM}		.076	.112	.084	.116
R^2_{RM}		.040	.015	.026	.012
$F_{3/149}$		1.93	4.91	1.98	5.86
p		p>.05	p<.01	p>.05	p<.001

TABLE 100
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Multiple-First Offense and Stability Groups

Factor		SCPe	SCD	SCPr	ICD
First/Stab.	$\bar{X}$	3.49	2.59	4.11	2.48
	S.D.	2.03	1.97	2.24	1.68
Mult./Stab.	$\bar{X}$	2.60	1.79	3.06	1.55
	S.D.	1.86	1.31	2.02	1.39
First/Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	3.49	2.25	3.07	2.28
	S.D.	1.46	1.47	1.34	1.72
Mult./Unstab.	$\bar{X}$	2.47	1.56	3.61	1.31
	S.D.	1.58	0.93	1.94	1.07
R_{FM}^2		.046	.061	.039	.087
R_{RM}^2		.000	.002	.000	.000
$F_{2/130}$		3.28	4.09	2.71	4.35
p		p<.05	p<.05	p>.05	p<.05

TABLE 101
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Multiple-First Offense and Family Composition Groups

Factor		SCPe	SCD	SCPr	ICD
First/Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.45	2.41	4.04	2.15
	S.D.	2.07	1.74	2.16	1.50
Mult./Both Parents	$\bar{X}$	3.04	1.91	3.06	1.63
	S.D.	1.98	1.32	2.05	1.39
First/Step- Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.87	2.67	3.67	2.06
	S.D.	2.25	2.35	2.50	1.63
Mult./Step- Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.23	1.33	3.10	1.36
	S.D.	1.11	0.73	1.65	0.98
First/One Parent	$\bar{X}$	3.49	2.19	3.03	2.47
	S.D.	1.55	1.32	1.53	2.18
Mult./One Parent	$\bar{X}$	2.36	1.32	2.78	1.32
	S.D.	2.06	0.84	1.89	1.55
R^2_{FM}		.039	.066	.025	.052
R^2_{RM}		.012	.006	.012	.000
$F_{3/147}$		1.04	3.12	0.64	2.70
p		p>.05	p<.05	p>.05	p<.05

TABLE 102
Means, S.D.'s, R^2 's and F Values
for Multiple-First Offense and Ethnic Groups

Factor		SCPe	SCD	SCPr	ICD
First/Anglo	$\bar{X}$	3.33	2.34	3.69	2.17
	S.D.	2.03	1.83	2.12	1.65
Mult./Anglo	$\bar{X}$	2.73	1.59	3.27	1.62
	S.D.	1.90	1.18	2.07	1.29
First/Spanish	$\bar{X}$	3.78	2.51	4.38	2.70
	S.D.	1.66	1.25	2.11	2.03
Mult./Spanish	$\bar{X}$	2.62	1.43	2.61	1.10
	S.D.	1.77	1.18	1.81	1.60
R^2_{FM}		.031	.045	.037	.063
R^2_{RM}		.000	.005	.002	.002
$F_{2/157}$		2.50	3.27	2.83	5.93
p		p>.05	p<.05	p>.05	p<.01

END