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ABSTRACT

For many years theorists have referred to adolescent deviance under the delinquency rubric. There appears, however, to be evidence that there is more than one type of adolescent deviance. This thesis argues that there are at least two types of adolescent deviance: delinquency and rebellion. These types are distinguished by the domain of deviance within which the act occurs and the motivation for committing the deviant act. Results indicate that this relationships is more true of females than males. Implications for integrated, generality, and feminist theories are discussed and future considerations are offered.
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CHAPTER I
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Several sociological theories provide insights into delinquency. Control, structural strain, labeling, and differential association theories address a broad range of "causes" of delinquency: attachment and commitment to conventional groups, blocked goals, acquisition of criminal labels, and learning inappropriate values. However, these theories have primarily sought to explain criminal acts of adolescent deviance. By focusing on infractions prohibited in governmental statutes, these theories ignore adolescent deviance which does not occur within the criminal domain.

Through much of Western history, the transition from child status to adult status has been marked by adult/parent-child conflict; the breaching of parental rules and limits by teenagers and youthful misconduct as young persons have tested social boundaries while they endeavor to negotiate the social passage from childhood to adulthood (Gibbons and Krohn, 1991). In 16th and 17th century London, apprentices shocked their elders with their dress, leisure and working habits. Several laws were passed in an attempt to control behavior such as wearing "gentlemen"-length hair and keeping a trunk with fine clothes in it (USA Today, 1993). In the early 1900's, psychology gave rise to the term known as adolescence (Boorstin, 1975). This new perspective encouraged parents to consider their children's norm breaking behavior as simply "behavior deviations" instead of "naughtiness." This distinction was intended to address a supposed universal developmental pattern where children discovered the boundaries in their world by
misbehaving. Today, deviant behaviors such as tattooing, body piercing, bizarre hairstyles, hard-core music tastes, inappropriate dress, skateboarding in parking garages, and arguing with parents and teachers are common for many adolescents. While there has been little attempt to control these behaviors by legislation, they have been labeled as deviant by many parents, teachers and other control agents. However, none of these behaviors violates the law and is thus delinquency. They seem to be a form of non-criminal adolescent deviance best described as rebellion against normative authority.

Over the years the rebelliousness of teenagers has become a topic of parental concern and worries, a recurrent movie theme, and the focus of pop culture capitalists. While it is true that some rebellious acts may involve delinquency, many also may not. In fact, rebellious teenagers often see themselves as deviant, but not delinquent (Friesen, 1990). If rebellion and delinquency are indeed two distinct forms of adolescent deviance, are delinquency theories adequate when it comes to explaining adolescent deviance which does not occur within the criminal domain? This project proposes that rebellion and delinquency can be described as two distinct forms of adolescent deviance, and develops a theoretical approach, label-seeking motivation, to explain adolescent rebelliousness—non-criminal activity that occurs within school, family and lifestyle domains of deviance.

Label seeking motivation is the effort to obtain a deviant label, within one of several domains of deviance, from authority figures to use for impression management. Some adolescents seek the disapproval of parents, school officials and non-significant others for the purpose of improving their status within their chosen peer group. Domains of deviance are social contexts within which an act occurs and is considered deviant by
authorities responsible for control in each social context. These domains include but are not limited to criminal, school, family, peer, lifestyle, occupational, and gender social contexts. It is possible for deviant acts to be exhibited in more than one domain at a time.

This thesis uses a sample of rebellious punk-rocker youth and a sample of incarcerated delinquent youth to explore two questions: how different is rebellious but essentially non-criminal deviance (deviance in the school, family and lifestyle domains) from criminal deviance (criminal domain), and can label-seeking theory account for rebellious deviance better than standard delinquency theories? Chapter II examines important distinctions between rebellion and delinquency in the literature on youth deviance, and proposes the first hypothesis of this thesis: behaviors in the rebellious domains of deviance will be more closely associated with each other than with behaviors in the criminal domain.

Chapter III considers why several widely used theories of delinquency have difficulty in accounting for essentially non-criminal adolescent deviance, and develops label-seeking theory as an alternative explanation of this deviance. It then advances the remaining hypotheses: measures of label-seeking will be more associated with rebellious deviance and indices of several delinquency theories more associated with criminal deviance.

Chapter IV contains details on both sampling and variable measurement, while Chapter V presents the findings for each hypothesis. Chapter VI discusses the two conclusions from this research: among these females but not males, rebellious deviance is distinct from criminal deviance, and label-seeking theory offers more promise in explaining
rebellious deviance than do several standard theories of delinquency. The thesis ends by considering some implications of and caveats to these conclusions and suggesting some directions for subsequent research and theory on youth deviance.
CHAPTER II

REBELLION AND DELINQUENCY

Most researchers define juvenile delinquency as adolescent law violations (Buckner, 1971; Bierne and Messerschmidt, 1991). Gibbons and Krohn (1991: p.5) give this common definition, “Juvenile delinquency consists of acts or infractions that are prohibited in the statutes of the individual states. Juvenile delinquents are youths who commit one or more of these infractions.” Thus, juvenile delinquency is a deviant act committed by a juvenile which falls within the criminal domain--it is prohibited by statute (this includes both status offenses and adult crimes) and enforced by the criminal justice system. It is this type of adolescent deviance which this report seeks to distinguish from rebellious adolescent behavior.

Perhaps the classical delineation of rebellion came from Merton’s (1968) typology of modes of individual deviant adaptation. According to Merton, whenever individuals are faced with anomie they will develop adaptations to deal with their inability to achieve culturally approved goals through institutionalized means. Rebellion is one form of adaptation which represents a transitional response in which individuals seek from a deviant subculture both new goals and new means for achieving these goals. Since this time many definitions of rebellion have been offered. Lyman and Scott (1989: p.194) refer to rebellion as “the flagrant violation of norms”; Pink (1978) sees it as participation in a rebellious peer culture as well as deviant behavior; to Sanders and Yanouzas (1985), it is the rejection of both pivotal and peripheral norms; and Schwartz (1987) views it as disinterest in the "classic" image of success. Some even view rebellion as a personality trait related to the defiance of
rules of social conduct, peer group affiliations, and fashion statements (Bleich et al., 1991).

While these definitions make different assumptions about the motivations, goals and actions of rebellion, they do have commonalties: participation in a peer subculture and the commission of deviant acts. They also suggest that rebelliousness and delinquency may encompass more than delinquent conduct, but they do not attempt to make a distinction between the types of deviance practiced by a rebellious person and the types of deviance committed by a delinquent.

Rebellion is similar to delinquency in that both are social products (Gibbons and Krohn, 1991). However, I propose two primary differences between rebellion and delinquency. First, each tends to concentrate in separate domains. Delinquency occurs primarily within the criminal domain and rebellion occurs mainly within non-criminal domains. However, adolescent acts of deviance can occur in more than one domain at a time. While some behavior within the criminal domain is also rebellion, most rebellious behavior is non-criminal. Rebellious deviance which does not violate laws cannot, by definition, be delinquent. Second, the motivation for each type of behavior differs. Rebellion is motivated primarily by the perceived need to acquire a deviant, usually non-criminal label from authorities who control that particular domain of deviance: from teachers who control the school domain, from parents who control the family domain, and from the general public who control the lifestyle domain. On the other hand, the motivation for delinquency has been explained by social strain, differential values, a lack of control or a desire for new sensations. But, the delinquent act is not usually motivated by seeking out the deviant label from those who control the criminal domain—police, probation officers and judges. While adolescents
may wish social control agents in non-criminal domains to know of their norm violations and label them as deviance, they generally do not want their deviance to come to the attention and fall under the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system.

Rebellion is motivated by adolescents seeking the deviant label to set themselves apart from conventional society and to impress their peers. This label seeking process is fundamentally different from the motivations for delinquency in that there is a willful intent on the part of the deviant adolescent to attract the deviant label. When committing a crime, the delinquent does not intentionally seek the deviant label because of the social penalties involved when caught committing a crime, because of the stigma attached to persons committing crimes, and because the label might interfere with their ability to commit future delinquent acts. On the other hand, the rebellious adolescent can intentionally seek the deviant label because they encounter only minor social penalties and stigma which are ameliorated by their peer attachments, and being labeled a deviant for committing an act within non-criminal domains does not interfere with the adolescent committing further acts of deviance.

There are some similarities and overlap between the rebellious and delinquent orientations. Among delinquent youths, and especially among gangs, being caught while committing a crime can lead to an increase in status (Katz, 1988). Thus, the deviant label is important to status within delinquent peer groups just as it is within rebellious peer groups. The difference is that delinquents are not seeking a deviant label, rather they are seeking to demonstrate their willingness to expose themselves to the threat of social penalty and then endure that penalty (Yablonsky et al., 1996). While it is important for the delinquent to be
"down with the set," they are not trying to get caught and they are not intentionally seeking the label, they are demonstrating their bravery to their peer group (Katz, 1988). On the other hand, rebellious adolescents face no serious threat to their future well being, they do not attempt to "get away with" rebellion and the rebellious act is generally executed publicly.

Adolescents motivated to commit delinquency and adolescents motivated by seeking the deviant label may outwardly appear to be quite similar. Indeed, many parents of rebellious teenagers may perceive them as juvenile delinquents. But, it is the need to gain acceptance and status within a rebellious peer group through the expression of individuality and alienating authority, the label seeking process, that defines rebelliousness. Thus, while juvenile delinquents and rebels share some characteristics, there are two characteristics which separate the two types of adolescent deviants: the domains of deviance, and the motivation for committing the deviant act.

Evidence of Difference

Some evidence suggests that adolescents themselves separate rebellion from delinquency. Rebellious teenagers do not consider themselves as delinquents.

While heavy metal participants welcome the 'deviant' stigma, most resent the 'delinquent' label which often accompanies an application of the former. Headbangers recognize the term 'deviant' as connoting 'different', and the term 'delinquent' as implying 'criminal.' (Friesen, 1990, p. 68)

This distinction, which is key to the current theory, demonstrates that not only does the criminal justice system consider that there is a difference between criminal (delinquency) and non-criminal adolescent deviance (non-delinquency), but adolescents also conceive of
their status as deviant but not delinquent. Those with the power and authority for labeling deviant acts and the adolescents themselves identify some difference between criminal and non-criminal deviance (Friesen, 1990). This distinction may be simply the delineation between those acts which are classified criminal and those which are tolerable under the law, but to both labeler and the labelee these are important distinctions.

There is also evidence that rebellious teens exhibit most of their deviance in non-criminal and mixed domains of deviance. In Arnett's (1993) profile of three types of heavy metal fans (selected as representative of distinct typologies from his larger sample), the subject type described as "True Believer" self-reported most of his deviance within non-criminal and mixed domains. This subject indicated the most deviance in mixed domains dealing with dangerous lifestyles and illegal acts. Using drugs and driving recklessly were both reported in frequencies ranging from 10 to 50 times in the last year. The two non-criminal items, sex without contraception and sex with a stranger also occurred frequently. However, the two items falling totally within the criminal domain, shoplifting and vandalism, reported zero frequency. The other two subject types profiled reported zero or near zero participation in any of the deviant activities, but these types of heavy metal fans did not associate with a heavy metal peer group. Thus, people representative of the rebellious teen committed deviant acts within non-criminal and mixed domains, but not within the criminal domain.

Concerning the label seeking motivation, Gross (1990: 112), in his study of heavy metal music as a new subculture, quoted a heavy metal radio deejay as saying, "Heavy metal is a safe form of rebellion, it lets everyone know that you are different, but in reality
you never really have to take a stand; you dress up and act like a misfit.” This observation tells us that part of belonging to this rebellious group is being deviant. The deviant label is sought to “let everyone know you are different” by “dress[ing] up and act[ing] like a misfit.” This observation also implies that the deviance exhibited by heavy metal fans is rather innocuous and does not tend to involve the commission of crimes. Kennedy and Baron (1993) reported that the punk rockers they studied believed that the abuse they received for their appearance was part of the experience. Those who worried too much about what others thought of their appearance did not last long in the group. Only those who were truly committed to being labeled a deviant by passersby would be successful in assimilating with the punk rocker group. Furthermore, Kennedy and Baron found that the punk rockers were more inclined to participate in deviant acts when there was a third party present to witness their deviance.

**Hypothesis 1**

The first hypothesis of this study focuses on the proposed differences between delinquency and rebelliousness. If delinquency and rebellion are distinct types of adolescent deviance, then deviant acts committed in non-criminal domains should have a stronger association with each other than they do with acts in the criminal domain. Hence, the first hypothesis:

The family, school, and lifestyle domains of deviance will be more positively associated with each other than with the criminal domain.
Notes

1 Parents and teachers probably also make the distinction between acts that are illegal and acts which are not illegal. However, many deviant acts which are not illegal occur in the domain over which they are responsible for social control. Thus, while they may make the distinction between criminal and non-criminal acts, they are still labeling as deviant the non-criminal deviant activities of the adolescent.
CHAPTER III
DELINQUENCY THEORIES AND REBELLIOUS, NON-CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

Traditional research into the nature of delinquency has fallen into one of four theoretical frameworks which examined the effect of social factors on the norm breaking motivations of adolescents. Control theory focused on explaining the motivation to conform, assuming that deviance will occur naturally unless people are controlled. Structural strain theories including social disorganization, revised strain, general strain, and anomie theories seek to explain how structural forces can diminish the commitment to norms. Differential association proposed that motivations for deviant behavior are learned in much the same way as conforming behavior is and that association with delinquent peers begins a process leading to delinquent acts. Labeling theory looks at how the social labeling of a person as deviant affects that person's motivation for committing secondary acts of deviance (Traub and Little, 1994). A more psychological and recent approach has looked at the risk-taking orientation of delinquents, positing that young people will commit deviant acts as a means of "sensation seeking" through "edgework" (Lyng, 1993). The first section examines the utility of the first three theoretical explanations of adolescent deviance, as well as Lyng's description of dysfunctional risk taking, in accounting for rebellious versus delinquent orientations. The following section combines several aspects of the labeling perspective to develop a theory of label-seeking which can explain rebellious but non-criminal conduct.
Delinquency Theories And Rebellious Deviance

Control Theory

Ivan Nye proposed that parent-adolescent relationships were a significant factor in social control and the prevention of delinquency. He argued that, "When controls internal and external are weak and alternative routes to goal achievement are restricted, delinquent behavior can be anticipated" (1958, p.3). Travis Hirschi (1969) argued that human beings are inherently prone to deviate unless they are socially bonded to reference groups that prescribe conformity. Thus, delinquency occurs when an adolescent has weak social bonds and does not feel bound by legal norms. Recently several research efforts have supported social control theory. Extent of social integration, school bonding, and parental attachment have been found to have a strong inverse relationship with frequency of offending, marijuana use, and self-reported delinquency in general (Junger, 1992; Cernkovich and Giordano, 1992; Marcos and Bahr, 1988).

The problem with applying control theory to non-criminal adolescent deviance is that an adolescent does not necessarily have to ignore familial bonds or external control forces when considering the non-criminal deviant act. Adolescents know they will not be arrested for clothing, hair or music tastes, and that they do not have to destroy social bonds in order to smoke cigarettes or come home late. While these acts of deviance have caused considerable conflict between parents and children, these are issues which do not typically evoke the sanctions of the criminal justice system. The adolescent may feel compelled by controlling bonds not to commit a robbery or vandalize property, but this level of control is
far different than that which the adolescent must ignore if they decide to smoke cigarettes or listen to outrageous music.

While recent research has supported the general tenets of social control theory, when the measured deviance is broken down into delinquent and rebellious behavior the link between a lack of social control and rebellious behavior becomes even less clear. While Singer and his colleagues (1993) found that non-criminal rebellious deviance (preference for heavy metal music) was associated with delinquency among youth who experienced low parental control, they provide no evidence of any direct effect of low parental control on this type of rebellious deviance. Furthermore, there was no association between heavy metal music and delinquency when peer and school variables were controlled for, suggesting that forces which may impact this type of non-criminal deviance are not the same as those which affect delinquent activity. Sokol-Katz (1993) found that low family attachment was significantly associated with both major and minor delinquent behavior. However, cigarette smoking, a type of non-criminal deviance, occurred nearly equally among youth with high and low family attachment. Thus, non-criminal deviance could not be explained solely by a lack of control.

Strain Theory

Structural strain theories propose that pressures from the structure of a society can lead to delinquency. Similar to the social control theories, social disorganization is the process by which the relationships between members of a group are broken or dissolved. It occurs when there is a change in the equilibrium of forces which leads to a breakdown of the
social structure so that social control no longer functions effectively (Elliott and Merrill, 1950). Merton's theory of anomie contends that when the desire to attain culturally valued goals cannot be met through legitimate institutionalized means the individual might choose illegitimate means to reach those goals. An adolescent will commit a delinquent act when they see no other way to reach a culturally approved goal (Merton, 1968). Although Merton saw rebellion as being one type of strategy for adapting to social strain, he was primarily talking about an adaptation used by persons in lower classes who are denied the institutionalized means to achieve culturally approved goals and seek to change both the means and the goals. Yet, many rebellious adolescents come from middle-class families where institutionalized means are more readily available and access to culturally approved goals is more open than it may be to a lower class adolescent. Thus, while Merton's theory of adaptation to social strain might apply to those in the lower classes experiencing anomie, it may not explain why a middle class youth would choose to rebel. It might be the case a relative amount of goal-blockage would cause strain on the middle-class adolescent, but the resources of the middle class youth are such that this strain would occur only when high-level goals are blocked.

Several recent attempts at testing the usefulness of strain theory for understanding delinquency have provided differing results. When testing strain theory in a religious setting defined by a school's religious characteristics, no support was found for any of the processes advocated by strain theories (Thompson, 1986). Another report found a weak positive relationship between school social status and vandalism, and a weak negative relationship between academic achievement and vandalism (Tygart, 1988). With regard to the poorest of
the poor, the homeless, consistent evidence has been found that hunger causes theft of food, problems of hunger and shelter lead to serious theft, and problems of unemployment and shelter produce prostitution (McCarthy and Hagan, 1992).

Robert Agnew (1985; 1989) proposed and tested a revised strain theory that seeks to overcome the shortcomings of the original theory. Prior to this, strain theory insisted that it was the blockage of goal-seeking behavior that initiated the strain which led to eventual deviance. But Agnew tested the idea that it was the blockage of pain-avoidance behavior which initiated strain and led to delinquency. His findings supported this supposition and demonstrated that the blockage of goal-seeking behavior was only weakly associated with delinquency. From this earlier work, Agnew has now developed what he calls general strain theory. According to Agnew (1992a; 1992b), strain leading to delinquency had one of three sources: the failure to achieve goals, the removal of positively valued stimuli, and the presentation of negatively valued stimuli. These sources can either be actual or anticipated by the person. Agnew's tests of general strain theory support these suppositions and his findings have been independently confirmed (Paternoster and Mazerolle, 1994).

While there is substantial evidence that social strain has at least some effect on delinquency, a distinction between criminal and non-criminal adolescent deviance is simply not reported in the social strain literature. Other data sets contain self-report non-criminal deviance items (e.g., National Youth Survey), but none seek to distinguish non-criminal deviance. Thus, there is no evidence of an association between strain and rebellious deviance. If one exists, it could be different from the delinquency-strain relationship. Perhaps the overt and public nature of rebellious acts would themselves lead to strain, instead
of being influenced by it. Rebelling against a parent’s norms could in many cases lead to the removal or threatened removal of a positively valued stimuli or goals, two of Agnew’s sources of strain. The very acts which define rebellious behavior could become a source of strain in Agnew’s general strain theory. Thus, rebellious behavior could be a cause of strain which may then influence further deviant behavior.

Differential Association

Differential association theory proposes that delinquency is learned through association with deviant peers. Through their associations with others, adolescents learn values, norms, motivations, rationalizations, techniques and definitions that may be favorable or unfavorable to law violation (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970). The idea that learned behavior patterns favorable to violation of legal codes increase the likelihood of delinquency has been supported (Matsueda, 1982; Matsueda and Heimer 1987). In an attempt to isolate the primary source of influence from differential associations, the actual behavior of peers was found to have a greater impact on delinquency than the expressed attitudes of peers (Warr and Stafford, 1991). Differential association has also been used to explain the age distribution of crime. Crime statistics consistently show an aging out effect where a majority of crimes are committed by younger persons. Because peer relations tend to change over the years, it follows that differential associations will also change. Warr (1993) has used this change in peer relations from delinquent to non-delinquent peers over the life course to explain the aging out of crime.
While peer influence is certainly a factor in all types of adolescent deviance, label-seeking may not require the teenager to learn delinquent motivations and rationalizations for committing rebellious deviance. I contend that this motivation—the need to belong to a peer group—precedes membership in a rebellious group, coming from previous learning about the importance of peers and the need to belong. Such previous learning has demonstrated to adolescents that they feel better when accepted and worse when they are not accepted. Thus, adolescents learn first that they want to be a member of a peer group, then attempt the behavior necessary to belong to that group. Because motivations and rationalizations for committing rebellious acts seem to be developed prior to, rather than after, joining the group, the main differential association research model appears inadequate in accounting for at least the initiation of rebellious behavior.

Risk Taking

Seeking sensations through risk taking and risk taking edgework have recently been proposed to explain delinquency. According to Lyng (1993), activities that can be classified as sensation-seeking edgework involve the process of negotiating a boundary between life and death, consciousness and unconsciousness, sanity and insanity, or any other conceptualization of the line between order and disorder. In other words, the people manufacture a certain sensation when they create or enter a situation where they have little control over the outcome. Thus, the person enjoys “living on the edge” between control and chaos. When this is applied to deviant behavior Lyng calls it “dysfunctional risk taking.” Katz’s (1988) phenomenological analysis reveals that the attraction of crime may sometimes
have more to do with the rewards of the experience itself rather than the tangible goods that the delinquent act will yield. Adolescents seek out such opportunities because of the sensations and feelings they offer cannot be found in any other realm of their life experience. Substance abuse is one area of deviance which has been shown to be highly correlated with sensation-seeking variables such as thrill-seeking, immediate gratification, and impulsivity (Wood et al., 1995). Some evidence even suggests that the whole attraction of popular music is the need to create sensations which serve as a catharsis against the daily stress experienced in a complex society (Johnson, 1989). As compelling as these observations are for an explanation of delinquency, they may not explain the social nature of deviant activities such as listening to "Suicidal Tendencies" or dressing in "grunge" wear. These acts could have associated social actions leading to intense sensations (e.g., skateboarding), but not everyone who listens to hard core music or wears grungy clothes participates in these intense activities. Thus, the social nature of rebellious behavior is lost. Furthermore, a pierced nose or a blue mowhawk could hardly be considered edgework. The adolescent is not placing their situation out of their own control by inviting rude stares and impolite comments. The risk-taking concept can be applied to rebellious acts like skipping school, smoking cigarettes or staying out late, acts which involve a certain amount of edgework, but again this does not explain the social nature of such activities. That is, the meaning of these actions to the individual is not socially constructed in the risk-taking approach. If rebellious behavior is to be understood as a social product, rebellion against norms, it requires an explanation which can account for the social construction of this meaning.
Labeling Theory

The application of the labeling perspective to delinquency has focused on the effects on individuals from being socially labeled a deviant. Tannenbaum (1938) described the subtle transference from defining the acts committed by an individual as delinquent to describing the individual as delinquent. As the community's definition of a person changes from conformer to delinquent, the person's self-perception changes in the same direction. Lemert (1951) argued that this change in self-perception, combined with the social limitations attached to the deviant label, led persons to engage in secondary deviance. Matsueda (1992) argues that these changes in self-perception arise from reflected appraisals of the self as a rule violator. These substantially affect future delinquency by reinforcing the process whereby the adolescent is labeled and then comes to accept the label as self-descriptive. At first, the label is applied only by those who react to the action as deviant, but if this label is part of a parental appraisal, then the adolescent will soon accept this reflected appraisal and self-identify with the deviant label.

While the labeling perspective is quite effective at explaining how an adolescent can go from experimenting with criminal acts to becoming a career delinquent, it does not explain what compels the adolescent to commit the original acts which might come to the attention of authorities and for which the adolescent obtains the delinquent label. Moreover, it does not explain why an adolescent would choose to commit public, non-criminal deviant acts which are sure to come to the attention of authorities and attract a deviant label. In fact, it seems that rebellious adolescents desire and enjoy the negative labels which others apply. The stares and rude comments, parental aversion, and the deviant label in general which are
sought by some adolescents as a means of acceptance, impression management and status attainment within certain peer groups. The rebellious teen wants to experience the deviant reflected appraisal, and they actively seek it out.

**From Labeling To Label-Seeking**

In this section, I try to demonstrate how the labeling process is differentially manifest across various situations. The labeling of positive deviance and the causal order espoused by proponents of the labeling theory of delinquency are discussed to demonstrate how the labeling of delinquency differs from the labeling of rebelliousness. Then I focus on why adolescents seek deviant labels by examining the processes by which we acquire peer group affiliation and the impression management associated with this affiliation.

The idea that definitions of deviance are a reaction by society was founded early in sociological history. Durkheim believed that, "What confers this [deviant] character upon them is not the intrinsic quality of a given act but that definition which the collective conscience lends them" (1938, p.70). From this reactive definition of deviance came the labeling perspective. Contrary to other theories of deviance which proffer that deviance is the violation of a norm, the labeling perspective posits that an act becomes deviant when it is so labeled by those with the power to bring sanctions (Traub and Little, 1994). This has proven to be a powerful approach, allowing the phenomena of deviant behavior to be examined as a subjective social construction instead of assuming that an act is universally deviant. The labeling perspective argues that an act is socially defined as deviant if and only if it is labeled as such by those with the power to bring sanctions.
Labeling Processes

Labeling processes operate differently for the criminal than for the non-criminal domains of deviance. Delinquent behavior committed within the criminal domain is labeled by the criminal justice system which also enforces the sanctions for this behavior. The penalties for delinquent behavior can include probation, counseling, fines and incarceration. Non-criminal deviant behavior is labeled by parents, teachers and the mainstream population all of whom can enforce various sanctions. The penalties for non-criminal deviant behavior can include restriction of privileges, school suspension or discrimination from the mainstream population.

Labeling theory predicts that once an adolescent is labeled as delinquent, stigma from the effects of being labeled will lead to further delinquency. Although it has not been applied in this manner, labeling theory might also predict that once an adolescent receives a deviant label for committing a non-criminal deviant act from parents, teachers, or mainstream society, stigma from this deviant label will also lead to further deviance. This causal order is rejected in this report on the basis that adolescents who participate in non-criminal deviant behavior bear no criminal stigma that would lead to secondary deviance. On the contrary, they seem to enjoy their deviant status. Unlike a delinquent label that limits the adolescent's participation in society, creates a self-fulfilling prophecy and increases the likelihood that they will participate in a delinquent subculture, a rebellious label does not usually generate social penalties which would limit the adolescent's normal social participation. According to labeling theory this lack of societal access is what compels the adolescent to seek out a deviant peer group. If the adolescent is not compelled by a lack of societal access to join a
deviant group, then there must be another motivation for committing non-criminal deviant acts and joining a deviant subculture. Thus, it is not the official deviant label which leads to secondary acts of non-criminal deviance; rather the deviant label seems to be precisely what the rebellious adolescent is seeking through continued deviance.

The concept of positive deviance provides some insight into how labeling can lead to a deviant act when societal access is not denied. Positive deviance has been defined as acts which are singled out for special treatment and recognition. These acts are evaluated by others as superior because they surpass conventional expectations (Dodge, 1985). The acts are deviant because they exceed conventional norms, hence the term positive deviance. Just like negative deviance, positive deviance can bring social penalties and sanctions. A student or employee who overexcels at their work might face the jealousy or condemnation of their peers because they raise the standards which not every person in the group can or wants to meet. The affected peers will apply a negative label such as "teacher’s pet," "brown noser" or "suck-up." But, regardless of these negative labels, it is not likely that the overachiever will seek to work down to the level of their peers. Instead, they will continue to seek out the positive labels and accolades of their teachers or managers (Homans, 1950). Thus, what compels the positive deviant to commit further acts of deviance may be that they are actually seeking the positive deviant label. In this case, the overachiever is seeking a positive evaluation from one audience, teachers and managers, while causing a negative evaluation by another audience, other students and coworkers. In the case of non-criminal deviants, however, the negative assessment of other audiences--teachers, parents and non-significant others--is sought in order to receive a positive evaluation from the peer group audience.
Peer Groups and Impression Management

Peer interaction is intended to draw the person closer to the peer group. Peer ideology can influence violent behavior as peer discourse provides the cognitive meanings that connect violence with group interests and goals (Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1985). In her study of violent street gangs, Campbell notes that, “the boy's desire to associate with his peer group will naturally draw him there. It is on the street that he gains exposure to adult role models and seeks to demonstrate his masculinity” (1986, p.118). This association between delinquency and peer groups is predicted by differential association theory (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970).

Peer influences are not limited to the inspiring of delinquent behavior. The Schwendingers (1985) note that peer societies are an important part of group identity. The adolescent will identify with their peer society inclusively while viewing out-groups by their lowest members and applying an out-group homogeneity. That is, the peer group will view out-group members as being homogenous and base this perception on the worst of the out-group. Not only is the out-group all the same, but they are all just as bad. Childers and Rao (1992) found that an adolescent's peer group will have a greater influence on the consumption of certain items than the influence of nuclear or extended families. Thus, when it comes to consumption decisions based in the public arena, the peer group is more influential than a familial group. Bleich et al. (1991) examined the association between identification with rebellious group norms and consumption of defiant rock music. They discovered that the rebellious peer group avoided music which was non-defiant in nature, perhaps reflecting the peer influence to avoid non-defiant music. Peer groups have also been found to provide a
prime supportive function in day to day situations (Frey and Rothlisberger, 1996), and the
effects of peer group participation on self-esteem have been well documented (see Bishop
and Inderbitzen, 1995, for review). It is clear from this literature that the peer group has an
inclusive influence on its members.

Favorable peer evaluations appear to be particularly salient to adolescents. Douvan
and Adelson (1966) viewed a supportive adolescent peer group as the primary social arena in
which adolescents develop a healthy sense of self. Kinny's (1993) in-depth study of
adolescent peer groups found that adolescents who were negatively labeled as nerds in middle
school sought to change their status by associating with "normal" peer groups in high school.
These "nerds" became a part of groups which formed more diverse peer cultures that were
organized into a less hierarchical social structure. Thus, the transition to high school
provided an opportunity for students to redefine themselves by obtaining positive peer
evaluations from the more diverse groups found in the high school setting. This process was
described in earlier research which had shown that teenagers frequently apply social labels to
their peers while searching for a sense of personal identity (Douvan and Adelson, 1966). In
a small qualitative study, it was found that among seventh- and eighth-grade boys who were
rejected by their peers there occurred a categorical stability within which all of the rejected
boys accepted peer membership. The only exception was one boy who continued to seek
acceptance (eventually successfully) from the rejecting peer group instead of simply imitating
his accepted peers (Merten, 1996). The adolescent need to belong to a peer group appears to
be part of the developmental process and should be considered as an important consideration
in the day to day lives of adolescents.
Perhaps the key component of the peer/adolescent relationship is the importance placed on the adolescent's presentation of self. As Merten and Kinney indicated, those teenagers who were unable to manage an impression acceptable to a peer group were rejected out of hand and supplied with a pejorative label. The adolescent's ability to create an impression acceptable to the peer group becomes an important component of group membership. Indeed, the performance of the team becomes an important part of group identity, and any deviation can carry negative sanctions from other team members (Goffman, 1959). Thus, a primary factor in an adolescent's acceptance into a peer group is the teenager's ability to manage an impression that is acceptable to other peer group members, and then present this self to others as a symbol of group membership. Since peer group associations are a primary concern of the adolescent, the presentation of self also becomes a primary concern.

The rich effects associated with the labeling perspective, the mental process of presentation of self by impression management, and the social process whereby adolescents choose, associate with and are influenced by peer groups; provide the basis for the theoretical explanation of rebellious, or non-criminal deviant behavior. Once an adolescent has chosen to associate with a peer group with rebellious characteristics it becomes necessary for the adolescent to integrate themselves into their chosen peer group. Since the primary identification of many such groups is the counterculture orientation, the adolescent must demonstrate that they possess such an orientation in order to be accepted. One way to demonstrate acceptance of the group's performance is to commit acts which will be labeled as deviant by the appropriate reference groups, i.e., parents, teachers, and mainstream society.
That is, the adolescent must present a deviant self to the group and then manage this impression by committing deviant acts. However, these acts need not be criminal in nature. If there are no other influences such as social strain or lack of control, the adolescent will likely choose less risky forms of deviant expression that occur outside the criminal domain. Thus, the motivation for non-criminal deviant behavior is the adolescent seeking the deviant label for peer acceptance, peer status, and for self-definition. The deviant label is not applied a priori to the rebellious adolescent’s choice to join a rebellious peer group; rather, the adolescent seeks the deviant label as a means of impression management, to affirm their association with their chosen peer group. The adolescent, if under no other influence, will select non-criminal deviant acts to create this impression.

Hypothesis 2

In this chapter, I have argued that a lack of social control, social strain, differential association and the unconventional values it produces, and risk-taking theories explain adolescents’ criminal deviance better than they explain non-criminal rebellious deviance. It was further considered that the labeling process, when combined with processes of peer association and impression management, suggests that some adolescents would have a reason to seek the deviant label. It is this seeking of the deviant label which is proffered to explain rebellious, non-criminal adolescent deviance.

Hypothesis # 2a: Social strain, differential values and risk taking will be more positively associated with the criminal domain than with the school, family and lifestyle domains.
Hypothesis #2b: The label seeking motivation will be more positively associated with the family, lifestyle, and school domains than with the criminal domains.
Notes

1 Similarly one would expect that if the chosen peer group displayed conformist characteristics, the adolescent would practice conforming behavior to gain acceptance. Of course conformist here implies a normative conformity, it could easily be argued that rebellious peer groups exhibit a great deal of conformity to the counterculture norms of the group. Deviant label-seeking only occurs when the chosen peer group is already labeled as deviant. Positive label-seeking could occur if that is the accepted impression of a normative group.

2 This does not exclude the possibility that some type of previous residual rule breaking (Scheff, 1963) might have left the adolescent with a reflected appraisal of themselves as deviant but not delinquent. They would seek membership in the rebellious peer group because of prior labeling as a deviant but not as a delinquent. Still another explanation for joining a deviant peer group would be the increased status and power which comes from belonging to a group that is feared or intimidating (Friesen, 1990).
CHAPTER IV

METHODS

Sample

Data for this study came from an anonymous questionnaire (see Appendix A) given to two groups by the researcher. The first sample consisted of 82 self-described “punk rockers.” The respondents were members of a population of about 200-300 “ punks” who live in the West Texas area between Amarillo and Midland/Odessa. A coffeehouse in Lubbock which served as their hang-out was utilized to give the survey (the coffeehouse has since relocated and changed clientele). The coffeehouse had become known in the “punk” music community and attracted bands from a wide area. This characteristic was utilized to encourage participation in the survey. Respondents filled out questionnaires measuring both deviant conduct and motivations for this conduct in exchange for a free ticket to a show featuring local and out of town bands. The surveys were conducted on the two weekends prior to the show and on the day of the show. Respondents were asked to sit by themselves and not consult others about the survey. Eighty-two questionnaires were originally completed and 82 tickets were distributed. Another 40+ “ punks” paid $5.00 to see the show. One questionnaire was thrown out because it was grossly incomplete and contained obvious inaccuracies. Fifty-four males and twenty-seven females ranging in age from 13-19 satisfactorily completed the survey.

The second group to be given the survey were adolescents incarcerated in the Lubbock County Youth Center, a juvenile detention center. Collection of these data was
part of a joint project with the Lubbock County Youth Center (LCYC). The researcher collected data from these adolescents for and under the direction of LCYC so that it could have a better understanding of the types of deviance in which the adolescents had participated. Original data for this group remains with LCYC. Forty-three males and seventeen females ranging in age from 13-17 satisfactorily completed the survey.

Most of the adolescents expressed to the researcher that they enjoyed taking the survey. Some of the punk youth stated that they thought the researcher was trying to stereotype or "pigeonhole" their behavior. Questions from the respondents concerning the meaning of some of the vocabulary or the meaning of whole items came almost exclusively from the delinquent sample. This is probably a result of their lower ages and educational achievement. All questions were addressed in language which the youth could understand. For example, many of the delinquent kids asked what a contraceptive was (this did not occur in the punk sample), the researcher responded that contraceptives are "rubbers." The punk sample seemed to be more concerned with anonymity than the delinquent sample.

Measurement of Variables

Dependent Variable

The questionnaire measured deviant behaviors through self-report questions. Various deviant behaviors were listed and respondents were asked to "Please estimate the number of times you have acted this way DURING the last 12 months." These behaviors were separated into domains within which deviant acts occur. Four of these domains
(criminal, family, school, and lifestyle) were considered pure domains and the deviant behaviors listed within each domain are unique to that domain. Domains that included behaviors which might fit into more than one domain were included on the survey, and one was selected for analysis. This domain was labeled “punker” and included deviance overlapping the non-criminal domains (lifestyle, family, and school) generally common to rebellious adolescents. For example, deviant behaviors such as “listened to music you parents disapprove of,” and “worn clothing or a hairstyle to school that the school disapproved of,” are common for rebellious adolescents and occur within the lifestyle domain as well as the family and school domains (see Appendix B for a complete list of the items within each domain).

The number of deviant acts from the last 12 months was used for analysis as these best reflect the adolescent’s situation at the time of the survey. Outliers were recoded to one above the maximum established to include 95% of the original responses (see Table 5 for a listing of outliers). For example, if 95% of the responses fell below 30, then all outliers were recoded to 31. The means of each domain were then computed. If a respondent answered four of the six items in the pure domains or three of the five in the mixed domain, that case was included in the analysis. The mean for each of the five domains is the measure of that variable. Alpha coefficients for these five dependent variables computed for the entire sample are: criminal (.84), family (.72), school (.87), lifestyle (.59), and “punker” (.79).
Independent Variables

The questionnaire also included ten statements for each of four possible theoretical motivations for committing deviant acts: social strain, differential values, risk-taking, and label-seeking. Respondents were instructed, “Beside each statement indicate which response best represents YOUR opinion.” Responses were strongly disagree, mildly disagree, sometimes agree/sometimes disagree, mildly agree and strongly agree, scored 1 through 5, with higher scores indicating a greater disposition toward that particular motivation. Principal components analysis was used to reduce items measuring each of the deviance motivations to a more limited set of variables in the from of factors. The items that comprise each of these factors, along with their mnemonic names, are listed in Appendix C.

Table 1 presents eigenvalues for all components of each type of deviance motivation, the items which comprise them, and their loadings after orthogonal rotation. Three to four of the original items were eliminated since they were either not correlated with any of the other items or did not load at a reasonable level (.40) on any of the factors. The alpha coefficients were quite low for these factors, ranging from .26 to .69. However, each set of factors captured at least 50% of the common variance, and each of the factors makes conceptual sense.

Three factors measure risk-taking motivation, “risky attitude” refers to support for risk-taking in general, “driving dangerous” indicates a positive orientation toward risky driving, and “adventure” captures the desire to take risks for the sake of new experiences. The two measures of differential values motivation are “MTV education,” referring to a
grouping of attitudes that reflect the current youth culture, and "reject society’s values" indicating a refusal to accept the norms of the general society. Motivations from social strain is measured by "strain on me," which refers to strain which is experienced at the individual level, and by "strain on society," which captures strain experienced by the larger society. The two factors that tap label-seeking motivation are "label me deviant," reflecting the adolescent’s desire to be labeled different from conventional peers, and "label my friends deviant," indicating the desire to have friends labeled differently from more conventional peers.

The questionnaire also collected demographic data on age, gender, education, school plans, family composition, and self-report indicators of socioeconomic status. Appendix E contains means of these and all other variables for the entire sample and two subsamples.

**Data Analysis.** Hypothesis 1 requires comparisons of levels of deviance between the domains. For this analysis I calculated Pearson’s $r$ for each pair of domains, as well as the mean $r$ of all non-criminal domains with the criminal domain. Fisher’s $Z$ transformation was used to test the significance of the differences between the $r$’s. In addition principle components analysis was used to determine if two factors would be formed along the criminal/non-criminal dimension.

Hypothesis 2 examines the relationship between the four sets of motivations and deviance in the criminal and non-criminal domains. The first part of this hypothesis predicts that traditional explanations (risk taking, differential values, social strain) for deviance will be associated more closely with criminal than non-criminal deviance. The
second part of this hypothesis predicts that label seeking will relate more strongly to non-criminal than criminal deviance. To test these predictions I calculated Pearson’s $r$ between each motivation factor and each domain of deviance. Comparisons were made between mean $r$’s within four different groupings: risk taking/social strain/differential values with criminal domains, risk-taking/social strain/differential values with non-criminal domains, label seeking with criminal domains, label seeking with non-criminal domains. Fisher’s $Z$ transformation was used to determine if any differences were statistically significant. The .05 level of significance has been chosen for these tests and levels of .01 and .001 will also be reported.

Due to the many reported instances of differences between female and male deviance this sample will be analyzed separately for each gender.
### Table I

**Factor Loadings For Deviance Motivation Items After Orthogonal Rotation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Taking</th>
<th>Risky Attitude</th>
<th>Driving Dangerous</th>
<th>Adventure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTEXPLOR</td>
<td>-.22051</td>
<td>.03040</td>
<td>.82887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTHIGHPL</td>
<td>.49604</td>
<td>.43154</td>
<td>.21781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTRIDDRG</td>
<td>-.08109</td>
<td>.75293</td>
<td>-.21104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTCLMBMT</td>
<td>.46178</td>
<td>-.01494</td>
<td>.64195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTTRYDRG</td>
<td>.73554</td>
<td>.14227</td>
<td>-.11424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTDANACT</td>
<td>.78945</td>
<td>-.15015</td>
<td>.03133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTRIDBR</td>
<td>.07916</td>
<td>.66828</td>
<td>.15503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>1.181156</th>
<th>1.20485</th>
<th>1.14143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differential Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTV Education</th>
<th>Reject Society's Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DVPARVAL</td>
<td>.06788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVEDIMP</td>
<td>.82400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVAPPSUC</td>
<td>.14081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVMARCHL</td>
<td>.60336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVMTVVAL</td>
<td>.51667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVSCLOWST</td>
<td>.82561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>2.03954</th>
<th>1.40752</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Strain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain On Me</th>
<th>Strain On Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSANGSOC</td>
<td>.72949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSOCSUC</td>
<td>.83888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSATHHAR</td>
<td>.66145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSREBBVR</td>
<td>.12216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCNTON</td>
<td>.09433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCNGGOV</td>
<td>-.02750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>2.21424</th>
<th>1.25067</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.)

Factor Loadings For Deviance Motivation Items After Orthogonal Rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label-Seeking</th>
<th>Label Me Deviant</th>
<th>Label My Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSFRENGDS</td>
<td>.04905</td>
<td>.85292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSNORBOR</td>
<td>.55969</td>
<td>-.12980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSLIKFRD</td>
<td>-.18379</td>
<td>.68695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPARMUS</td>
<td>.71250</td>
<td>-.00835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTHKPNK</td>
<td>.51389</td>
<td>.04922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCRAZY</td>
<td>.73374</td>
<td>.13064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPARFUN</td>
<td>.44948</td>
<td>.58746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigen value   | 1.98404          | 1.45844          |
| % of variance | 28.3%            | 20.8%            |
| Cumulative    | 49.2%            |                  |
Notes

1 The lifestyle domain differs from those of the other domains. The other domains have boundaries which are either physical in nature (family, school) or are codified (criminal). The boundaries of the lifestyle domain are defined by the tastes of the individual and how these tastes are judged and labeled by the rest of the society. Sobel (1981) offers a compelling argument for how individuals' tastes are reflected in their lifestyle, and how these lifestyles are judged by other reference groups within the social structure as well as by the individuals' own reference group.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings from analyses that test the two hypothesis separately for each gender. The first set of results focuses on the first hypothesis. Two types of analyses of the domains of deviance—comparison of correlation coefficients and principal components analysis—examine the extent to which non-criminal deviance differs from criminal deviance. I then examine the second hypothesis by comparing the correlation coefficients of factors representing the four types of deviance motivation with each domain of deviance.

Hypothesis 1: Differences In Domains Of Deviance

The first hypothesis is based on the argument that delinquency and rebellion are distinct types of adolescent deviance. It contends that the non-criminal domains of deviance in which rebellion mainly occurs will be more closely associated with each other than with criminal domain. Table 2 presents comparisons of correlation coefficients which comprise the first test of this hypothesis. If non-criminal rebellion and criminal delinquency are separate types of deviance as the hypothesis predicts, then two outcomes should occur. First, the six correlation coefficients among the four non-criminal domains should be significant, while those between the non-criminal and criminal domains should not be significant. Second, associations between the four non-criminal domains should be stronger than the association between the criminal and non-criminal domains.
Results from the male sample in Table 2 do not confirm this hypothesis. Neither of the expected outcomes occurs. As predicted, three non-criminal domains are related to each other: punker-family, school-lifestyle, and lifestyle-punker. However, there are also significant associations of the criminal to the school and lifestyle domains. Since only half of the ten predicted relationships occur, these results do not support the first hypothesis. Associations among the non-criminal domains are not stronger than associations between the criminal and non-criminal domains. This is demonstrated by the lack of a significant difference between the mean $r$ within the non-criminal domains (.23) and the mean $r$ of the criminal with the non-criminal domains (.30; $p > .05$).

Findings from the analysis on the female sample are more supportive of the first hypothesis (see Table 2). All six of the associations among the non-criminal domains are strong and significant. There are two moderate and significant associations between the criminal and the school and lifestyle domains. These are the only two associations which do not match the predicted outcome. Perhaps more important than the number of significant relationships is the strength of these associations. The mean $r$ of the criminal with the non-criminal domains is .20 and the mean $r$ within the non-criminal domains is .69 ($p < .01$). Thus, the second predicted outcome emerges: relationships among the non-criminal domains are stronger than associations between the criminal and the non-criminal domains.

Principal component analyses of the five domains of deviance produce results in Table 3 that mirror the findings from Table 2. For males there is no clear criminal or non-criminal factor. The crime, school, and lifestyle domains load on one factor, with the
family and punker domains loading on a separate factor. However, for the female sample the factors emerge as the first hypothesis predicts. The school, family, lifestyle, and punker domains all load strongly on the first factor (.75 or higher), while the criminal domain alone (loading of .90) comprises the second factor. Note also that the two factors among females capture considerably more of the variance among the five domains (females= 84%: males=66%), suggesting a better factor solution among females than males.

**Hypothesis #2: Delinquency Theories Versus Label-Seeking**

The second hypothesis made two predictions. First, deviance motivations representing traditional delinquency theories would be related more to criminal deviance than non-criminal deviance. Second, the label-seeking deviance motivation would be related more to non-criminal deviance than criminal deviance. Both predictions assume that each motivation factor will be positively related with their respective domains of deviance.

The data presented in Table 4 show the correlation coefficients for the male sample. For this sample the second hypothesis is not supported. The first prediction that the motivation factors representing traditional delinquency theories would be related more to criminal deviance than non-criminal deviance is not supported. The mean $r$ for the traditional factors with the criminal domain is .03 and the mean $r$ with non-criminal domains is .14 ($p > .05$). Three of the criminal with traditional factor associations are significant (one negative) and four of the non-criminal with traditional factor associations
are significant. The second prediction that label-seeking would be more strongly related to non-criminal than criminal deviance is evident (non-criminal = .21; criminal = .056) but it is not significant at .05 (Z = 1.24). Although these differences are not significant, the label-seeking factors are positively and significantly associated with the non-criminal domains, but are not significantly associated with the criminal domains. However, due to the lack of statistical significance the hypothesis must be rejected for this sample.

More support for the second hypothesis occurs among the female sample. While the mean $r$ for the traditional motivation factors with the criminal domain (.12) is larger than the mean $r$ of these factors with non-criminal behavior (.08), this difference is not significant. However, four of the seven factors representing motivations posited by traditional delinquency theories— at least one from each theory— have significant positive associations with the criminal domain, while none are positively related in a statistically significant fashion with non-criminal behavior. Overall, most of the predicted relationships of the traditional motivational factors occur. Thus, even though the difference between the mean $r$'s fails to support the first prediction of this hypothesis, the pattern of relationships which is statistically significant (chi-square = 5.6, $p < .05$), suggests that the traditional motivational factors are more connected with criminal than non-criminal behavior among the female sample.

Regarding the second prediction the mean $r$ for the label-seeking factors with the criminal domain is -.26 while the mean $r$ with the non-criminal domains is .35 ($p < .01$). Both of the label seeking factors are strongly, positively and significantly associated with the non-criminal domains. One of the label-seeking factors is significantly associated with
the criminal domain, but this association is negative meaning that label-seeking is not a motivation for criminal conduct. Because there is statistical and substantive significance, the second part of hypothesis 2 is confirmed for this sample.
Table 2
Correlation Coefficients By Gender: Criminal By Non-Criminal Domains Of Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males (N=97)</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>LIFESTYLE</th>
<th>PUNKER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIME</td>
<td>.1462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>.5314***</td>
<td>.1611</td>
<td>.5050***</td>
<td>.2572**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1097</td>
<td>.5106***</td>
<td>.0390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFESTYLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2853**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001

Mean $r$ for criminal with non-criminal domains = .30263
Mean $r$ within non-criminal domains = .22715  $Z_F = .557$  $p > .05$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females (N=44)</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>LIFESTYLE</th>
<th>PUNKER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIME</td>
<td>.0256</td>
<td>.3019*</td>
<td>.3270*</td>
<td>.1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>.5631***</td>
<td>.5484***</td>
<td>.6703***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>.9249***</td>
<td>.7569***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFESTYLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>.7036***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001

Mean $r$ for criminal with non-criminal domains = .1965
Mean $r$ within non-criminal domains = .69453  $Z_F = 2.98$  $p < .01$
Table 3
Factor Scores For Domains Of Deviance By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRIMINAL</th>
<th>NON-CRIMINAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIME</td>
<td>.78335</td>
<td>-.29933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>.78976</td>
<td>-.27906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>.36055</td>
<td>.62671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFESTYLE</td>
<td>.81519</td>
<td>-.02891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNKER</td>
<td>.32277</td>
<td>.78222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue 2.13607 1.17293
% of variance 42.7% 23.5%
Cumulative 66.2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRIMINAL</th>
<th>NON-CRIMINAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIME</td>
<td>.90006</td>
<td>.33174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>.07429</td>
<td>.93836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>-.39207</td>
<td>.75024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFESTYLE</td>
<td>.11567</td>
<td>.92241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNKER</td>
<td>-.20620</td>
<td>.87707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue 1.02525 3.17351
% of variance 20.5% 63.5%
Cumulative 84.0%
Table 4

Correlation Coefficients By Gender: Deviance Motivation Factor Scores By Criminal And Non-Criminal Domains Of Deviance Mean Frequencies

Males (N=97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRIMINAL DOMAIN</th>
<th>NON-CRIMINAL DOMAINS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISKY ATTITUDE (RT)</td>
<td>.0443</td>
<td>.2781**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVING DANGEROUS (RT)</td>
<td>.2262*</td>
<td>.2421**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVENTURE (RT)</td>
<td>-.2675**</td>
<td>-.1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTV EDUCATION (DV)</td>
<td>.2391**</td>
<td>.2832**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REJECT SOCIETY’S VALUES (DV)</td>
<td>-.1376</td>
<td>.1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAIN ON ME (SS)</td>
<td>.1345</td>
<td>.1956*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAIN ON SOCIETY (SS)</td>
<td>-.0062</td>
<td>-.0476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABEL ME DEVIAN'T (LS)</td>
<td>.0704</td>
<td>.2377*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABEL MY FRIENDS (LS)</td>
<td>.0422</td>
<td>.1759*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Mean r for traditional factors with criminal domain = .03326
Mean r for traditional factors with non-criminal domains = .13624

Z_F = .712 p > .05

Mean r for label-seeking factors with criminal domain = .11740
Mean r for label-seeking factors with non-criminal domain = .20680

Z_F = 1.24 p > .05

Females (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRIMINAL DOMAIN</th>
<th>NON-CRIMINAL DOMAINS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISKY ATTITUDE (RT)</td>
<td>-.1186</td>
<td>.2503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVING DANGEROUS (RT)</td>
<td>.2594*</td>
<td>-.1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVENTURE (RT)</td>
<td>-.4177**</td>
<td>-.0810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTV EDUCATION (DV)</td>
<td>.4795***</td>
<td>-.2699*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REJECT SOCIETY’S VALUES (DV)</td>
<td>-.2198</td>
<td>.0898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAIN ON ME (SS)</td>
<td>.4080**</td>
<td>.1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAIN ON SOCIETY (SS)</td>
<td>.4310**</td>
<td>-.1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABEL ME DEVIAN'T (LS)</td>
<td>-.0991</td>
<td>.3289*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABEL MY FRIENDS (LS)</td>
<td>-.4152**</td>
<td>.3620**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Mean r for traditional factors with criminal domain = .11740
Mean r for traditional factors with non-criminal domains = .08930

Z_F = .129 p > .05

Mean r for label-seeking factors with criminal domain = -.25175
Mean r for label-seeking factors with non-criminal domain = .34545

Z_F = 2.82 p < .01
Notes

1 MTV education, a differential value factor, is significantly linked with less noncriminal behavior—opposite what would be expected if differential values generated such behavior.
Support for the hypotheses varies considerably between the male and female subsamples. Findings from analyses on adolescent males could not statistically support either hypothesis. Results showed that family, school, lifestyle and punker domains of deviance were not more positively associated with each other than with the criminal domain, prompting rejection of the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis fared little better. While the label-seeking motivation was significantly associated with non-criminal but not criminal deviance among males (as was predicted), the difference between the two sets of relationships did not attain a reasonable level of statistical significance. Further, social strain, differential values and risk taking theories did not predict males' criminal deviance any better than their non-criminal deviance.

Results from analyses on adolescent females tell a different story. Criminal and non-criminal deviance emerged as more distinct behavioral categories. The overall pattern of statistically significant relationships among the deviance domains suggests that the two categories are distinct. Although two of the four non-criminal domains had statistically significant links to criminal deviance, all of the non-criminal domains displayed significant relationships to each other. But it was the much stronger associations among the four non-criminal domains compared to their connections with criminal deviance that created the most support for hypothesis 1. Motivations also differed for criminal and non-criminal deviance among the female sample, as predicted in hypothesis 2. However, comparison of
the mean \( r \)'s of motivations from the three traditional theories of delinquency to criminal versus non-criminal deviance revealed no statistically significant variation. However, four of seven motivation factors, representing all three traditional theories of delinquency, had significant positive associations with criminal deviance and none were positively linked to non-criminal deviance—an overall pattern that was statistically significant. Further, both indices of label-seeking exhibited significant positive relationships with the non-criminal domain but not with the criminal domain, and the difference between the mean \( r \)'s of each set of relationships was significant. For these adolescent females label-seeking is clearly a motivation for non-criminal but not criminal deviance; factors posited by traditional delinquency theories but not label-seeking motivate criminal more than non-criminal deviance.

This discussion will consider implications of these findings for three current trends in explaining deviance: use of integrated theory, the concept of the generality of deviance, and the use of feminist perspectives to explain gender differences.

**Implications For Theory**

**Integrated Theory**

The last ten to fifteen years has witnessed an explosion in efforts to use integrated theory to explain criminal conduct (see Siegel, 1995: Chapter 10, for complete summary). Findings from this study indicate the utility of these efforts, in that variables representing three different theories are associated with the criminal deviance of these youth. However, these findings also caution that integrated theories may not be as useful in
accounting for non-criminal deviance among women. This appears to be distinct from their criminal deviance and is explained by factors other than those from the traditional explanations of delinquency such as social strain, differential values and risk taking which are frequently merged into an integrated theory (Elliott, 1979; Thornberry, 1987; Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). If integrated theory is to fully explain deviance, at least among female adolescents, it may need to incorporate more approaches than are addressed by traditional explanations of delinquency.

Generality of Deviance

According to Osgood et al. (1988) there are two plausible explanations for the general association between deviant behaviors which many researchers have found in the past. The first is that engaging in one type of deviant behavior leads to engaging in other types of deviant behavior. For example, a person who tries marijuana will begin to associate with a peer group who may be involved in more deviant activities which will then involve the original pot smoker. The second explanation is that different types of deviant behaviors are related because they have some type of shared influence. Our pot smoker, for example, will commit other deviant acts because she is influenced by a motivation which compels her to participate in any deviant activity, regardless of its characteristics. Thus, the same motivation which compels the young adolescent to smoke pot will be the same motivation which compels the youth to rob a 7-11.

Regarding the first explanation, the results of this survey indicate that among the males behavior in the criminal domain is associated with non-criminal deviant behavior.
Within the female sample, however, non-criminal domains of deviance are clearly not as strongly associated with the criminal domain as they are with each other. It seems that among males the commission of a delinquent act is not differentiated from the commission of non-criminal acts. But for the females it appears that criminal and non-criminal deviance are highly differentiated.

Regarding the second explanation for the generality of deviance, research by Elliott et al. (1985) and Jessar and Jessor (1977) has demonstrated that different deviant behaviors can be influenced by the same factors. For example, social strain will influence not only property theft, but will also influence assault or rape as well. This type of influence can also be seen in both the male and female samples, but in different patterns. Among the male population deviance motivations predicted both criminal and non-criminal deviance indicating that the same motivation which influences criminal deviance is the same which influences non-criminal deviance. However, among the female sample one set of motivations influenced criminal but not non-criminal deviance. If there are separate motivations which influence the commission of criminal and non-criminal acts, and the two sets of domains are distinct, then the motivation which influences murder could also influence burglary but not a mohawk, while the motivation which influences multiple face piercings can also influence parental conflicts but not robbery. Thus, the second explanation of the generality of deviance is supported among the female sample, but only when the criminal/non-criminal delineation is considered.

Results of this study support the idea of the generality of deviance for men, but for women the pattern is quite different. For the women generality may occur but only within
the criminal or only within the non-criminal domains. Further, for both the male and female samples the label-seeking motivation seems to influence the generality of non-criminal deviance, but there is no positive relationship between label-seeking and delinquency.

Feminist Theory

The early work on delinquency from which the traditional theories were formed used male samples. Hence, many contemporary scholars believe that these traditional theories are inadequate at explaining female deviance (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Carlen, 1990; Thomas and Stein, 1990; Caufield & Wonders, 1994). Eileen Leonard (1982: xi, 182) writes,

Theoretical criminology is incapable of adequately explaining female patterns of crime....Theories that are frequently hailed as explanations of human behavior are, in fact, discussions of male behavior and male criminality....We cannot simply apply these theories to women, nor can we modify them with a brief addition or subtraction here and there.

This argument has two dimensions. First, because the traditional theories were based on data drawn from male samples, these theories should not be generalized to female delinquency. Second, because female behavior is inherently different from male behavior, these theories cannot be generalized to the female population.

Smith and Paternoster (1987) tested this supposition and found that when the traditional theories of deviance are tested among both men and women, there is not much significant difference between the two genders. The explanatory power of traditional theories was not gender specific. This research only tested one type of deviance,
marijuana use, but none of the measures of social bonds, differential association, social strain or deterrence showed a significant difference between the genders. The authors conclude that there is no support for increasing the sex stratification of theories of deviance. Gender-specific theoretical development is "based on the unproven assumption that the deviant behavior of males and females reflected different underlying processes and motivations" (Smith & Paternoster, 1987: 157).

In this study, however, it was found that the types of deviant behavior engaged in and the patterns of this behavior are fundamentally different between females and males. Males who engaged in criminal behavior showed an almost equal propensity for engaging in non-criminal deviance. However, the females in the sample who engaged in criminal deviance tended to confine their actions to the criminal domain, while those who engaged in non-criminal deviance tended to confine their actions to the non-criminal domains. Moreover, the traditional theories of deviance had equal explanatory power for both criminal and non-criminal male deviance, but they only explained criminal female deviance. Thus, one important gender distinction for the generality of deviance is the domain in which the deviance occurs and is labeled deviant. Label-seeking predicted the generality of non-criminal deviance among both genders. However, for females this relationship was negative, while it was near zero for men. According to this sample then, the primary differences between males and females are the domains of deviance, and the effects of label-seeking.
Label-Seeking Hypothesis

The label-seeking hypothesis predicts that rebellious adolescents would engage in acts of non-criminal deviance to obtain a deviant label for the purpose of impression management within a rebellious peer group. As the results indicated this explanation was significantly supported among females, and was substantively supported among males although the difference in association was not statistically significant. One explanation for the stronger effects of label-seeking on female deviance is that females, more than males, conform to the expectations of their peers (Nord, 1969; Thomas & Weigart, 1971). Smith and Paternoster (1987) found similar evidence with an item in their survey which measured peer attachment. Females showed a significantly higher level of peer attachment than males (F=3.65 : M=3.36, on a 5-pt. scale). If females do indeed feel a stronger need for acceptance from their peers, then the motivation to present a proper self to their peer group should also be stronger. Thus, if a female chooses a deviant peer group they are likely to put more energy into their presentation of self as deviant. In order to manage this impression they would be more inclined than males to commit deviant acts. But, if this is the case then why is label-seeking deviance limited to non-criminal deviance for women? If the drive for peer acceptance is so strong then wouldn’t the females be inclined to commit any type of deviant act to better their chances for creating the proper impression? There are two reasons why women would have more of a reason to stick to non-criminal deviance for their label-seeking. First, if the locus of control, in this case the peer group, decides that non-criminal deviance is okay but criminal deviance is not, then the best strategy for managing the proper impression would be to stick to high levels of non-
criminal deviance. Second, female deviance is generally judged more harshly than male deviance. As Schur (1984: 15) points out, “Rarely has female deviance been interpreted ‘appreciatively’ as active rebellion or simple unwillingness to conform.” If female deviance is labeled more harshly by society, then it would not be necessary for the female adolescent to commit criminal deviance to obtain the deviant label. A heavy dose of non-criminal deviance can have the same labeling effect on a female that criminal deviance has on males.

Methodological Weakness and Future Directions

This survey used indices of deviance motivations which were low in reliability when statistically tested. In this sense the instrument could use some sharpening. Also, the survey instrument used to test the label-seeking hypothesis utilized respondent’s attitudes towards various statements. These attitudes are then interpreted to mean a general disposition toward label-seeking. I do not need to point out the lack of empirical support between attitudes and behavior, but this is only one weakness of the study. If indeed the label-seeking process is an interactional process as it has been defined here, then a true test of the hypothesis requires the gathering of ethnographic data. Personal interviews and participant observation are just two tools which can be utilized to test the label-seeking hypothesis. Finally, this study utilized two rather small and homogenous samples. In order to determine if these results might be generalizable to other deviant groups or the society at large then a much larger sample is required. Also, not every deviant group particularly wants to be known as a deviant group. Drug addicts and sexual
deviants may not try to publicly seek a deviant label to impress their friends, in fact such an approach might be contrary to the norms of the group. Thus, label-seeking can only be applied in cases where the adolescent seeks to manage an impression that requires labeling from those outside the group.

Another caveat is the exclusion of social control theory from the survey. It has since occurred to me that this important deviance variable should not have been left out, although this was done more for convenience than out of sheer neglect. Issues of social bonds and self-control are very important in explaining delinquency and they might prove to be helpful in explaining non-criminal deviance, especially among the males in this sample. However, I would caution that a lack of self-control would be nearly opposite the desire to seek deviant labels. If an adolescent is seeking the deviant label, it would seem that he or she would be in control, insofar as they are practicing goal-directed behavior which does not violate criminal law. The label-seeking adolescent does not lack self-control, as they are seeking to control their presentation of self through impression management. Nevertheless, the implications these findings have for integrated theory and the generality of deviance suggest that elements of control theory need to be included in any future analysis.

I believe that the best approach to testing the label-seeking hypothesis would utilize a tri-methodological approach. The first method is the one utilized here. The collection of data which describes the adolescent's expressed attitudes and behaviors is useful in determining the levels of various types of deviance as well as general orientations. The second method would be an experimental approach. The experimental
manipulation would be to vary the audiences of a group interview. In one condition the youths would be interviewed in a group by the researcher. In the next condition they would be interviewed by someone who outwardly would appear very similar to themselves. In the third condition they would be interviewed by someone who appears to be an adult authority figure. The prediction would be that if they are seeking the deviant label, their responses to each of the interviewers would vary as they seek to manage an impression in front of the peer group. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, ethnographic data needs to be collected. This would require observation and perhaps participant observation on the part of the researcher. If the general label-seeking hypothesis can be demonstrated in the first two manufactured settings, then it would be up to the last methodology to confirm these findings in a natural setting. Further, data collected from the first two methods can be used to guide the observations of the ethnography.
Notes

1 Although Hirschi and Gottfredson (1993) argue against integrated approaches, their theory on self-control takes into account "reckless acts" which are an indicator of low self-control. The "driving dangerous" factor in this study was significantly associated with criminal deviance among males and females, and also with non-criminal deviance among males. Thus, it would seem that Hirschi and Gottfredson have integrated risk-taking factors into their conception of delinquency resulting from low self-control, an idea which is supported in this study.
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
This survey is being used to examine the nature and origins of rebellious and delinquent behavior among adolescents. Since accuracy is important to any scientific endeavor, it is necessary that you respond as accurately as possible to the questions asked. No names or identities are asked below and none will be associated with this information. Confidentiality will be maintained at all costs.

1. Age:______________

2. Gender:____________

3. Circle the last grade of education completed:

7 8 9 10 11 H.S. dropout H.S. Grad GED

4. Are you planning on attending school in the fall? yes no don’t know yet

5. With whom do you live? (Check one)
Live with own mother and father_______
Live with father and stepmother_______
Live with mother and stepfather_______
Live with mother only___________
Live with father only___________
Live with other relative(s)_________
Don’t live with family or relatives_______

6. Compared with American families in general would you say your family income was: (Check one)
Far below average________
Below average__________
Average__________
Above average__________
Far above average________
Don’t know________

7. If you were asked to use one of four names for your social class which would you say you belong in: (Check one)
Lower class_______
Working class__________
Middle class_______
Upper class_______
Don’t know________
Below are some ways people frequently behave. For each behavior, please estimate the number of times you have acted this way **DURING the last 12 months.** It is difficult to be precise, so give your best estimate. Please give a NUMBER for each answer, remember zero is a number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taken something from a store without paying for it:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionally hurt someone bad enough to need bandages or medical treatment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been in trouble with the police:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionally damaged property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened someone with a weapon:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken into a vehicle or building:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run away from home:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been asked to leave your family's home:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored chores or family responsibilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argued or had a non-violent fight with your parents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lied to your parents about where you were or your actions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened a parent with physical violence:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped school:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not studied for a test when you knew you needed to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argued or had a non-violent fight with teachers or school administrators:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been disciplined at school:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lied to teachers or school administrators:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheated on a test:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Had a body part pierced:

20. Raced another car while driving or riding:

21. Worn clothing to a non-school function that was inappropriate:

22. Had your body tattooed:

23. Had sexual intercourse without a contraceptive:

24. Seen a pornographic video or movie:

25. Hit one of your parents:

26. Stolen something from a family member:

27. Damaged family property on purpose:

28. Damaged school property on purpose:

29. Hit a teacher or school administrator:

30. Stolen property from your school:

31. Drunk alcohol to get drunk:

32. Driven while intoxicated:

33. Used marijuana:

34. Made bad grades despite your parents' warnings:

35. Watched television or a movie your parent(s) disapproved of:

36. Lied to your family about how you were doing in school:

37. Listened to music your parent(s) disapproved of:

38. Worn a hairstyle your parent(s) disapproved of:

39. Worn clothing your parent(s) disapproved of:

40. Worn clothing or a hairstyle to school that the school disapproved of:
41. Worn clothing or a hairstyle that other students or peers disapproved of:

42. Drive or ride in a car going more than 80 mph:

Beside each statement indicate which response best represents your opinion. (Circle one)

Strongly Agree = A
Mildly Agree = B
Sometimes Agree/Sometimes Disagree = C
Mildly Disagree = D
Strongly Disagree = E

1. It is important that my friends think I am just like them.
   A B C D E

2. Wearing a necktie is waste of a strip of cloth and only serves to label people.
   A B C D E

3. My family has had a hard time because we haven't had much money.
   A B C D E

4. I would have enjoyed being one of the first explorers of a strange new land.
   A B C D E

5. I like it when other people think I am different.
   A B C D E

6. My parents values are the same as mine.
   A B C D E

7. It is hard for someone like me to find a job.
   A B C D E

8. I enjoy gambling when I have the money to spend.
   A B C D E

9. It is important that I don't look like anyone else.
   A B C D E

10. Education is important in leading a happy life.
    A B C D E
11. I am angry because society won't let me look and behave like an individual.
A B C D E

12. I like the feeling of standing next to the edge of a high place.
A B C D E

13. People that look and act normal are boring.
A B C D E

14. Dress and appearance should be considered a sign of success.
A B C D E

15. Society tries to keep people like me from being successful.
A B C D E

16. I don't worry when I ride with a person who is drinking or using drugs.
A B C D E

17. I like to look and behave like my friends.
A B C D E

18. Going to school is a waste of time to me.
A B C D E

19. Authority figures seem to single me out for harsh or unfair treatment.
A B C D E

20. I don't understand people who enjoy climbing dangerous mountains.
A B C D E

21. I am pleased when my parents don't like my music.
A B C D E

22. My family is important to me.
A B C D E

23. The situation of the average person is getting worse.
A B C D E

24. I would not like to try any drug which might produce strange or dangerous effects on me.
A B C D E

25. I don't want other people to think I am a punk with no motivation or future.
A B C D E
26. I look forward to getting married and having children.
   A B C D E

27. It's not fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.
   A B C D E

28. I would like to own and ride a Harley Davidson motorcycle.
   A B C D E

29. I want other people to think I am a crazy teenager.
   A B C D E

30. It is okay for anyone 14 years old to have sex.
   A B C D E

31. Rebellious behavior is necessary to shake up the establishment.
   A B C D E

32. I would like to ride a skateboard down an off-ramp in the draft of a semi truck.
   A B C D E

33. I don't care if my parents think me and my friends look funny.
   A B C D E

34. Conforming to society's rules is very important.
   A B C D E

35. These days people don't really know who they can count on.
   A B C D E

36. If I were a salesman I would prefer working on straight salary rather than taking a chance of making more or less money on commission.
   A B C D E

37. I hate associating with groups outside my peer group.
   A B C D E

38. MTV and music videos best represent my personal values.
   A B C D E

39. There is little use in trying to change the government.
   A B C D E
40. A sensible person avoids activities that are dangerous.
A    B    C    D    E

In the space below, or on the back, please offer any comments or opinions you may have about this survey or the questions you responded to.
APPENDIX B

DOMAINS OF DEVIANCE ITEMS
CRIME:
- Taken something from a store without paying for it
- Intentionally hurt someone bad enough to need bandages or medical treatment
- Been in trouble with the police
- Intentionally damage property
- Threatened someone with a weapon
- Broken into a vehicle or building

FAMILY:
- Run away from home
- Been asked to leave your family’s home
- Ignored chores or family responsibilities
- Argued or had a non-violent fight with your parents
- Lied to your parents about where you were or your actions
- Threatened a parent with physical violence

SCHOOL:
- Skipped school
- Not studied for a test when you knew you needed to
- Argued or had a non-violent fight with teachers or school administrators
- Been disciplined as school
- Lied to teachers or school administrators
- Cheated on a test

LIFESTYLE:
- Had a body part pierced
- Raced another car while driving or riding
- Worn clothing to a non-school function that was inappropriate
- Had your body tattooed
- Had sexual intercourse without a contraceptive
- Seen a pornographic video or movie

PUNKER:
- Listened to music your parents disapproved of
- Worn a hairstyle your parents disapproved of
- Worn clothing your parents disapproved of
- Worn clothing or a hairstyle to school that the school disapproved of
- Worn clothing or a hairstyle that other students disapproved of
APPENDIX C

DEVIANCE MOTIVATION FACTOR ITEMS
RISKY ATTITUDE:
I like the feeling of standing next to the edge of a high place: (RTHIGHPL)
I would not like to try any drug which might produce strange effects: (RTTRYDRG)
A sensible person avoids activities that are dangerous: (RTDANACT)

DRIVING DANGEROUS:
I would like to ride a skateboard down an off-ramp in the draft of a truck: (RTRIDBR)
I don't worry when I ride with a person who is drinking or using drugs: (RTRIDDRG)

ADVENTURE:
I would have enjoyed being one of the first explorers in a strange new land: (RTEXPLOR)
I don't understand people who enjoy climbing dangerous mountains: (RTCLMBMT)

MTV EDUCATION:
Education is important in leading a happy life: (DVEDIMP)
I look forward to getting married and having children: (DVMARCHL)
MTV and music videos best represent my personal values: (DVMTVVAL)
Going to school is a waste of time to me: (DVSCWST)

REJECT SOCIETY'S VALUES:
My parents values are the same as mine: (DVPARVAL)
Dress and appearance should be considered a sign of success: (DVAPPSUC)

STRAIN ON ME:
I am angry because society won't let me look and behave like an individual: (SSANGSOC)
Society tries to keep people like me from being successful: (SSSOCSUC)
Authority figures seem to single me out for harsh or unfair treatment: (SSATHHAR)

STRAIN ON SOCIETY:
Rebellious behavior is necessary to shake up the establishment: (SSREBBVR)
These days people don't really know who they can count on: (SSCNTON)
There is little use in trying to change the government: (SSCNGGOV)

LABEL ME DEVIANT:
People that look and act normal are boring: (LSNORBOR)
I am pleased when my parents don't like my music: (LSPARMUS)
I don't want other people to think I am a punk with no motivation or future: (LSTHKPK)
I want other people to think I am a crazy teenager: (LSCRAZY)

LABEL MY FRIENDS:
It is important that my friends think I am just like them: (LSFRNDS)
I like to look and behave like my friends: (LSLIKFRD)
I don't care if my parents think me and my friends look funny: (LSPARFUN)
APPENDIX D

TABLE 5 AND TABLE 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>% RECODED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMASSAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMTHEFT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPOLIC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMVANDL</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMTHRET</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMBURGL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMNAWY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMKIKOT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMIGRSP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMFITE</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMLIED</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMTHRET</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTRUAN</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNOSTD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCARGTE</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCDISPL</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCLISCL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCHEAT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFPIERC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFRACER</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFCLOTH</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFSEXWO</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFPORNO</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punker domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMUSPR</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLHARPR</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLCLOPR</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCLOSC</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCLOST</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Means Of Self-Report Deviance By Sample And Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>PUNKERS</th>
<th>LCYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIME</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONCRIME</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>10.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFESTYLE</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNKER</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISKY</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFER</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAIN</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEKER</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCREV</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05; difference between punkers and LCYC youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MALE PUNKERS</th>
<th>MALE LCYC</th>
<th>FEMALE PUNKERS</th>
<th>FEMALE LCYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIME</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0**</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONCRIME</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.7**</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFESTYLE</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNKER</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISKY</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFER</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAIN</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEKER</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.0***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCREV</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.5**</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.1***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p ≤ .05; between male punks and male LCYC

*** p ≤ .05; between female punks and female LCYC
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