

SHOPLIFTING AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS:

A STUDY IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF CRIME

By

ILYAS BA-YUNUS

Bachelor of Arts  
University of Karachi  
Karachi, Pakistan  
1952

Master of Arts  
University of Karachi  
Karachi, Pakistan  
1955

Master of Arts  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
1964

Master of Arts  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, Illinois  
1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
May, 1970

Thesis  
1970D  
B361s  
cop. 3

OKLAHOMA  
STATE UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY  
FEB 0 1971

SHOPLIFTING AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS:  
A STUDY IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF CRIME

Thesis Approved:

W. Donald E. Allen  
Thesis Adviser

Gene Hauff

Larry M. Peters

R. A. H. L. G.

D. Durham  
Dean of the Graduate College

769794

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To engage in an academic writing puts the writer under heavy strain. It is also a great burden to his family, teachers, colleagues, and friends. The burden becomes heavier if the writing is aimed at the formal recognition in the form of a college degree. The wife has to stand the irritable absent-mindedness and understand the occasional soliloquys of her husband. Teachers have to readjust their schedules for the frequent but unscheduled demands for guidance, and colleagues and friends have to forgive the occasional "unsociable" behavior of the writer. All these are signs of the generosity extended by the familial, academic, and friendly circles, and the best the writer can do is thank them from the depths of his ego.

My special thanks are due to Professor Donald E. Allen, chairman of my dissertation committee, without whose criticism, encouragements and suggestions, this dissertation would have been reduced to an excursion in the criminological fantasy. Professor F. Gene Acuff, Chairman of the Department of Sociology at Oklahoma State University, throughout the writing of this dissertation displayed that academic posture which is so crucial in keeping an already tired student going. I humbly acknowledge his efforts in making this project a success. I also wish to thank Dr. Raymond Habiby and Dr. Larry Perkins whose valuable suggestions and approval gave this dissertation the final shape. Various student organizations who helped in collected the sample and all those

who took part in the sample were some of my best friends who made the data collection for this dissertation possible. Dr. John H. Guilbert of the Computer Center at Bradley University rendered the greatest help in programming the statistical tests. Worthy of mention is also Mrs. Thomas W. Lee who not only typed the dissertation, but with her background of high school English teacher made appropriate corrections in the text and thus made it look like an academic language.

In the end, I must thank my wife Syeda, who as a bride when I first started on this project, I am sure, could only find in me an academic cynic, and was able to hear and appreciate what I was writing. Her encouragement and suggestions were crucial.

Thus, so many of them participated in this effort. However, if still there is anything lacking in it, I am solely responsible for that.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	9
The Positive Criminal . . . . .	9
Classical School - The Re-emergence . . . . .	23
III. THEORETICAL STATEMENT . . . . .	32
Thomas' Model of Social Behavior . . . . .	34
Recasting of Thomas' Model . . . . .	36
A Theory of Crime . . . . .	37
IV. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	49
Self Reporting . . . . .	49
Shoplifting Among College Students . . . . .	53
Postulates . . . . .	55
Hypotheses . . . . .	58
The Research Design . . . . .	59
V. ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS . . . . .	73
Etiology of Shoplifting by College Students . . . . .	73
Patterns of Shoplifting Among College Students . . . . .	94
VI. INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS . . . . .	114
Limitations . . . . .	114
Discussion . . . . .	117
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	132
Summary . . . . .	132
Conclusions . . . . .	145
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	149
APPENDIX . . . . .	157

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Parsons' Formulation of Responses to "Ambivalence" . . .	20
II. Major Crimes in the United States . . . . .	51
III. Some Attributes of the Colleges and the Campus Towns Selected in the Sample . . . . .	60
IV. Distribution of Sample by Sex, School, and Semester in College . . . . .	63
V. Reliability Coefficients of Criminogenic Attitude and Aggressive Personality Items in the Questionnaire . . . . .	68
VI. Frequency of Shoplifting Differentials by Relevant Objective and Subjective Factors . . . . .	75
VII. Frequency of Shoplifting Differentials by Sex . . . . .	75
VIII. Frequency of Shoplifting Differentials by Status of College . . . . .	76
IX. Urban - Nonurban Differentials in the Shoplifting Frequency . . . . .	76
X. Crimes Ranked in Order of Seriousness by College Students . . . . .	77
XI. Criminogenic Attitude Differentials by Relevant Objective and Subjective Factors . . . . .	79
XII. Criminogenic Attitude Variation by Sex . . . . .	79
XIII. Criminogenic Attitude Variation by Status of College . .	80
XIV. Difference in Shoplifting Frequency by Criminogenic Attitudes Toward Shoplifting . . . . .	80
XV. Difference in Shoplifting Frequency by Aggressive Personality Traits . . . . .	81
XVI. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Criminogenic Attitudes in Different Campus Towns . . . . .	82

Table	Page
XVII. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Criminogenic Attitude for Different Aggressive Personality Traits . . . . .	84
XVIII. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Aggressive Personality Traits in Different Campus Towns . . . . .	85
XIX. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Aggressive Personality Traits for Different Criminogenic Attitudes . . . . .	86
XX. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Criminogenic Attitudes for Different Aggressive Personality Traits in Charleston (Size 1) . . . . .	87
XXI. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Criminogenic Attitudes for Different Aggressive Personality Traits in Jacksonville (Size 2) . . . . .	88
XXII. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Criminogenic Attitudes for Different Aggressive Personality Traits in LaCrosse (Size 3) . . . . .	89
XXIII. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Criminogenic Attitudes for Different Aggressive Personality Traits in Peoria (Size 4) . . . . .	90
XXIV. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Aggressive Personality Traits for Different Criminogenic Attitudes in Charleston (Size 1) . . . . .	92
XXV. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Aggressive Personality Traits for Different Criminogenic Attitudes in Jacksonville (Size 2) . . . . .	92
XXVI. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Aggressive Personality Traits for Different Criminogenic Attitudes in LaCrosse (Size 3) . . . . .	93
XXVII. Variation in Shoplifting Frequency with Aggressive Personality Traits for Different Criminogenic Attitudes in Peoria (Size 4) . . . . .	93
XXVIII. Number and Proportion to Total by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted at Least Once Since They Came to College (Small Town Campuses) . . . . .	97
XXIX. Number and Proportion to Total by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted at Least Once Since They Came to College (Large Town Campuses) . . . . .	98



XXX.	Number and Proportion to Total by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted at Least Once Since They Came to College (Total Sample) . . . . .	99
XXXI.	Number and Proportion to Total by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted at Least Once During the Semester Under Study (Small Town Campuses) . . . . .	101
XXXII.	Number and Proportion to Total by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted at Least Once During the Semester Under Study (Large Town Campuses) . . . . .	102
XXXIII.	Number and Proportion to Total by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted at Least Once During the Semester Under Study (Total Sample) . . . . .	103
XXXIV.	Shoplifting Frequency by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted During the Semester Under Study (Small Town Campuses) . . . . .	105
XXXV.	Shoplifting Frequency by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted During the Semester Under Study (Large Town Campuses) . . . . .	106
XXXVI.	Shoplifting Frequency by Sex and School of Those Who Shoplifted During the Semester Under Study (Total Sample) . . . . .	107
XXXVII.	Total Dollar Value of Items Shoplifted During the Semester Under Study (Small Town Campuses) . . . . .	109
XXXVIII.	Total Dollar Value of Items Shoplifted During the Semester Under Study (Large Town Campuses) . . . . .	110
XXXIX.	Total Dollar Value of Items Shoplifted During the Semester Under Study (Total Sample) . . . . .	111

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Probably crime is as old as the human society itself. In fact we cannot even conceive of crime without society, so the lonely Robinson Crusoe would not commit any crime. Man has learned, most probably by necessity, how to live in societies and groups in order to take part in and utilize the collective effort to save himself from the vagaries of nature and to improve his standard of living. And yet this effort is marred every now and then, if not hampered altogether, by the very people whose well-being depends on this collective effort. Hence the question: Why do people commit crime?

This is an old question for which there has been less than a satisfactory answer. Reformers and politicians, laymen and scientists, law abiding citizens as well as those who do not always abide by the law, are interested in this question. The answers to the "why" of crime are varied in nature and are embedded in superstitions, in lay experiences, and in such scientific and pseudo-scientific inquiries as fall in the areas of psychiatry, psychology, and sociology. We reject superstitions and lay experiences as having little empirical or theoretical foundations. Yet, even the very sophisticated inquiries in the above mentioned disciplines have glaring weaknesses in their views of crime and in their tools of research.

There are three major dilemmas in criminology. If criminology is to be scientific, theory in criminology must provide answers to these questions systematically and research must be able to test all the hypotheses originating from that theory. First is the question of crime causation: Why do people commit crime? Second is the question of differential response or why do people with some traits and in some circumstances commit crimes and others with the same traits and in the same circumstances do not do so? Third is the question of crime selection, i.e., why do people commit certain crimes and not other crimes?

The second question - that of differential response - is, in fact, directly connected with the first. Research done in this direction shows that criminal behavior is associated with social and personal pathologies such as poverty, bad housing, slum residence, lack of recreational facilities, inadequate and demoralized families, feeble mindedness, anomie, alienation, and several other conditions and traits. What do these conditions and traits have in common which apparently produce criminality? Research studies have also demonstrated that many persons with those pathological traits and conditions do not commit crimes and that persons in the upper socio-economic class frequently violate the law, although they are not in poverty and are not necessarily mentally retarded or emotionally unstable. Obviously, these are not the traits and conditions in themselves which cause crime for they are sometimes present when criminality does not occur and sometimes they are present when criminality does occur. Hence the dilemma of differential response. This dilemma, in my opinion, is not so much an objective fact in itself as it is a result of our faulty theorization. The more exclusive is the explanation of crime, the less

is the dilemma of differential response.<sup>1</sup>

Basically, then, there are only two questions in criminology: crime causation and crime selection. One way to answer these questions is to look at criminal behavior as yet another behavior in society. As Howard Becker pointed out, until recently there has been a general tendency in criminology to treat deviant behavior "qualitatively differently from conforming behavior."<sup>2</sup> When criminologists try to throw light on deviant behavior, they automatically keep conformity in the dark, thus letting both appear as if they are embedded in different environments. This seems to be a little farther from the truth because both deviant behavior and conformity occur in society. In fact, both lose their meanings without society; and whatever goes on in society could be summed up in terms of culture insofar as it predisposes to act, in terms of personality insofar as it reflects more permanent response pattern, and in terms of social situation insofar as it is responded to. In a pluralistic society, as most societies today are, there are different subcultures which predispose their participants differentially. It is participated in by people who have different personalities which are distinguished by their respective response patterns. It offers a multitude of situations to be responded to. These factors interact in a variety of combinations which provoke different behavior in society, conforming or otherwise. Each behavior pattern has its own calculus peculiar to it. Any particular combination of factors should be able to explain not only causation but also the selection of the ensuing behavior.

In brief, insofar as both deviant behavior and conformity could be regarded as two aspects of behavior in society, the explanation of

deviant behavior or crime should be embedded in the general theory of behavior. Probably, this is what Becker was trying to suggest<sup>3</sup> and probably this conforms to the demands of Parsons<sup>4</sup> and also Cohen.<sup>5</sup> Sociological criminology is becoming more and more conscious of this fact as is evident from innumerable hints in various commentaries and explanations of crime.<sup>6</sup> However, other than suggestions and hints, little has been done in this direction.

What follows revolves around the two questions of crime causation and crime selection. Thus, this project is not aimed at exploring the patterns of relationship in some particular crime. Rather, it is aimed at building an adequate theory of crime inside the broader framework of a general theory of behavior, and testing this theory by the data pertaining to some crime in this society.

This project was carried out in three stages: (1) review of the already published work on crime - in psychiatry, psychology, and in sociology, (2) development of an adequate model for the explanation of crime causation and crime selection, and (3) lastly testing this model by collecting and analyzing the data from shoplifting among college students which was selected for this purpose.

Chapter Two contains a critical review of the criminological theories and researches. Focus of attention has been the sociological explanation of crime not only because of the societal rather than individual relevance of crime, but also because of the fact that, as Cressey and Ward pointed out,<sup>7</sup> sociological explanation is of the widest variety and is scientifically more valid.

In the sociological literature it is mentioned that there are three periods of major "breakthroughs" in the sociology of crime.<sup>8</sup>

The first period of intensive theorizing about crime was in the late 1930's when Merton wrote his famous essay on anomie, Sutherland introduced his principle of differential association, Sellin talked about the conflicting subcultures and Stonequist reinterpreted "marginal man" in psychological terms. Two of these, i.e., anomie theory and the principle of differential association, still provide the two master currents in sociological criminology. They have given rise to a multitude of research and further theorization.

The second "breakthrough" was in the late 1950's when Cohen wrote his treatise on the delinquent gangs and introduced the concept of contraculture, and Cloward and Ohlin using the concept of subculture formulated their theory of differential opportunity to explain crime causation and crime selection in one proposition. This is also the period which experienced intensive research inspired by the principle of differential association.

These new dialogues were well projected in the early 1960's and criminological researches were gaining new insights when the third "breakthrough" came. Matza wrote his provocative essay on delinquency and drift in which he rebelled against the very positive methods in criminology and opened the door to look back at the classical explanation of crime which deals with such nonsocial factors as human instinct and the nature of man.

Chapter Two contains a brief but critical review of all these approaches plus some important psychiatric and psychological approaches. Toward the end of the chapter a rather detailed treatment is given to Parsons' theory of deviance which has been ignored by all but a few criminologists. Parsons introduced this theory in 1951 in his theory

of social system. The review of literature on crime would have been left incomplete without any reference to this theory which not only has a much broader range but is also embedded in the more general theory of social system, for, as it has been contended above, it is necessary that an adequate theory of deviance stem from a general theory of behavior. This made the review of the Parsonian formulation necessary in this search for a better explanation of crime even though most criminologists have ignored it.

After reviewing the literature on crime, a new model is developed in Chapter Three. This model is based on W. I. Thomas' theory of definition of situation. In fact, the only two theories which can be adequately used for the derivation of a criminological formula are the ones presented by Thomas and by Parsons. Thomas' theory was preferred over Parsons' because of the former's simplicity, because of its concern for deviance, and because of its use of situation and attitude as independent variables which have a great deal of specificity in them for the emergence of any behavior. This, as we shall see later, helps explain selection of behavior.

Briefly, this model explains that a situation objectively offers some specific opportunities, attitudes of actor specific toward this situation or physical and social objects in this situation take note of this situation, and personality traits of the actor help him decide whether the situation, in terms of its ecological setting, is good for action or not. This model, as is evident, is a modification of Thomas' model. Whereas Thomas was using only attitude of the actor as the deciding factor in making a decision to act, this model distinguishes between the two subjective states of the actor, i.e., attitude and

personality. One is used to select the specific situation and the other is used as a decision maker.

Chapter Four deals mainly with the methodology. It contains a discussion on why the method of self report is preferred over the official statistics on crime and why shoplifting among college students is selected as a test case. It explains the sampling method used, the instrument, and the statistical tests applied. Chapter Five deals with the statistical analysis of the data which is explained and interpreted in Chapter Six. Chapter Seven contains the summary and conclusions.



## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>The exclusive character of the explanation of deviant behavior has been more succinctly put forth by Albert K. Cohen, "A theory of deviant behavior must not only account for the occurrence of deviant behavior; it must also account for its failure to occur, or conformity." For detail see his Sociology Today. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom and Leonard S. Cotrell, eds. (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), p. 464. Cohen's approach is the direct outcome of Parsons' theory of deviant behavior which Cohen was commenting upon in the above. See Talcott Parsons, "Deviant Behavior and Mechanisms of Social Control" in Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1951), pp. 249-341.

<sup>2</sup>Howard S. Becker, Outsiders (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Parsons, 1951.

<sup>5</sup>Cohen, 1959.

<sup>6</sup>For instance see Howard S. Becker, ed., The Other Side (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1965). Also see Robert Dubin, "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure: Continuities in Social Theory," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24 (April, 1959), pp. 147-164.

<sup>7</sup>Donald R. Cressey and David A. Ward, Delinquency, Crime, and Social Process (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), especially Part I.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

We generally carry in our minds concepts of a variety of phenomena. The reference phenomena may be physical as well as social. Among these concepts is one which we may generally label as criminal behavior. One of the main preoccupations of criminology has been to make this picture as representative as possible. Traditionally there have been two schools in criminology. One of them is known as the classical school which was long dead before its recent revival by a provocative essay on juvenile delinquency by Matza.<sup>1</sup> The other one and very much in vogue today is the so-called positive school.

#### The Positive Criminal

It was Lombroso who in the fashion of the empiricists first tried to seek causal relationship of crime in the body characteristics of human beings.<sup>2</sup> Even though his hypotheses are hardly accepted by any criminologist today, yet his empirical approach in the explanation of crime persists. Lombroso's criminology, which one may call "physical criminology," is now replaced by explanations emanating from psychiatry, psychology, and sociology.

#### Psychiatric Explanation

Psychiatrists have centered their interest in mental balance and

mental processes. The assumption is that a mentally healthy person is also socially healthy. Conversely, a mentally deficient or a mentally disturbed person shall also be socially disturbed - a deviant. Thus psychiatric theory is relatively oblique to the explanation of deviance and crime.

Psychiatric theory takes its basic inspirations from the Freudian psychology. In American tradition, however, there is a marked tendency to broaden the scope by dealing with more societal factors in etiological formulations. There are at least five schools of thought in the psychiatric criminology in America today. Here it shall be impossible to outline in detail the approaches of all of these. Suffice it to say that American psychiatry of crime started from the explanation of crime in neurosis in the early 1930's,<sup>3</sup> followed by an explanation which emphasized crime as a revolt and revenge against the undue repression inside the circle of family<sup>4</sup> mainly in connection with self-direction, self-assertion, and independence. This school of thought has continued to be most persisting even in the 1960's which have seen psychiatric convergence upon sociology. During the late 1940's and the 1950's two more schools developed. They emphasized mal-socialization and mal-integrated personality as the leading factors in crime.<sup>5</sup> More recently research treatises are concluded with the note that most criminals are psychologically healthy. Guttmacher calls them "normal criminals,"<sup>6</sup> and this is one of the basic assumptions of this thesis.

The greatest weakness of the psychiatric explanation is its assumptions which deal generally with the remote past of an individual. Psychiatry has failed to develop any objective method which can successfully prove or even disprove any of these assumptions.<sup>7</sup>

## Psychological Approach

Psychologists are more true successors of Lombroso since he was primarily interested in the physical traits of criminals and psychologists are interested in the personality traits conducive to the commission of crime. In psychology crime is a form of behavior. It is a response pattern which reflects aggressive, self-centered, and self-confident personality traits.<sup>8</sup> Research, especially in delinquency, subscribes to this.<sup>9</sup> Criminal action, may it be manslaughter or cheque forgery, is not merely a response to a situation. Rather, it is an acting out of a disorganized and malfunctioning personality, a view which many psychiatrists have held as mentioned above. In psychology, the immediate situation serves only to trigger or elicit the response pattern which is latent in the personality.

The psychological approach, thus, emphasizes the process by which a person becomes a criminal rather than looking at him as a born criminal.<sup>10</sup> Crime in this sense is not the result of any defective birth in general. It is looked at as a response of malfunctioning personality which results from malsocialization mainly in the context of the family.

Having thus relieved man of his "original sin," psychologists, however, became victims of their own myth. Personality became the cause of primary importance in crime commission. Other factors, like a situation offering an opportunity to commit crime, do remain of some importance but only insofar as they provoke the criminal personality. This resulted in the psychologist shoving off other factors probably of equal importance and their concentrating too heavily on one single factor - personality. This brings about the dilemma of differential response. There are too many exceptions to the psychological

explanation.<sup>11</sup> To this date, it seems that psychological enquiry of crime has not been able to go beyond the reduced level of personality.

Also, as is evident, emphasis only on personality does not explain crime selection at all. Cloward and Ohlin put it more succinctly.

. . . psychological theorists commonly - and erroneously - assume that an explanation of the motivational basis for a deviant pattern also explains the resulting response. That is, they assume an identity between the pressure toward deviance and the subsequent solution.

. . . Whether or not we accept the theory of motivation . . . the final statement is anything but self evident. Why do persons who expect to fail of realizing their aspirations and who have incompletely internalized cultural norms necessarily become delinquent rather than, say, suicidal.<sup>12</sup>

To accept the psychologists' over-emphasis on personality in crime, quite clearly, is not fruitful; but to reject the importance of personality altogether in the explanation of crime causation would be as great a fault. In my opinion, the dilemma of differential response is present in the psychological explanation of crime not because personality is irrelevant in the explanation of crime; rather, it is because personality is not a sufficient criterion to explain crime-causation and crime-selection.

### Sociology of Crime

The distinguishing feature of the sociological theory of crime, in contrast to formulations stressing personality, lies in the prominence of the social situation, call it the situation of strain as Parsons<sup>13</sup> and Merton<sup>14</sup> did, marginal situation as Park<sup>15</sup> did, conflict situation as Sellin<sup>16</sup> did, or associational situation as Sutherland<sup>17</sup> did. With the exception of Parsons' theory of deviance, all of the above-mentioned sociological theories of crime have been subjected to rigorous research.

Just for this reason, I shall try to discuss Parsons' theory of deviance in detail toward the end of the discussion on positive criminology.

Merton borrowed the concept of anomie from Durkheim<sup>18</sup> and redefined it as "strain toward deviation in society."<sup>19</sup> Starting as a societal condition, when applied to research in criminology, the concept of anomie, probably by the dictates of methodology, was reduced to the psychological levels. Long before McClosky and Schaar<sup>20</sup> had to redefine it as a "state of mind," terms like anomia, anomic personality or simply anomics were widely used in the sociological literature.<sup>21</sup> Clearly it is asking for too much from a research to prove or disprove a theory whose concepts are operationalized differently. Moreover, by emphasizing the role of anomic personality in the causation of crime we again face the dilemma of differential response and the question of crime selection is not answered at all.<sup>22</sup>

Today, most sociologists generally make use of psychological concepts and methods. It is therefore not strange that they do interpret the social circumstance as a back drop of personality. This shows the great impact of psychology on the sociological thinking. However, what we have overlooked, especially in the context of crime, is that social structure not only helps develop personality but, more important from our point of view, it also builds settings for personalities to act into. Merton does seem to reflect psychological leanings in his writings. But in his original essay on this topic he was quite clearly dealing with a social situation - a condition of disjunction between cultural and social situation in society. This is the anomic situation. "The consequences of such structural inconsistency are psychopathological personality, and/or antisocial conduct and/or revolutionary activities."<sup>23</sup>

In a purely ecological fashion Robert Park wrote in 1926 about the strains and problems immigrants generally face when they settle in a new culture.<sup>24</sup> His ecological disciples like Shaw<sup>25</sup> and Thrasher<sup>26</sup> were already conducting their studies in the "natural areas of delinquency." They did not utilize the concept of marginal man in the explanation of crime and delinquency. Neither did Park think of utilizing this concept in connection with crime. However, the period 1930 to 1960 saw an active application of this concept mainly in the context of personality. Stonequist, who first used this concept, elaborated more on the personality aspects of the marginal man who tries to define and understand the new culture traits and in the meanwhile commits crimes, if not for any other reason, simply because he does not have proper definitions.<sup>27</sup> More important, Stonequist opened a new dialogue on the psychological marginality of the members of society; social structure quite often exerts pressure toward marginality on its own participants. Researches on this theme have continued into the past decade.<sup>28</sup> King's study of about 300 college graduates utilized this concept.<sup>29</sup> This study used the self-report method and the data failed to support the hypotheses of association between psychological marginality and criminality. Instead, he found a rather low but significant association between marginality and tendency toward withdrawal and a significant negative association between marginality and aggression.

Sellin's theory of conflicting subcultures in a pluralistic society does not seem to have any psychological overtones in the sense that it does not explain crime through anything like conflicting personality.<sup>30</sup> Yet, his theory was never tested by any research. It shall be

interesting to note how a research in this direction shall be able to avoid the same psychological reduction as has been true of other sociological researches in crime.

Sutherland's principle of differential association, like Sellin's principle of conflict, does not seem to have any psychological overtones in it. However, as the theory was subjected to active research in the mid-1950's, Cressey, the junior author of the theory, had to shift position by reinterpreting the theory through definition of situation, which is a function of personality.<sup>31</sup>

Before we look into Parsons' theory of deviance, it should be asserted here that this is not weakness of the sociological explanation of crime that it is following the psychological guidelines. It is, rather, that sociological explanation has not been able to recognize the pitfalls in the psychological criminology. Hence there is the dilemma of differential response with the sociological explanation, too. Another weakness in the sociological explanation of crime is the disjunction between theory and practice. For instance, as has been mentioned above, anomie theory by Merton deals with a societal situation of disjunction which puts individuals under strain. This situation is responded to differently by different personalities and not that different personalities become anomic personality, disengage themselves from other activities in society, and start committing crime. But, this is how the research has been dealing with the anomie theory. A research in the right direction under anomie must first collect a sample of the persons affected by anomie in the social situation. This sample then should be determined as to the various personalities as they respond in this situation. It is perhaps this way (there could



be other ways as well) that the attitudes of these different personalities toward criminality can be determined. In other words, it is suggested that personality is an important part of the sociological research, and yet it is not the only variable which the sociological theory is concentrating upon.

One great contribution of the sociological theory of crime is that it has sensitized us with the question of crime selection. Also, it has dealt with this question more successfully than any other explanation as is evident from the principle of differential association and the theory of differential opportunity by Cloward and Ohlin<sup>32</sup> who tried to fuse the theories of anomie and differential association together to explain crime causation and crime selection in one stroke. However, as long as the theory of anomie is still contaminated with the dilemma of differential response this noble attempt on the part of Cloward and Ohlin is still far from being adequate. Cloward and Ohlin also introduced the concept of criminal subculture. Cohen, a few years earlier, was already working on the theme of the delinquent gang as being the contraculture.<sup>33</sup> As has been commented by Matza<sup>34</sup> and found by research later, the concept of criminal subculture or contraculture is not valid and does not explain crime causation satisfactorily.<sup>35</sup>

A more ambitious scheme, basically along the same lines as that of anomie by Merton, though not so popular with criminologists, is the explanation of deviance by Talcott Parsons.<sup>36</sup> At least one point in favor of this theory is that it is an outcome of and is directly connected with Parsons' general theory of social system. Parsons also emphasizes "strain" as did Merton. Only he did so in a much broader spectrum, so that Merton's formulation of disjunction between cultural

goals and institutionalized means becomes for Parsons only a special case applicable only to the western societies and not applicable to those cultures which emphasize ascription rather than achievement.

Because of this element of culture-boundness of the Merton paradigm, and because of the inclusion of the motivational element, we may presume that the version presented here is the more general one, of which Merton's is a very important special case.<sup>37</sup>

Parsons looked at deviance from the point of view of the individual motivation and defined it as "tendency" of an actor to behave in contravention of one or more institutionalized normative patterns. From social system point of view, Parsons defined deviance as a dysfunction to the equilibrium in the system. Because of great variation among human societies and because of the inner plurality of the most human societies today, Parsons emphasized that any deviance must be looked at with reference to the respective society or the respective subsystem in any given system.

It is difficult to explain Parsons' theory in a few pages. Therefore, in the following pages I shall present Parsons' theory in the form of a paradigm for the sake of brevity.

1. Human beings live in systems of interaction with each other.
2. In any system of interaction:
  - a) Actor's expectation toward others becomes a part of his own dispositions.
  - b) These expectations attach the actor to other actors as cathectic objects, and
  - c) This pattern of relationships or interaction is internalized by the actor and any encroachment on this pattern frustrates the actor's need dispositions.
3. Deviance must always be referred to its respective system or sub-system of interaction.

4. Deviance is a tendency on the part of an actor to act in contravention to one or more institutionalized normative patterns on the one hand and to disturb the equilibrium in the system of normative patterns on the other.
5. When the actor does not receive the expected response the above-mentioned three categories in Number 2 come under strain.
6. In order to manage this strain, actor may bring change in one, two, or all three categories in Number 2.
7. When category 2a changes, actor changes his personality need dispositions. (Parsons ignores this category for the present analysis.)
8. When category 2b changes, actor abandons his cathexis with the object who put him under strain.
9. When category 2c changes, actor seeks to bring change in the normative system of patterned interaction.
10. The situation of ambivalence - the situation of strain - creates in the actor only the "tendency" to deviate in addition to the tendency to conform which was present all the time in the course of interaction.
11. The tendency to conform is a positive tendency and the tendency to deviate is a negative tendency.
12. When the positive component is dominant over the negative one, overt "compulsive conformity" occurs in relation to the cathectic object(s) and/or in relation to the system of interaction.
13. When the negative component is dominant over the positive one, overt "compulsive alienation" occurs in relation to the cathectic object of the actor and/or in relation to the normative pattern of interaction.

In the above paradigm items 12 and 13 represent overt responses of the actor in the situation of "ambivalence" with the objects in interaction with him and with the very system of relationships also. Actor's personality in the form of his need dispositions is also under strain, but, as mentioned above, this is of little importance for Parsons for the present analysis.

Parsons then proceeds to make a typology of overt "compulsive conformity" and overt "compulsive alienation," as explained in Table I. Parsons adds two more dichotomies to the table. One is the dichotomy of activity-passivity and the other is that of actor's orientation toward social objects - actor's orientation toward the normative system (8 and 9 in the above paradigm). These three dichotomies yield an eight-fold classification of overt behavior of the actor under strain. Of these, four cells under alienation dominance are directly related with deviance which under the form of activity shows up in rebelliousness toward either the cathectic objects or toward the normative system in the form of what Parsons calls incorrigibility. Or, in the form of passivity, deviance may occur in withdrawal and therefore in independence from the cathectic object(s) or in withdrawal from the system of normative interaction in the form of evasion.

As a theory of deviance, Parsons' theory is very broad. It is much broader than any other attempt in this direction. The four cells yield a wide variety of deviant phenomena from fighting for a "show-down" as in the case of rebelliousness toward social objects through incorrigibility as in the case of juvenile delinquency and through retreatism to tax evasion.

As a theory of criminality, which could only be derived from this general theory of deviance, it has serious limitations. These are enumerated in the following.

1. The condition of actor's compulsive conformity and the condition of compulsive alienation depend primarily on alters actions. This is a disturbance in the system from outside, as Parsons put it. This theory then pictures the actor as incapable of initiating a deviant act

TABLE I

PARSONS' FORMULATION OF RESPONSES TO "AMBIVALENCE"\*

	Activity		Passivity	
	Compulsive Performance Orientation		Compulsive Acquiescence	
	Focus on Social Objects	Focus on Norms	Focus on Social Objects	Focus on Norms
Conformative Dominance	Dominance	Compulsive Enforcement	Submission	Perfectionistic Observance (Merton's Ritualism)
	Rebelliousness		Withdrawal	
Alienative Dominance	Aggressiveness Toward Social Objects	Incorrigibility	Compulsive Independence	Evasion

\*SOURCE: Talcott Parsons, The Social System (The Free Press of Glencoe, Ill., 1951), p. 259.

on his own. According to Parsons, then, deviance is always a response - always a reaction to others who have the capacity to alienate the actor. This passivity or incapability on the part of the actor to take initiative seems illogical especially because of the subsequent formulation by Parsons of activity-passivity dichotomy on the part of the actor.

2. Sources of activity are not explained by the theory. Are these active and passive personality traits of the actors or are these active and passive attitudes of actors toward social objects or the normative structure? Lack of answers to these questions poses problems for research which already is capable of treating personality and attitude differently and has developed different instruments to measure these closely associated but distinct subjective characteristics of man.

3. Under rebelliousness and also under withdrawal, how is it that some actors direct their response toward social objects and others toward the normative system, whereas both categories of actors have the same source of alienation - alter? Lack of answers to this question poses the dilemma of differential response.

4. This theory does not have any mechanism to explain crime selection. For instance, how can one say that an actor actively alienating himself from the normative system shall burn his draft card and not engage in fee splitting and mixing with drugs? How can one say that a passive tax payer who is compulsively alienated from the system will evade taxes and not dodge the draft? What about hidden crimes like embezzlement and engaging in bribery?

5. Two of the four categories under alienative dominance given in Table I, the ones in connection with social objects, cannot be treated as categories of deviance because Parsons himself defined deviance as a tendency to act in contravention of the institutionalized normative system of interaction. Thus only the two categories under alienation, i.e., rebelliousness against the normative system and withdrawal from the normative system can be treated as pertaining to deviance. It may be argued that alienation from social objects may also be treated as deviance because it makes a breach in the normative system of interaction between actor and his social objects. However, one may contend that this action on the part of the actor shall be a breach of the normative system only in case that the normative system supports the continued relationship between the actor and his social objects. Insofar as this is true, the categories of alienation from the normative system include the other two categories.

It is rather strange to see that Parsons' theory of deviance had little application in empirical research. The concept of alienation has been widely used both in criminological and non-criminological researches. However, none of these researches except very lately have given a single reference to Parsons.<sup>38</sup> Allen and Sanhu<sup>39</sup> and more recently Roczesky<sup>40</sup> seem to have taken some inspiration from the above theory of deviance by Parsons. Allen and Sandhu found high alienation connected with unemployment among the institutionalized youth<sup>41</sup> and institutionalized youth are found to be more alienated than the non-delinquent youth.<sup>42</sup> Roczesky did find a significant relationship between frequency of crime and alienation.<sup>43</sup> These studies, however, provoke this question: Is alienation the cause of delinquency and

crime or is it a function of being sentenced and spending time in prisons and reformatories? More researches like these are welcome because they provoke questions and help refine the theory.

#### Classical School - The Re-emergence

The administration of criminal law in 18th century Europe was corrupt, arbitrary, and cruel. Voltaire had prepared the way for reform by publicizing the weaknesses of the criminal law, but it remained for Beccaria to demonstrate what the faults were and what the remedies might be.<sup>44</sup> Beccaria's writings were in part a protest and in part an assumption. The protest was against the highhandedness and arbitrariness of the judges. The recommendation which followed was about strict legislation of punishment because

The fear of law is salutary, but the fear of men is a fruitful and fatal source of crime. Men enslaved are more voluptuous, more debouched and more cruel than those in a state of freedom.<sup>45</sup>

The assumption is that man possesses "free will" which he surrenders to the state in exchange for the security provided to him. Beccaria did not have any academic successors. But some action oriented philosophers of the time, Voltaire being the most important of them all, gave an enthusiastic support to the basic concepts in Beccaria's work. Consequently his work seems to have had a great impact on the reforms in the 18th century Russia, Sweden, Prussia, and Austria.<sup>46</sup>

Before Matza tried to dig the classical ghost out, the only adherents of Beccaria's view were the social control theorists who have been severely criticized by Cohen and Short for holding the view of delinquency and crime as ". . . a potentiality of human nature which



automatically erupts when the lid is off."<sup>47</sup>

Matza in a purely classical fashion tried to stress both the points: the nature of law enforcement and the nature of man.<sup>48</sup>

Throughout his essay Matza stressed the connection between the delinquent thought and the thought pervading juvenile law and its administration. This connection is sought in the concept of neutralization of conventional values

. . . by which the legal bind is episodically subverted on its own terms, and a conception of subterranean support by which agents of convention and law unwittingly and with good will contribute their services and sentiments to the feasibility of neutralization.<sup>49</sup>

Neutralization of the convention takes the "lid" off the free will and this, according to Matza, makes a juvenile act possible. However, to explain the actual commission of the juvenile act Matza stresses the purely sociological concept of situation. A juvenile delinquent is not always committed to delinquency which occurs only when a peculiar situation offers itself. When the "lid" is off and the situation offers itself, according to Matza, delinquency has a great probability of occurrence.<sup>50</sup>

Classical theory is much more an ideology than a scientific theory of delinquency. It is an action program rather than an explanation of interrelation of different factors in crime. The protest against the legal practices is clearly outside the domain of scientific enquiry. Likewise, the assumption of "free will" has yet to be proved scientifically.<sup>51</sup> And yet Matza tried to take help from the classical view of crime. This may reflect the general dissatisfaction which scholars and the researchers are developing toward the positive methods in criminology. Many shall not agree with Matza's classical faith and yet it

seems that writing in disgust with the positive criminology Matza has contributed to it greatly by putting in the forefront the concept of situation in the causation of crime. As it is mentioned above, Colward and Ohlin<sup>52</sup> and Sutherland<sup>53</sup> also used this concept insofar as it is good for explaining crime selection. On the other hand, it seems that by attributing causation to situation in addition with the subjective factors we not only shall be able to reduce the dilemma of differential response but shall at the same time be able to explain crime selection. This point will be further elaborated in the next chapter.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>David Matza, Delinquency and Drift (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964).

<sup>2</sup>For a detailed account of Lombroso's "Positive Criminology," see Marvin E. Wolfgang, "Cessar Lombroso" in Herman Maunheim, ed., Pioneers in Criminology (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1960), pp. 210-218.

<sup>3</sup>An early and still influential statement of this view is F. Alexander and H. Straub, The Criminal, The Judge, and The Public, rev. ed. (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956).

<sup>4</sup>Healy is generally considered to be the founder of this school. For details see W. Healy and A. Bronner, New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment (New Haven, Conn., 1936). Also see W. Healy, "The Family Environment and Delinquency" in S. Arieti, ed., American Handbook of Psychiatry (New York: Free Press, 1959), pp. 213-221.

<sup>5</sup>The concept of the antisocial character through malsocialization is closely connected with K. Freidlander, The Psychoanalytic Approach to Juvenile Delinquency (New York: Harper and Row, 1945). A briefer statement on the same subject is K. Freidlander, "Latent Delinquency and Ego Development" in K. R. Eissler, ed., Searchlights in Delinquency (New York: Harper and Row, 1949). The concept of mal-integrated personality as a result of incomplete development of superego was first used by Alfred M. Johnson, "Sanctions for Superego Lacunae of Adolescents" in Eissler, *Ibid.*, pp. 149-164.

<sup>6</sup>Manfred S. Guttmacher, "The Psychiatric Approach to Crime and Correction" in Richard W. Nice, ed., Criminal Psychology (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1965), pp. 112-120.

<sup>7</sup>For a detailed review of methods in psychiatry see David Feldman, "Psychoanalysis and Crime" in Bernard Rosenberg, Israel Gerver, and F. William Howton, eds., Mass Society in Crisis (New York: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 50-58.

<sup>8</sup>For details see Alfred C. Harseh and Robert A. Davis, "Personality Traits and Conduct of Institutionalized Delinquents," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Vol. 29 (July, 1938), pp. 241-244.

<sup>9</sup>For instance see Lester E. Hewitt and Richard L. Jenkins, Fundamental Patterns of Maladjustments: Dynamics of Their Origin (Springfield, Illinois: State Printer, 1946), pp. 14-15. For more recent information see President's Report on Delinquency and Crime, Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare (Washington, D.C., 1968).

- <sup>10</sup>President's Report on Delinquency and Crime, Ibid.
- <sup>11</sup>For a detailed review of research in psychological criminology, see Leonard G. Lowrey, "Delinquent and Criminal Personalities" in John M. Hunt, ed., Personality and the Behavior Disorder (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967), pp. 243-251.
- <sup>12</sup>Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960), pp. 34-35.
- <sup>13</sup>Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1951). See especially Chapter VII on Deviance.
- <sup>14</sup>Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie," American Sociological Review, Vol. 3 (October, 1938), pp. 672-682. For a revised version also see his Social Structure and Social Theory (New York: Free Press, 1956).
- <sup>15</sup>Robert Ezra Park, "Marginal Man," American Journal of Sociology (Spring, 1926), pp. 154-161.
- <sup>16</sup>Thorstein Sellin, Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41 (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1938), pp. 17-32.
- <sup>17</sup>The Principle of Differential Association was first published in Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressy, Principles of Criminology (New York: Lippincott, 1939).
- <sup>18</sup>Emile Durkheim first used the concept of anomie in The Division of Labor in Society (Paris, 1890), and later he expanded the concept to explain relative normlessness in society. See also Suicide.
- <sup>19</sup>Robert K. Merton, 1956.
- <sup>20</sup>Herbert McClosky and John H. Schaar, "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy," American Sociological Review, Vol. 30 (February, 1965), pp. 14-39.
- <sup>21</sup>For a comprehensive inventory on anomie, see Stephan Cole and Harriet Zuckerman, "Inventory of Empirical and Theoretical Studies of Anomie" in Marshall B. Clinard, ed., Anomie and Deviant Behavior (New York: The Free Press, 1964), pp. 243-311. Probably it was Robert McIver who first used the term anomia explaining the mental condition of normlessness, powerlessness, goallessness, and valuelessness. See his Ramparts We Guard (New York: Harper and Row, 1938). Most important contribution to research in anomie in psychological direction is probably Leo F. Srole whose Anomia Scale is still in fashion with slight variations in psychiatry, psychology and sociology. See his "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21 (December, 1956), pp. 695-701.

<sup>22</sup>Cloward and Ohlin's critique of psychological theory of crime in connection with crime selection is valid for anomie theory also. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) especially because they were writing in connection with anomie also. Not that research under anomie completely ignored the sociological definition of anomie as presented by Merton. In fact, research in anomie went through two phases. First, during the 1940's, immediately after Merton's essay was published, social structure and anomie were used as independent as well as dependent variables. However, these researches do not agree in replications and in their conclusions about different crime as dependent variables. For instance, see Arthur L. Wood, "Social Organization and Crime in Small Wisconsin Communities," American Sociological Review, Vol. 7 (1942), pp. 40-46; Matilda White Riley and Samuel H. Flowerman, "Group Relations as a Variable in Communication Research," American Sociological Review, Vol. 16 (1961), pp. 174-180; and Bernard Lander, Toward an Understanding of Juvenile Delinquency (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954). The second period started in the 1950's after Nettler and Srole perfected their alienation and anomia scales respectively. See William J. Goode, "Illegitimacy, Anomie, and Cultural Penetration," American Sociological Review, Vol. 13 (1941), pp. 910-925. For a disagreement with Lander's findings, see Ronald J. Chilton, "Delinquency Area Research: Baltimore, Detroit, and Indianapolis," American Sociological Review, Vol. 29 (1964), pp. 71-83; James H. Bryan, "Apprenticeship in Prostitution," Social Problems, Vol. 12 (Winter, 1965), pp. 287-297; and John A. Gardner and David J. Olson, "Gambling and Political Corruption" in Task Force Report: Organized Crime, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1967).

<sup>23</sup>Robert K. Merton, 1938, p. 676. Also see further elaboration by Merton, "Anomie, Anomia, and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior," in Marshall B. Clinard, ed., Anomie and Deviant Behavior (New York: The Free Press, 1964), pp. 213-242.

<sup>24</sup>Robert E. Park, 1926.

<sup>25</sup>Shaw and Thrasher, both, are considered to be the pioneers in research in delinquency. See Clifford R. Shaw, The Jack Roller (University of Chicago Press, 1928). Also see Shaw and Henry D. McKay, "An Ecological Analysis of Chicago," in Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas (University of Chicago Press, 1942).

<sup>26</sup>Fredrick M. Thrasher, The Gang (University of Chicago Press, 1931).

<sup>27</sup>Everret V. Stonequist, The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937).

<sup>28</sup>Some other researches in this direction are, Solomon Kobrin, "The Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas," American Sociological Review, Vol. 16 (October, 1951); and Milton K. Barron, The Juvenile in Delinquent Society (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1954).

<sup>29</sup> Albert A. King, Crime and Marginality (New York: Wiley, 1964). Along the same lines, also see, James G. Guilbert, "Urbanism and Crime: A Reformulation" (unpub. Master's thesis, microfilmed, Western Michigan University, 1967).

<sup>30</sup> Sellin's theory of conflicting subcultures is generally regarded as a forerunner of Sutherland's principle of Differential Association. Sutherland himself associated with Sellin under a grant from the Social Science Research Council which yielded Sellin's conflict theory of crime. Conflict theory is similar to other sociological explanations of crime in the sense that it starts with societal situations. According to Sellin, law reflects the values of the most dominant subculture in society. Members of all other subcultures, then, automatically are criminally oriented. See Thorsten Sellin, 1938.

<sup>31</sup> The paradigm consisting of 7 propositions initially and later of 9 propositions is what was named the principle of Differential Association by Sutherland and Cressey in Principles of Criminology (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1939). Initially causation of crime was attributed to learning in an interactional setting. However, it was soon pointed out that the principle explains, at best, only crime selection depending upon which interactional setting one belongs to. Also, objections were raised that in order for an interactional setting to be the cause of crime, the setting itself should be a criminal one. Principle of differential association seems to ignore this. In response to this, Cressey reacted that it is wrong to believe that "the theory is concerned only with contacts or associations with criminal delinquent pattern." He further goes on to explain that the critics seem to ignore the seventh proposition which emphasizes the excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to the violation of law. For more detail, see Donald R. Cressey, "Epidemiology and Individual Conduct: A Case from Criminology," The Pacific Sociological Review, Vol. 3 (Fall, 1960), pp. 47-54. Probably Cressey had to shift his position, also, in response to research which, inside the context of association, has been concentrating on personality development rather than on individuals shifting in their roles from association to association.

Active research under the principle of differential association started in the late 1950's, though Sutherland himself gave a few reports in the 1940's. However, they lack in sophisticated statistical analysis. He primarily depended upon collection of the data and descriptive analysis. See Sutherland, "White Collar Criminality," American Sociological Review (1940), and "Crime and Business," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCXVII (1941), 112-118. Some of the other representative researches are: James F. Short, Jr., "Differential Association and Delinquency," Social Problems, Vol. 4 (January, 1957); James F. Short, Jr., "Differential Association As a Hypothesis: Problem of Empirical Testing," Social Problems, Vol. 8 (Summer, 1960), pp. 14-25; Albert Reiss and Levis Rhodes, "An Empirical Test of Differential Association Theory," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. I (January, 1964), pp. 5-18; Robert Stanfield, "The Interaction of Family Variables and Gang Variables in the Etiology of Delinquency," Social Problems, Vol. 13 (Spring, 1966),

pp. 411-417; and John R. Stratton, "Differential Identification and Attitudes Toward Law," Social Forces, Vol. 46 (December, 1967), pp. 252-262.

<sup>32</sup>Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, 1960.

<sup>33</sup>Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang (New York: The Free Press, 1955). Also see his, "A General Theory of Subcultures," in Delinquency, Crime, and Social Processes, Donald R. Cressey and David A. Ward, eds. (New York: Harper and Row, 1969).

<sup>34</sup>David Matza, 1964.

<sup>35</sup>See for instance, James F. Short, Jr., Romon Rivera, and Ray A. Tennyson, "Perceived Opportunities, Gang Membership, and Delinquency," American Sociological Review, Vol. 30 (February, 1965), pp. 56-67; and Walter A. Miller, "Violent Crime in City Gangs," Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 343 (March, 1966), pp. 97-112. For a more comprehensive survey of theory and research in this direction, see, "Delinquent Subcultures: Theory and Recent Research," in Donald R. Cressey and David A. Ward, eds., Delinquency, Crime, and Social Processes (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 709-721.

<sup>36</sup>Talcott Parsons, 1951.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 289.

<sup>38</sup>For instance, see John Hajda, "Alienation and Integration of Student Intellectuals," American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (October, 1961), pp. 258-277; and Melvin Seeman and John W. Evans, "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting," American Sociological Review, Vol. 27 (1962).

<sup>39</sup>Donald E. Allen and Harjit S. Sandhu, "Family Affect, Religion, and Personal Income in Juvenile Delinquency," Social Forces, Vol. 46 (December, 1967), and also by the same authors, "Alienation, Hedonism, and Life Vision in Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 58 (1968).

<sup>40</sup>George C. Rocesky, "Alienation and Adult Criminality," Canadian Journal of Science, Vol. 43 (December, 1968), pp. 245-253.

<sup>41</sup>Donald E. Allen and Harjit S. Sandhu, 1967.

<sup>42</sup>Donald E. Allen and Harjit S. Sandhu, 1968.

<sup>43</sup>George C. Rocesky, 1968.

<sup>44</sup>Caesar Beccaria, An Essay on Crime and Punishment (Philadelphia: P. H. Nicklin, 1891). Also for the critiques of Beccaria, see, M. T. Maestro, Voltaire and Beccaria as Reformers of Criminal Law (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942); and Elio Monachesi, "Caesar Beccaria" in Herman Maunheim, ed., Pioneers in Criminology (Chicago: Quadrangle Book, Inc., 1960).

<sup>45</sup> Caesar Beccaria, 1891.

<sup>46</sup> Elio Monachesi, 1960.

<sup>47</sup> Albert K. Cohen and James F. Short, Jr., "Research in Delinquent Subcultures," The Journal of Social Issues, XIV (1958), p. 38.

<sup>48</sup> David Matza, 1964.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 182.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> For a more comprehensive discussion on this topic see, Ellsworth Farris, The Nature of Human Nature (New York: McGraw Hill, 1937), pp. 251-253.

<sup>52</sup> Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, 1960.

<sup>53</sup> Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, 1939.



## CHAPTER III

### THEORETICAL STATEMENT

There are two sides to the coin of crime: objective and subjective. As the review of the literature shows, there has been too much emphasis on the subjective factors preceding crime. When such objective factors as inadequate and broken families, bad housing and slum residence are mentioned, they are used as factors developing certain personalities which lead to crime. When such objective factors as association or subculture are mentioned, they are used as factors developing certain attitudes which may lead one to commit crime.<sup>1</sup> In other words, no direct connection between objective factors and crime is envisioned. This is a rather monolithic approach in which causation is assigned only to personality or only to attitudes of the actor. Moreover, this approach underestimates the role which any specific situation may play in exciting, regenerating or accentuating the subjective controls of the actor who may commit crime, if for no other reason, simply because he found himself in such a situation. This does not mean to say that situation is the factor in crime. What I am suggesting is that the element of situation must not be ignored in the explanation of crime, and for that matter any human action. Further, in order to avoid the pitfalls in the monolithic approaches mentioned above, these three factors should be seen as interacting with each other. The basic thesis of this chapter is that social situation is

the objective factor directly connected with crime and cultural predispositions (attitudes) and aggressive personality are the subjective factors involved. These subjective factors make the criminogenic perception of situation possible and it is only when a situation is perceived as criminogenic that crime becomes probable.

This is by no means a completely new idea. Situational analysis probably first goes back to W. I. Thomas in whose view the on-going social process involves a series of situations which are responded to. In fact, for Thomas "every concrete activity is the solution of a situation."<sup>2</sup> Later, in developing his "action frame of reference," Parsons wrote that it is most fruitful

. . . to distinguish the orientation of the actor on one hand, and the structure of the situation on the other. Though the situation includes both the environment and other persons, the point of view from which it must be analyzed for this purpose is not that of physical and biological sciences as such, but various types of significance of situational facts to the actor. This means that the analysis of the situation must be fully integrated with the analysis of the action itself.<sup>3</sup>

Also, Merton talked about the significance of "strategic sites" related with action.<sup>4</sup> However, it seems that sociologists in general and criminologists in particular, by and large, have ignored the element of situation in the analysis of human action. In the criminological literature, as mentioned above, we can single out only two explanations which have made use of this factor. These are Cloward and Ohlin who used the element of situation under the title "opportunity" to explain crime selection and not crime causation.<sup>5</sup> Matza also used this concept as a causal factor in delinquency, but he seemingly more by intuition than by any theoretical convictions tried to relate it with such poorly defined concept as human will.<sup>6</sup>

The concern about situation in human action does not seem to be out of place at all. In fact, every behavior whether it is institutional or noninstitutional, deviance or conformity, has a setting of its own. This setting may be composed of a physical and a social component. The physical component is a part of the natural environment and the social component is a part of the society. However, for the explanation of human behavior, according to Parsons as quoted above, the important point is the significance of these components to the actor and for Thomas, as quoted below, this is the definition of situation which is important.

An adjustive effort of any kind is preceded by a decision to act or not act along a given line, and the decision is itself preceded by a definition of situation, that is to say, an interpretation, or point of view, and eventually a policy and a behavior pattern. In this way quick adjustments and decisions are made at every point in every day life.<sup>7</sup>

In this search for an adequate theory of social behavior in order to derive a theory of criminal behavior from it, Thomas' theory, because of the situational importance in it, seems worth looking into.

#### Thomas' Model of Social Behavior

The above quotation shows that Thomas distinguished between the definition of situation and the decision to act in the situation.

Definition of situation precedes decision to act.

For Thomas definition of situation is a process which includes an interaction between values and attitudes of the actor. He did not give any definition of values involved in this interaction. However, it is quite evident that he used values "in relation with the elements and the objects contained in the situation."<sup>8</sup> We look at the contents of any situation in terms of our values. He defined attitude as "tendency

to act." When a situational structure, according to Thomas, has the value contents which conform with our attitudes, conforming behavior is possible. When the values come in conflict with our attitudes deviance or disorganization has a probability of occurrence.

The same situation or experience in the case of one person may lead this person to another type of adjustment; in another it may lead to crime; in another to insanity, the result depending upon whether previous experiences have formed this or that constellation of attitudes.<sup>9</sup>

After the situation is defined as such, the decision to act, according to Thomas, depends on the natural characteristics of the actor. Humans differ in their physiochemical details from one another and this is what explains the differential response.

The reaction of different individuals in the same culture to identical cultural influences will depend partly upon their different trains of experience and partly on their biochemical constitutions and unlearned psychological endowments.<sup>10</sup>

Thomas' theory has been criticized for its lack of clarity and the resultant ambiguity.<sup>11</sup> For instance, it is not clear what Thomas exactly meant by the term value. Society generally develops standards of evaluation of the objects which come into our experience during the course of our interaction. These are the standards which we call value and not the objects which are evaluated by these standards. At the same time it is quite obvious from the above that probably Thomas did not distinguish between "tendency to act" and "more permanent response pattern" - the two subjective characteristics which are known as attitude and personality in the contemporary social psychological literature. Lack of clear distinction between the two may result in confusing one with the other or in ignoring one while overemphasizing the other. It is the latter which seems true in the case of the above theory of Thomas. This overemphasis on one subjective trait and ignoring the

other is probably what led Thomas to explain the process of decision making in terms of the natural human differentials. There is no doubt that no two human beings seem to be alike in terms of their physiological characteristics at any given moment. However, it has yet to be proved scientifically that these natural differentials are the factors in making a decision to act or not to act.<sup>12</sup>

#### Recasting of Thomas' Model

As long as we are not sure as to what role the natural factors play in the process of decision to act or even whether they are of central importance in this context, it is risky to dwell on this line of argument. In the absence of any scientific visions in this direction, what a student of sociology can do is to refine the picture of human behavior in terms of social, cultural and psychological variables.

Today there does not seem to be so much confusion in and ambiguity about such concepts as attitude and personality. They both are regarded as subjective aspects of human behavior. Attitude is defined as predisposition to act. It is specific to a certain object. It may be modified, vary in intensity and be changed over a relatively short period of time depending on information and experience.<sup>13</sup> Personality is defined as more permanent response pattern. It is not variable in the same sense as attitude is because it is not oriented toward any specific object and is not modified or changed over a short period of time.<sup>14</sup> These definitions may seem rather loose. But they are considered to be the most suitable at this point as analytical tools in social research. It may be possible that attitude which has a variable quality may change over time into rather permanent response pattern.

Likewise, personality could be viewed as affecting attitudes. However, both attitude and personality could be treated as discrete subjective elements which may also interact in different degrees of combinations to define a situation and may give rise to different behaviors - conforming as well as nonconforming.

We may modify Thomas' theory as presented in the following paradigm.

- 1 - Human behavior occurs in an objective situation.
- 2 - Human behavior occurs in objective situation after it is defined as such.
- 3 - Definition of situation includes:
  - a. An objective situation
  - b. Attitude of the actor
  - c. Personality traits of the actor.

This, then, is a general theory of human behavior. It should explain conformity as well as nonconformity or deviance.

#### A Theory of Crime

The theory of crime, as mentioned above, must provide answers to at least two questions: the question of crime causation and the question of crime selection. As noted above, the dilemma of differential response is a result of our faulty theory building. The more adequate is the explanation the less is the dilemma of differential response, and this adequacy depends directly on the logical sufficiency in the theorem of the variables involved. This is the reason why the three variables mentioned above have to be used together instead of being treated individually which reduces the sufficiency and therefore the adequacy.

The model of social behavior developed above shows that whatever an actor does is the end product of a process. So is crime - an end product of a process. This process starts with the selection from the situation of the objects toward which an actor is criminally oriented or is going to be so. Thus selection depends directly on the elements of situation and attitude which can be well specified and which should be viewed as limiting factors because every situation has its own limits as regards opportunities and an attitude (oriented toward specific object in the situation) has only probability of bringing forth any specific behavior.

The two factors mentioned above set the direction and help the actor aim. The decision to trigger the action is made by the third factor - the dominant personality of the actor - only after the selection is made and only in conjunction with the first two factors. All by itself the personality factor is nothing more than a potentiality for certain type of behavior. Only when the situation and the attendant attitude call for specific type of behavior that the personality of the actor triggers the action.

#### Criminogenic Situation

As an objective physical and social setting, situation is independent of the actor and his social and psychological characteristics. It exists whether there is someone to utilize it or not. If it does not exist, the actor or the actors have to construe one to suit the ensuing behavior. Without a social situation we cannot predict a social behavior and we shall always face the dilemma of differential response if we continue the practice of looking at the interaction

among various psychological and social factors antecedent to crime as if they are operated in vacuo.

Most situations in society develop or are developed in order to facilitate conforming behavior. However, situations may be criminogenic, neutral, or non-criminogenic, in relation to specific crimes. For instance, a person out for robbing a bank may find a police car patrolling the area with brief intervals. He may find the situation non-criminogenic for bank robbery. But this very situation may be neutral to embezzling, bribing, fixing prices, and for many other invisible crimes. This situation is neutral specifically for the invisible crimes in the sense that it neither encourages nor discourages these crimes. Divided highways are constructed in order to facilitate efficient movement of people and goods. But this very situation is highly criminogenic for speeding. This situation, however, becomes non-criminogenic if a highway patrol car becomes a part of the scene. This has two implications. First, an objective situation is specifically criminogenic only for some crimes and neutral or non-criminogenic for others. This very specificity, then, partly determines the selection of crime. We select our crimes only from those for which a situation is either criminogenic or neutral. The second fact which emerges is that a situation may change in its relative criminogeny for any specific crime(s). For any given crime, a situation may change from highly non-criminogenic, through neutral to highly criminogenic. The significance of this fact is that it may partly determine the intensity or frequency of any given crime with the changing situation.



### Definition of Situation

Objective situation, however, is not a live situation unless the actor enters into it and becomes a part of it himself. Here we come to the element of definition of situation by the actor. This opens new dimensions into our enquiry of crime. It is here that we have to look into the social and psychological factors of the actor. These factors being wrongly attributed as the causation of crime, I assert, only have the function of making the perception of situation by the actor possible and not that they are causes in themselves simply because they are associated with, and precede, crime in time. In fact, Sutherland could not go beyond what Thomas said earlier mainly because he was treating the elements of association and values separately from the element of situation. Man is a cultural as well as a psychological entity. However, these cultural and psychological factors are not the exclusive causes of human behavior in themselves. Rather, they help him move from one situation to another. They help him choose his own situation out of a multitude of them available in society. They help him find a situation, weigh it, and then act accordingly. In short, they help him perceive the situation. When a suitable situation is not available, they help him make the perception of the one which is more suitable.

Perceived or defined situation, then, is composed of an objective situation and the cultural and psychological factors of the actor. Causation cannot be attributed to any one or any two of them interacting with each other. If causation can be attributed to anything it is the defined or perceived situation.

### Criminogenic Pre-dispositions

All societies or groups make informal or formal rules to regulate the behavior of the collectivity. However, rules which are a sort of limitation on the human behavior are not made by all members of the society or the group. Also, in the rule-making process all members may not agree on and may not believe in the rules that are made. Moreover, in the process of socialization relative newcomers and neonates in the society have not internalized the values supporting these rules. Thus most people look at the rules, both formal and informal, only as necessary evil or the price they have to pay for living in society or in a particular group. As Howard Becker said, it may raise the question: "Whose rules?"<sup>15</sup> Thus every society or group has germs of rule-breaking in it. It is not intended to suggest that society creates crimes, but that in the middle of the cultural milieu differential agreement on, differential knowledge of, and differential socialization about law in society become the potential sources of deviation.

This may not be so true in the case of a rather small and a relatively more homogeneous society or group. In this case rules are so highly internalized that they become values in themselves and therefore sacred. But the human society of today in general and western society in particular is now far removed from that state of relative homogeneity and simplicity. Today's societies are spread over large areas, are very large in numbers, and are far more complex in their organizations. It seems more fruitful to conceive of the present societies as made up of segments - different groupings of people hinged together in "organic solidarity." These segments could be anything from social classes, occupational categories and religious denominations to political

parties, colleges and business firms depending upon the nature and the level of analysis. These segments overlap each other and are criss-crossed by the roles which people play in their different statuses in several different segments of society. For instance, a person may be a business executive, a member of the Methodist Church, and a member of the Rotary Club at the same time. However, every person has a major role to which he is committed, where he spends most of his time and with which he generally identifies. This role may be called his primary role and other roles are secondary, tertiary, and so on. Each role is played in its own respective segment which has its own socio-cultural structure. This structure may be composed of both formal and informal aspects. These are the unwritten rules of conduct considered to be the most appropriate in the case of formal rules and only recommended in the case of informal ones. This does not mean that every segment in society is an encapsulated sub-culture all by itself or that every segment is engaged in an eternal conflict with every other segment as Sellin put it.<sup>16</sup> Rather, the very fact that every segment is embedded in the society at large and is overlapped by other segments, forces the segment to keep its doors open for a two-way traffic among the neighboring segments on one hand and the segment and the society on the other. For any given individual in society the areas of priority are his own segment, his secondary segment and the society at large including other segments. When he is not moving in his own segment(s), his feelings of individuation are accentuated, he is a stranger in his own society, and he is lonely in the whole crowd around him. Thus I look at man as the one who cares more for the unwritten code and the social practices of his own segment than the written law of the society

at large which in spite of their formality of reward and punishment are still relatively foreign to him.

From this perspective man looks more like a value-accepting, rule-making and rule-abiding person rather than a deviant, a criminal, or a mischief monger. However, insofar as a society may be conceived of having germs of breaking rules because of the factors mentioned above, every segment in society may be thought of as having its own reservations and apprehensions, regard and disregard, and predispositions to conform or break certain aspects of the legal structure in society. For instance, persons in the upper socio-economic class may be expected to respect the laws against street fighting and yet they may be quite frequently engaged in bribing the public officials, in fixing prices, and in entering into other illegal business activities. Workers in the auto industry may respect the laws of food and drug administration, but those in the business of food and drug production may not. Army officials may respect and promote laws about draft, but college students may be more disposed to ignore them. As members of our own respective segments and in conformity to the generally understood socio-cultural structure of these segments, we develop tastes and distastes for the environment around our respective segments. This environment includes, among other things, the legal structure of the society. As sub-cultural entities and as "social facts," then, these segments provide the psychological bases from where one may pick up his predispositions to his future refraction from or conformity to the laws and rules of the society at large.

The above statement resembles Sellin's statement of conflict in society and Sutherland's principle of differential association. But I

reject Sellin's picture of the societal segments engaged in an eternal conflict among themselves. On the contrary, the segments overlap each other and keep their doors open for a two-way traffic among them though they are differentially oriented toward the legal structure in society. As to the principle of differential association in the sense that I do not assign causation to the segmental attitudes, rather I conceive of them only as being one of the factors which lead a person to react to an objective situation.

This statement of the segmental sub-cultural predispositions explains not only the origin of criminogenic attitudes but also solves the dilemma of crime selection as does the principle of differential association. It is evident from the above that every segment provides its members with a limited range of crimes. It is from this limited range that one may pick any particular crime.

### Criminogenic Personality

The above statement about segmental attitudes explains only the origin of deviant attitudes and selection of a deviant act. However, perception of situation as criminogenic shall not be possible unless we also look into the traits of the person involved. In order to reduce the dilemma of differential response one must take into account as many relevant factors as is possible. In connection with the perception of situation I have already emphasized the importance of objective situation and segmental attitudes. The concept of personality provides a third important factor in crime.

All persons are committed to their respective primary segments. Yet, the very fact that their segments are embedded in the society at

large forces them to fall in line with at least the legal code of the society. The question of criminality and non-criminality, then, is partly the question of preference or non-preference of the segmental socio-cultural structure over the legal structure of the society at large. Outcasting or withdrawal of favors and blessings as in the case of excommunication from the Catholic Church are not enough deterrents against the segmental deviations at least in the case of more developed societies. A person who does not react vehemently as the situation may demand in a slum may be ridiculed as being feminine. If a person is overly friendly with a Negro in the South, those regarding themselves as "white" brand him as a "nigger lover" and try to treat him with contempt.

On the other hand, an act done against the legal structure of society has great probability of evoking the full powers of such reactive agencies as the police, the courts, and the prisons. And the segment to which the deviant belongs reacts passively, or at best sympathetically toward him. In these circumstances, unless a person gets strong support from the segment as in the case of race riots, or if the person cannot stand to see his dearest values being threatened or unless he is aggressive enough to take the risk of defying the societal law, there is a great probability of conforming behavior and much less chance of breaking law.

In the case of normal criminality people generally break only those laws which are not kept very much in regard by the primary segment or toward which that segment is only indifferent; because to break the laws which are respected by the segment would not only bring the societal machinery into action against him, but would also draw the

wrath of the segment. But even to break those laws toward which the segment is only indifferent is not an easy job to do because in this case the social machinery would come into action against the deviant and the segment would at best sympathize with him. Therefore, I hypothesize that in the case of normal criminality the deviant has a more aggressive personality than the ones who do not have the "guts" to break societal law.

With the above remarks in mind I present the following paradigm which may be read as a proposition explaining crime causation as well as crime selection.

1. Crime occurs in a situation.
2. Crime occurs in a situation after it has been perceived as criminogenic.
3. Criminogenic perception of situation involves:
  - (a) An objective situation.
  - (b) Criminogenic subcultural pre-disposition.
  - (c) Aggressive personality.

The above paradigm explains that crime commission and selection does not depend only on situation, or only on attitudes, or only on personality. Rather, these subjective factors must interact with an objective situation to yield certain crime.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Reference is here to the tradition of Differential Association which has been further elaborated in terms of rationalizations and techniques of neutralizations of norms which have the function only of justification of the ensuing behavior by prior realignment of attitudes. See, for instance, Gresham M. Sykes and David Matza, Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency, American Sociological Review, Vol. 22 (December, 1957), pp. 664-670.

<sup>2</sup>W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, Polish Peasant in Europe and America (2d ed., New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1927), Vol. 1, p. 68, as quoted in Edmond H. Volkart, ed., Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas in Theory and Social Research, Social Science Research Council (New York, 1951), p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Talcott Parsons, "The Position of Sociological Theory," American Sociological Review, Vol. 13, No. 2 (April, 1948), pp. 156-164.

<sup>4</sup>Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (rev. ed., New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1957), p. 115.

<sup>5</sup>Cloward and Ohlin, 1960.

<sup>6</sup>Matza, 1964.

<sup>7</sup>W. I. Thomas, Primitive Behavior (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1937), p. 8.

<sup>8</sup>Thomas and Znaniecky, 1927, p. 87.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 176.

<sup>10</sup>Volkart, 1951, p. 11.

<sup>11</sup>See, for instance, Herbert Blumer, An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecky's The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, Social Science Research Council (New York, 1939).

<sup>12</sup>Farris, 1937.

<sup>13</sup>For instance, see Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn Sherif, An Outline of Social Psychology (rev. ed., New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), p. 494.



<sup>14</sup> For social psychological discussion on personality, see Arnold M. Rose, Sociology: The Study of Human Relations (New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1967), pp. 122-167. Also for further elaboration see Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (rev. ed., New York: The Dryden Press, 1958).

<sup>15</sup> Becker, 1963.

<sup>16</sup> Sellin, 1938.

## CHAPTER IV

### METHODOLOGY

#### Self Reporting

Probably the greatest difficulty in testing a theory in criminology is the nature and collection of appropriate data. Since law enforcing agencies are directly concerned with crime prevention and punishment, they have relatively more reliable statistics on crime and the criminals. Most criminologies, therefore, depend heavily on these sources. Many of the researchers in criminology obtain access to records of police departments, courts, and prisons to study the different factors involved in crime. These data provide information about crimes and criminals and afford foundations for many a theory in criminology. Lombroso's theories were based directly on the observation of convicted criminals.<sup>1</sup> Thrasher and Shaw formulated their ecological theories of crime on the basis of their study of official reports on crime.<sup>2</sup> Even anomie theory as formulated by Merton<sup>3</sup> and as used by those who assert the existence of criminal subcultures such as Cohen<sup>4</sup>, and Cloward and Ohlin<sup>5</sup>, insofar as it concentrates on the relatively less-privileged people in society, seems to derive inspiration from the official criminal statistics which generally over-represent the lower classes. What is true of the above-mentioned sociological explanations of crime is also true of psychological and psychiatric explanations which directly

stem from the first-hand study of criminals by psychologists and psychiatrists.

The most important single source of statistics on major crimes in America is Uniform Crime Reports published annually by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These statistics are generally used to find patterns in such visible crimes as manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, larceny, and so on. However, apart from the fact that visible crimes are not the only crimes in America, these reports have some other serious biases. For instance, as is evident from Table II, for many of the crimes reported to the police no arrest is made. Of those arrested not all are charged and brought to the court, and many of those who are brought to the court are not convicted. Rate of conviction for those who are charged increases as the seriousness of crime decreases. On the contrary, ratio of conviction for the number of cases reported for any crime decreases as the seriousness of crime decreases. For instance, conviction rate for the cases reported for crimes against person ranges between 42% and 51%, whereas the same rate for crimes against property falls between 11% and 18%. Manslaughter which includes negligent as well as non-negligent homicide has a 40.4% conviction rate for all cases reported. The same rate for reported cases for larceny which includes stealing money as well as shoplifting is only 12.72%.

There are other sources of bias as well, especially in connection with the study of the apprehended criminals. As soon as a criminal is caught by the police, interrogated and brought to the court, he has already entered into interaction with public authorities. To this new interactional situation the criminal may respond with rebellion,

TABLE II  
MAJOR CRIMES IN THE UNITED STATES\*

Crime	Reported	Cleared	Charged	Convicted	Convicted/Reported (In Per Cent)
Manslaughter	12,090	9,675 88%	6,234 65%	5,610 89%	46.40
Aggravated Assault	253,000	177,100 69%	130,985 76%	128,181 90%	50.65
Forcible Rape	27,100	16,266 60%	12,198 74%	11,498 95%	42.42
Robbery	202,050	60,615 30%	40,188 65%	36,368 95%	17.99
Burglary	1,606,700	321,201 20%	192,721 60%	192,684 99%	12.94
Larceny	1,047,100	188,840 18%	133,304 60%	133,250 99%	12.72
Auto Theft	654,900	130,980 20%	75,120 56%	75,001 99%	11.45

\*SOURCE: John Edgar Hoover, Crime in the United States: Uniform Crime Reports, 1967. Federal Bureau of Investigation (Washington, D. C., August, 1968), pp. 5-30.

repentance, alienation, contriteness, anomie, and so on. As Nye and Short pointed out, some of these very responses are treated by criminologists as causal factors in crime, whereas they may well be the consequences of being apprehended or "controlled" by the police.<sup>6</sup>

Because of the above-mentioned weaknesses in the official data on crime, the method of self-reporting is generally recommended.<sup>7</sup> This method simply calls for reaching the unapprehended "free" population and questioning them about their behavior and attitude much the same way as researchers such as Kinsey have done in research on sexual behavior.<sup>8</sup> The assumption is that so long as respondents are sure of remaining anonymous they may talk about their crimes much the same way as they talk about their sex behavior. This method has been more widely applied in Sweden than in any other western society. The general contention of these researchers is that this method may be more successful if very serious crimes are not involved. For instance, in connection with such serious crimes as manslaughter or forcible rape the respondents may flatly deny commission of the act even though they may be ensured anonymity. In the case of less serious crimes or misdemeanors, however, anonymous respondents more probably will give correct information because not much stigma is attached to these crimes and sanctions against them are not very serious either. This means that the method of self report also has its own limitations. It may include bias in the sample relative to the seriousness of crime under investigation. And as long as every crime does have some seriousness to it, the method of self report is always expected to contaminate the sample.

However, this is a different kind of bias from the one inherent in the official statistics on crime. In using the method of self report,

we may at least assume that there is a consistent positive ordinal relation between the degree of respondent's criminal behavior and the score generated in his self-report. Thus, there is a candor, although perhaps not complete candor, in self-reporting of deviant behavior.

### Shoplifting Among College Students

This project is aimed at testing a theory of crime and not at discovering patterns in some given crime. The above considerations, then, posed the question: which method to adopt - use of official data on crime or the method of self-reporting? The latter is selected mainly because the use of official data distorts the subjective aspects of crime commission. Also, the method of self-reporting involves survey techniques which are not new to social scientists any more. I was further motivated to use this method because I have sufficient theoretical and empirical convictions to believe that most of the dilemma of differential response in criminology is partly because of the extensive use of the apprehended criminal population in the samples. To make it more clear, I contend that there are too many exceptions to any theoretical formulation in criminology partly because there are too many criminals who are not caught, and, as Table II shows, arrest rate also varies by the type of crime. Last, but not least, it was imperative to use this method because of the dictates of the model developed in the preceding pages. Attitudes occupy an important place in this model to explain crime. An attitude, insofar as it has a certain amount of specificity toward certain objects or situations, has a tendency to shift in intensity and even to disappear altogether when a criminal is in a situation of interrogation by police or is behind bars.

After deciding in favor of the self-reporting method, the question was to select a crime for study which should suit this method but should not, at the same time, develop any biases which may contaminate the findings. The main criterion in this selection was the relative seriousness of crime. The relative seriousness of crime may be objectively or subjectively defined. Objective seriousness of crime is defined by criminal law in the form of penalties and the sanctions against a criminal. Subjective seriousness of a crime depends on people's judgment about the criminal law involved. Thus a crime may be objectively serious in the sense that the criminal law may create serious difficulties for the criminal, and yet the crime in question may not be defined as serious because people may not agree upon or may not approve of the criminal law itself. For instance, illicit use of drugs does involve a probability of serious penalties as defined by the criminal law and yet some people may approve of the use of drugs because they do not think that the use of drugs has any serious consequences either for the user or for others involved. Thus, a subjective decision about the relative seriousness of a given act involves subjective consideration about the relative seriousness of the consequences of that act. And, as the model presented above depends heavily on such subjective factors as attitudes and personality traits, the logical conclusion was to look for a crime which is not subjectively defined as a very serious act as to the consequences.

Yet another consideration was that, in the fashion of the model presented above, relative agreement and approval of law and therefore the subjective decision of relative seriousness of crime is subculture-bound. This called for the location of a subculture in order to locate

the relative seriousness of crimes in that subculture.

Those considerations, then, became the basis for the selection of the college subculture whence to draw the sample. College students are a distinct group in this society. They live on or around the campus. Most of their activities are centered around professors, classrooms, libraries, reading rooms, and the dormitories. In short, they have a way of life which is peculiar to them and which develops certain values of its own and which students are generally ready to defend.

College students may be predisposed to commit certain crimes. For instance, illicit use of drugs is supposed to be quite common on campus.<sup>9</sup> There is also evidence that some students engage in shoplifting.<sup>10</sup> Some male students are also known to engage in sex behavior which according to one survey may sometimes be defined as forcible rape.<sup>11</sup> These crimes among college students, among other things, reflect the attitudes of students toward certain aspects of criminal law and also their subjective decisions as to the relative seriousness of the consequences of these crimes. Two of the three above-mentioned crimes are already dealt with in detail in scientific and non-scientific literature. Shoplifting is the only crime which does not seem to have been subjected to any scientific analysis yet. These were sufficient reasons for the selection of shoplifting among college students as a case study to test the model developed in the preceding pages.

#### Postulates

The hypotheses which are formulated in the following pages follow the general directions of the model presented above. It gives rise to



certain postulates which became the basis for these hypotheses.

1. The above model deals mainly with situation, criminogenic attitudes, and aggressive personality traits which are exclusively necessary factors in crime. This excludes a multitude of factors generally considered in the preceding analyses of crime.

The first postulate, therefore, is that insofar as students spend most of their time on the campus, live on or near campus, and are part of and are concerned with the college subculture, the pre-college subcultural factors are only remote to them and may have little effect on the actual frequencies of shoplifting.

2. The second postulate is about the shoplifting situation. This simply means to say that shoplifting occurs where there are shops.

This is a physical as well as a social component of the shoplifting situation in the sense that shops and the objects of sale are physical things which can be measured as to their length, breadth, height, weight, color, and so on. They are also social in the sense that they reflect the shopping behavior of a community; they reflect certain habits of shop browsing, advertising, and display of goods, together with the related customs and laws of society. We may presently ignore the physical component and may concern ourselves only with the social aspects.

The shoplifting situation may change in its ecological character and along with it in its opportunity characteristics. For instance, a rather small town of 6,000 where there are a few street corner stores with nothing but a few standard items for sale, where almost every person knows everybody else, where a kind of "gemeinschaft" relationship prevails, presents a social situation which is less conducive for

shoplifting. In this situation, probably even those with highly criminogenic attitudes toward stealing and those with high aggressive personality traits will have as low frequency of shoplifting as those who are only slightly predisposed to steal and who are not very aggressive either.

On the other hand, a larger town of about 50,000 or over where there are a few stores operated by the "outsiders" with a great variety of items for sale, where anonymity is on an increase, where a kind of "gesellschaft" relations are developing, presents a social situation which is more conducive for shoplifting.

It is, therefore, postulated that the frequency of shoplifting is significantly larger in big towns and cities than that in smaller towns. The significant difference between the two situations is not that the large city itself is the cause of shoplifting. It is because the large city situation is more likely to invoke criminogenic perception and consequently it allows a positive correlation between the subjective factors of shoplifting and the actual frequency of shoplifting.

3. The third postulate is that shoplifting occurs after one is predisposed to shoplift. Any situation, however conducive it may be for shoplifting, may not yield shoplifting behavior unless one is predisposed to shoplift. This means that in the college subculture which contains or generates attitudes conducive for shoplifting, there must be a significant difference in frequencies of shoplifting according to low and high criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting. However, again we cannot assign causation to the criminogenic attitudes because of the many exceptions.

4. The fourth postulate is about aggressive personality as a factor in shoplifting. A rather meek or a nervous person may not shoplift even though he may be in an objective shoplifting situation and may also be predisposed to shoplift. This means that the frequency of shoplifting should be significantly different insofar as low and high aggressive personality traits are concerned. And yet, causation cannot be assigned to aggressive personality traits because there are too many exceptions to it.

5. After isolating the three factors which are necessarily conducive to shoplifting, we have to establish their sufficiency for shoplifting. In other words, we have to establish that frequencies of shoplifting vary with them taken together.

#### Hypotheses

The postulates above gave rise to the following hypotheses which are to be tested by the data on shoplifting behavior from the college subculture.

- H<sub>1</sub> - Situation (as measured by the size of campus town), criminogenic attitudes, and aggressive personality are factors which make significant difference in the frequency of shoplifting. (p = .05)
- H<sub>2</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting are significantly higher in urban situation than in the non-urban situation. (p = .05)
- H<sub>3</sub> - College students do not rank shoplifting high in seriousness.
- H<sub>4</sub> - Exposure to college subculture makes a significant difference in criminogenic attitude toward shoplifting among college students. (p = .05)
- H<sub>5</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting are significantly higher for high criminogenic attitudes than those for low criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting. (p = .05)

- H<sub>6</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting are significantly higher for high aggressive personality traits than those for low aggressive personality traits. (p = .05)
- H<sub>7</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting in different situations (as measured by the size of campus town). (p = .05)
- H<sub>8</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting for different aggressive personality traits. (p = .05)
- H<sub>9</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with aggressive personality traits in different situations (as measured by the size of campus town). (p = .05)
- H<sub>10</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with aggressive personality traits for different criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting. (p = .05)
- H<sub>11</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with criminogenic attitudes for relatively high aggressive personality traits in relatively high urban situation (as measured by the size of campus town). (p = .05)
- H<sub>12</sub> - Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with aggressive personality traits for relatively high criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting in relatively high urban situation (as measured by the size of campus town). (p = .05)

### The Research Design

#### Sample

A random sample of 1,509 students was drawn toward the close of the spring semester, 1969, from four colleges in the Midwest. As Table III indicates, two of these colleges are situated in small towns whose respective populations are slightly more than 10,000 and 20,000, and two of them are situated in rather modest sized cities with their respective populations being slightly more than 47,000 and 100,000. This randomization establishes the urban/nonurban dichotomy. These campus towns are arranged in Table III in the rank order of their size.

The same rank number has been used as a code in the questionnaire, as we shall see later, in order to control for this rank order.

TABLE III  
SOME ATTRIBUTES OF THE COLLEGES AND THE  
CAMPUS TOWNS SELECTED IN THE SAMPLE

Rank and Name of College	Status of College	Campus Town	Population
1. Eastern Illinois	State	Charleston, Ill.	10,505
2. MacMurray College	Private	Jacksonville, Ill.	21,691
3. Wisconsin State	State	La Crosse, Wisc.	47,575
4. Bradley University	Private	Peoria, Ill.	103,162

Table III also indicates that two of these four colleges are private and two of them are state schools. This provides us with the private/public dichotomy which may be explored for its possible confounding effects on the behavior of the students. A rather poor student, with no fellowship or scholarship, generally cannot afford to go to a private college. The general economic and scholastic background of students going to private colleges, therefore, is expected to be different from those going to public colleges and the general economic and scholastic background of the student may be expected to affect his orientation toward shoplifting.

The sample was further divided according to sex and semesters spent in college. No attempt was made to take into account the racial differences. This limitation on the study was accepted in order to avoid further complications in the statistical analysis, the main difficulty being, as shall be seen later, a very low reliability with respect to certain important items in the questionnaire when bi-racial groups were used.

These controls of urban/nonurban, private/public, male/female and semesters in college were exerted to form the basic stratification and structure of the sample in order to make it as representative as possible. Apart from being uniracial the sample has one more limitation on its representativeness, hence on its generalizability. This is the fact that the sample was collected from a rather limited area in the country. This limitation, however, had to be accepted in face of the time and monetary difficulties.

### Procedure

It was originally planned to collect a sample of at least 1,600 students, divided equally in four colleges, two sexes and eight semesters. Thus the sample consisting of 64 cells was planned to have at least 25 subjects in each cell. For this purpose letters of request were sent to a total of 2,540 undergraduate students in the above four colleges through their respective student governments and the student activity departments. Such a high number of request letters was in anticipation of a very high absentee rate because of the student disturbances currently going on. The first date for data collection was fixed in the middle of January, 1969, i.e., toward the close of the

first semester of the 1968-69 year. However, this could not materialize because two of the four colleges selected were having acute disturbances toward the beginning of January. The date for the data collection had to be postponed by one full semester.

Fortunately there were no troubles toward the end of the second semester and the data were collected in four different sessions. Copies of the questionnaire were served by the writer in person and were collected in little more than half an hour in each case.

The total return was 1,571 out of which 62 had to be rejected because of superfluous, irrelevant or incomplete response. This gave us, as Table IV shows, a sample size of 1,509 with an average number of 23.5 subjects per cell. No test for the adequacy of the sample was given. One thousand five hundred and nine was considered to be a sufficiently large number to satisfy the requirements for the adequacy of the sample.

### Instrument

The conceptual scheme and the hypotheses developed in the preceding pages became the basis for the development of the instrument used in this study. As Merton and Lazarsfeld pointed out,<sup>12</sup> it is taken into consideration that each item in the questionnaire should be related with the central problem, all parts of the instrument must hang together to make a unity, and the instrument must be limited in length and in its scope. The questionnaire, then, concentrated on criminogenic attitudes in the college subculture, aggressive personality traits of the college students, and relative urbanization of the campus towns, as independent variables; and shoplifting behavior of the college students

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY SEX, SCHOOL, AND SEMESTER IN COLLEGE

Number of Semesters in College	Wisconsin State University			Eastern Illinois University			Bradley University			MacMurray College			Total			Mean			
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Mean
1	27	24	51	23	21	44	24	21	45	27	25	52	101	91	192	25.25	22.75	48.00	24.00
2	23	21	44	25	23	48	22	27	49	23	24	47	93	95	188	23.25	23.75	47.00	23.50
3	28	26	54	22	26	48	24	25	49	29	26	55	103	103	206	25.75	25.75	51.50	25.75
4	25	20	45	21	24	45	29	26	55	21	22	43	96	92	188	24.00	23.00	47.00	23.5
5	23	26	49	27	21	48	20	21	41	20	25	45	90	93	183	22.50	23.25	45.75	22.875
6	26	21	47	23	20	43	23	21	44	24	23	47	96	85	181	24.00	21.25	45.25	22.625
7	24	28	52	24	24	48	20	25	45	24	22	46	92	99	191	23.00	24.75	47.75	23.875
8	25	22	47	21	22	43	24	22	46	20	24	44	90	90	180	22.50	22.50	45.00	22.50
Total	201	188	389	186	181	367	186	188	374	188	191	379	761	748	1509	190.25	187.00	377.25	188.625
Mean	25.13	23.50	48.62	23.25	22.62	45.87	23.25	23.5	46.75	23.50	23.88	47.37	95.125	93.50	188.63	23.78	23.38	47.14	23.57



as the dependent variable. The questionnaire also included items on a number of objective factors in order to measure their confounding effects, if any. The questionnaire has a progression from more simple and less "personal" items to less simple and more "personal" items.

The instrument consisted of a four-page questionnaire (Appendix). It was divided into three parts. Part A consisted of items on the objective background factors relevant to the students. Of these, Item No. II about sex and Item No. VI about semesters spent in college were directly concerned with the college subculture. The third important variable concerning college subculture, i.e., size of the campus town, was coded. This code consisted of a number which indicated the rank of the campus town in population size in the increasing order of 1, 2, 3, and 4. The code also included letters P designating the status of the college as private and S indicating the status of the college as a state institution. For instance, the code, as in the questionnaire reproduced in Appendix, is Form 3S appearing at the upper right-hand corner on the first page. This means that the campus town has a population size rank of 3 (4 being the highest) and the college is a state college or a university. Use of this code yielded an additional information about the private/public character of the college which was also made a part of the analysis.

The rest of the items in Part A were mainly concerned with the background variables outside of the college subculture. These items yielded information mainly on the hometown and the families of the students.

Part B in the questionnaire dealt with criminogenic attitudes of the students toward shoplifting and their aggressive personality

traits - the subjective factors preceding shoplifting by the college students.

Item VII in Part B was meant to measure the seriousness of different crimes as college students see them and to derive from this measure the seriousness of shoplifting relative to other crimes. Twelve different crimes which vary in their seriousness as defined by law were listed randomly. Students were requested to check one of the three boxes left as blanks to the right of each crime. The boxes labeled as No, Uncertain, and Yes were arbitrarily given the scores of 3, 2, and 1, respectively. The response "No" as against "Yes" was given the highest score because this response indicated a greater seriousness of the crime. Thus, this whole scale had a continuum of No, Uncertain, and Yes, yielding a range of scores for all crimes which then could be arranged in the rank order of seriousness.

Item VIII in Part B was an attitude scale containing 10 situational statements which provoked an approve-disapprove response. Generally, attitude surveys use simple statements provoking agree-disagree response. However, use of situational statements in attitude scaling is not unusual. Moreover, in this particular case, as indicated in the following pages, situational statements helped attain the desirable reliability of the scale.

Responses to each statement were measured along a five-point scale with arbitrarily assigned scores of 1 for strongly disapprove, 2 for disapprove, 3 for neither approve nor disapprove, 4 for approve, and 5 for strongly approve.

In order to avoid a possible acquiescence response from the respondents, statements 3, 5, and 10 were included. These statements

were scored in the reverse order with a score of 1 for approve and through a score of 5 for disapprove. As will be indicated later, all these statements hinged together yielding a high reliability coefficient. The total range of the scores for the scale was from a minimum of 10 to a maximum of 50.

Item IX in Part B was a personality scale measuring aggressive traits. These statements which provoked agree-disagree response and were scored 1 for agree and 2 for disagree were selected from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Numbers in the brackets in front of each item are the actual item numbers in the MMPI. Reliability of these items is already established. This scale measured the aggressive personality traits of students ranging from a minimum of 9 to a maximum of 18.

Part C in the questionnaire included items pertaining directly to the shoplifting behavior. Item X divided the sample into those who ever shoplifted since they came to college and those who never indulged in this behavior since they came to college. This, then, is to enable us to know the exact extent of the shoplifting population in the sample.

Item XI measured the actual frequency of shoplifting in the college subculture, and Item XII measured the minimum and maximum values of things stolen by the students.

### Pretests

The above instrument was given its final shape after a series of partial pretests were given to small samples of student populations in the fall, 1968, mainly with the purpose of determining the nature of

the sample in connection with the reliability of the items pertaining to criminogenic attitudes and aggressive personality traits of the students.

Because there was no prior scale available for criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting and because aggressive personality items used in this study are only a selection from MMPI, it was necessary to establish the reliability of these scales before they could be used in the questionnaire. For this purpose a modified technique of test-retest was applied to two matched samples ( $N = 31$ ), comprising both white and nonwhite students of both sexes from Illinois Central College in Peoria, Illinois. The criminogenic attitude items in the questionnaire at this time included statements which provoked agree-disagree response, like the following:

I do not think that to steal little things from stores is a serious crime.

I think that to steal is a crime and all crimes are bad whether it is shoplifting or stealing a car.

Shoplifting is not so bad in itself. What is bad is to be caught while shoplifting.

As Table V indicates, for this first partial pretest the reliability was not significant either for criminogenic attitude items or for aggressive personality items selected from MMPI. This called for a change either in the composition of the sample or in the questionnaire items or in both. The step taken was to change the composition of the sample from biracial to uniracial matched samples. This pair of matched samples ( $N = 35$ ) was drawn from the University of Illinois at Urbana. Table V indicates a substantial rise in the significance of reliability of the aggressive personality items; and yet the criminogenic attitude items still did not score the desired significance

level even though there was a gain in the reliability coefficient.

TABLE V  
RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDE AND AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY  
ITEMS IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Pretest	Criminogenic Attitude Items	Aggressive Personality Items
1	.257	.441
2	.398	.871
3	.793	.851

Results of the second pretest called for the correction of items on the criminogenic attitude. The third pair of matched samples (N = 28) was, therefore, drawn consisting of all white male and female students equally distributed in the sample from Illinois State University at Normal. This time a complete change was made in the criminogenic attitude items by replacing the original opinion items with the hypothetical situational items provoking an approve-disapprove response. The use of situational items in attitude surveys is not uncommon in the professional sociological studies. The greater amount of reliability associated with the situational items in attitude surveys is already established.<sup>13</sup> As Table V indicates, this change in the questionnaire items on criminogenic attitudes yielded a significant reliability coefficient.

These three partial pretests were crucial to the study which otherwise could have been contaminated with biases included in multi-racial sample and a faulty instrument.

### Statistical Tests

Because the data collected in this study can be best described as ordinal, nonparametric tests were employed for their analysis. These "distribution-free" techniques do put limitations on parameter estimation. However, as Seigel noted, these tests, when employed, allow us conclusions "regardless of the shape of the population(s)." <sup>14</sup>

The statistical analysis was done in two stages, each of which employed different statistical tests and required separate statements and subroutines in the computer program. The objectives of the first stage analysis were (1) to locate the effect of intra-attribute differences of each variable on the frequency of shoplifting, (2) to locate the effect of intra-attribute differences of each variable on the shoplifting attitude of the college students, and (3) to isolate the more significant factors related to shoplifting from other extraneous factors which might still have a confounding effect on the findings. The statistical tests employed for this were Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance <sup>15</sup> and Mann-Whitney test for two independent samples. <sup>16</sup> These are, respectively, a test for one way analysis of variance applicable to ordinal data and a nonparametric equivalent of the t test. These tests were used according to the dictates of the hypotheses as to the relationship among different variables.

The second stage of analysis dealt mainly with the computation of Spearman's rho <sup>17</sup> - a rank correlation technique applicable to the

ordinal data - after significant intra-attribute differences were established in the first stage. Besides these nonparametric tests which were used mainly to test the hypotheses, t test which is a parametric measure was also used wherever it was necessary to estimate the universe mean and to find significant differences between the sample means.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Wolfgang, 1960.

<sup>2</sup>For their ecological studies in Chicago, see Thrasher, 1931, and Shaw, 1928.

<sup>3</sup>Merton, 1938.

<sup>4</sup>Cohen, 1957.

<sup>5</sup>Cloward and Ohlin, 1960.

<sup>6</sup>For detail see, F. Ivan Nye and James F. Short, Jr., "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, Vol. 22 (June, 1957), pp. 326-331; Thorsten Sellin and Marvin E. Wolfgang, The Measurement of Delinquency (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964); and Ronald H. Beatti, "Problems of Criminal Statistics in the United States," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 57 (July, 1966), pp. 178-186.

<sup>7</sup>About the advantages and disadvantages and the assumptions to be made in self reporting method see, A. M. Carr-Sanders, Hermann Mannheim, E. C. Rhodes, eds., Young Offenders (London: MacMillan, 1965).

<sup>8</sup>Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pameroy, and Clyde E. Martin, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia: W. B. Sanders Co., 1948).

<sup>9</sup>Professional literature on the use of drugs on campus is rare. However, in popular literature this topic has attracted more interest lately. For instance, see "An Interview with Henry L. Giardano, Commissioner, U. S. Bureau of Narcotics," The American Legion Magazine, Vol. 76, No. 1 (January, 1967), pp. 37-41. Also see, "Drug on Campus," Time, July 5, 1968, pp. 31-32.

<sup>10</sup>Literature on shoplifting is extremely rare. In popular literature the writer could find only two reports. One of them was in Time, March 4, 1968, and the other was in Look, January, 1968. Both of these articles were based on the interviews with the employees of the big chain stores which are generally the targets of shoplifting. There is no indication that college students participate in this act more than any other person; but that they do participate in shoplifting is strongly indicated. There is only one professional article on shoplifting and this also is only about the way the courts react to the



shoplifters. See Mary Owen Cameron, "Court Responses to Shoplifting," in Earl Rubington and Martin S. Weinberg, eds., Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective (New York: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 169-170.

<sup>11</sup>On this topic see, Ira L. Reiss, "Social Class and Campus Dating," Social Problems, Vol. 13 (1965), pp. 193-205.

<sup>12</sup>Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Continuities in Social Research (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1950).

<sup>13</sup>For the application of this method, specifically in criminology, see Erwin O. Smigel, "Public Attitudes Toward Stealing as Related to the Size of Victim Organization," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21 (June, 1956), pp. 320-327.

<sup>14</sup>Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1956), p. 3.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 184-193.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., pp. 175-179.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 202-212.

## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

The theoretical frame of reference and the methodology developed in the preceding pages became the basis for collection of the data which is analyzed in this chapter. Whereas, the theoretical frame and the hypotheses which originated from it were etiological in nature, the methodology of self-report used in this study, yielded additional information directly pertaining to the structure of the universe of shoplifting among college students. These two sets of data are analyzed separately in two sections in the following. Whereas the etiological data is gathered directly under the guidance of the hypothesis formulated above, the data pertaining to the structure of crime under study is purely of exploratory nature. However, it is none the less important for it may provide us with sufficient insight in any future theorization about the structural aspects of the universe of crime. No attempt is made in this chapter to interpret and discuss the data. This will be done in the next chapter.

#### Etiology of Shoplifting by College Students

The twelve hypotheses which were formulated in the preceding chapter are tested in this section. Because these hypotheses emanate directly from the main thesis of this study, findings in this section are of central importance for us.

In the following a purely statistical procedure of hypothesis testing is adopted. Because it is a general statistical practice to formulate a null hypothesis for testing, all the hypotheses presented in the preceding pages are tested in the null form.

$H_1$ : Situation (as measured by the size of campus town), criminogenic attitudes, and aggressive personality are factors which make significant difference in the frequency of shoplifting. ( $p = .05$ )

This hypothesis was formulated in order to isolate the most significant variables affecting the shoplifting behavior among college students. Data for this hypothesis came from the responses to items I through VI and items VIII through XI in the questionnaire. The data are subjected to Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance, results of which are summarized in Table VI, and to Mann-Whitney test of which results are summarized in Tables VII and VIII. As is evident, out of a whole array of ten variables considered, situation (as measured by the size of campus town), aggressive personality, and criminogenic attitudes are the three factors which are responsible for significant variation in the shoplifting frequency at .031, .039, and .019 level of significance, respectively. Null is, therefore, rejected and  $H_1$  is tenable.

$H_2$ : Frequencies of shoplifting are significantly higher in urban situation than those in the non-urban situation. ( $p = .05$ )

After isolating the variable of situation as being significant in the shoplifting behavior of the college students, the question was raised in this hypothesis to ascertain the direction of variation. Hypothesis 2 is, therefore, mainly a directional hypothesis to determine the effect of urban and non-urban differences in the shoplifting behavior. This called for a Mann-Whitney test, results of which are

TABLE VI  
 FREQUENCY OF SHOPLIFTING DIFFERENTIALS BY RELEVANT  
 OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE FACTORS\*

Factors	Computed Value of H	df	p
Size of hometown	15.120	8	.061
Size of campus town	8.831	3	.031
Family adequacy	6.921	5	.251
Education of parents	13.342	8	.103
Income of parents	3.981	4	.412
Semesters in college	13.021	7	.071
Aggressive personality	8.129	3	.039
Criminogenic attitude	10.011	3	.019

\*Based on a Kruskal-Wallis one way Analysis of Variance.

TABLE VII  
 FREQUENCY OF SHOPLIFTING  
 DIFFERENTIALS BY SEX\*

Sex	n	Mean	z	p
Male	761	.84	1.13	.123
Female	748	.86		

\*Based on a Mann-Whitney U test.

presented in Table IX. As is evident, urban and non-urban differences in shoplifting behavior are established at .038 level of significance, thus enabling us to reject the null and to accept  $H_2$ .

TABLE VIII  
FREQUENCY OF SHOPLIFTING DIFFERENTIALS  
BY STATUS OF COLLEGE\*

Status of College	n	Mean	z	p
Private	753	.90	1.13	.123
State	756	.78		

\*Based on a Mann-Whitney U test.

TABLE IX  
URBAN - NONURBAN DIFFERENTIALS IN  
THE SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY\*

Size of Campus	n	Mean	z	p
Town				
Large	763	3.31	1.781	.038
Small	746	.92		

\*Based on Mann - Whitney U test.

$H_3$ : College students do not rank shoplifting high in seriousness.

This hypothesis was formulated in order to ascertain the existence of shoplifting attitudes in the college subculture. Information about this hypothesis came in response to item VII in the questionnaire. These data are summarized in Table X in which different crimes are rank ordered in seriousness as rated by the students. The whole distribution was then divided into four quartiles, the first quartile representing the lowest scores in seriousness and the fourth quartile representing the highest scores in seriousness. Table X shows that the college students regard only speeding as less serious a crime than shoplifting and that shoplifting falls well within the first quartile.  $H_3$  is, therefore, tenable, and the null is rejected.

TABLE X  
CRIMES RANKED IN ORDER OF SERIOUSNESS  
BY COLLEGE STUDENTS

Rank	Crime	Mean Score	Quartiles
1	Homicide	2.911	
2.5	Burglary	2.905	
2.5	Robbery	2.905	
4	Larceny	2.814	$Q_3 = 2.859$
5	Auto Theft	2.615	
6	Aggravated Assault	1.955	
7	Embezzlement	1.931	$Q_2 = 1.943$
8	Cheque Forgery	1.842	
9	Bribery	1.811	
10	Illegal Use of Drugs	1.451	$Q_1 = 1.631$
11	Shoplifting	1.401	
12	Speeding	1.327	

H<sub>4</sub>: Exposure to college subculture makes a significant difference in criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting among college students. ( $p = .05$ )

After ascertaining the existence of criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting in the college subculture, hypothesis 4 was formulated to raise the question about college culture being the factor in generating criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting. Information for this hypothesis came from responses to items I through VI and items VIII and IX in the questionnaire. Data presented in Table XI which are based on a Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance, and the data presented in Tables XII and XIII which are based on Mann-Whitney U test, summarize this information. Table XI indicates that exposure to college subculture, as measured by the number of semesters spent in college, is a significant factor at .009 level relating to criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting, but so are the factors, size of hometown and size of campus towns at .019 and .05 levels respectively. As is evident the data go beyond proving H<sub>4</sub>. In this case the null hypothesis is not tenable.

H<sub>5</sub>: Frequencies of shoplifting are higher for high criminogenic attitudes than those for low criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting. ( $p = .05$ )

After tracing the development of criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting in the college subculture, this hypothesis is posed to trace the direction of the effect of shoplifting attitudes on shoplifting behavior. Information for this was yielded by responses to items VIII, X, and XI in the questionnaire. These data were subjected to a Mann-Whitney U test, results of which are presented in Table XIV. In this table criminogenic attitude scores were divided at the median into high and low categories. Mean frequencies of shoplifting pertaining to

TABLE XI  
 CRIMINOGENIC ATTITUDE DIFFERENTIALS BY RELEVANT  
 OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE FACTORS\*

Factors	Computed Value of H	df	p
Size of hometown	18.523	8	.019
Size of campus town	7.901	3	.050
Family adequacy	5.783	5	.389
Education of parents	4.871	8	.301
Income of parents	5.611	4	.213
Semester in college	19.871	7	.009
Aggressive personality	5.442	3	.151

\*Based on a Kruskal-Wallis one way Analysis of Variance.

TABLE XII  
 CRIMINOGENIC ATTITUDE  
 VARIATION BY SEX\*

Sex	n	Mean	z	p
Male	761	3.91	.94	.174
Female	748	3.23		

\*Based on a Mann-Whitney U test.



high and low criminogenic attitude categories were included in the table for more illucidation. As the table indicates, shoplifting frequencies for high criminogenic attitudes are significantly higher at .026 level than those for low criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting. Hypothesis 5 is therefore tenable, and we reject the null.

TABLE XIII  
CRIMINOGENIC ATTITUDE VARIATION  
BY STATUS OF COLLEGE\*

Status of College	n	Mean	z	p
Private	753	3.61	.89	.187
State	756	3.53		

\* Based on a Mann-Whitney U test.

TABLE XIV  
DIFFERENCE IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY BY CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES TOWARD SHOPLIFTING\*

Criminogenic Attitudes	n	Mean	z	p
High	755	3.51	1.954	.026
Low	754	.72		

\* Based on Mann-Whitney U test.

H<sub>6</sub>: Frequencies of shoplifting are significantly higher for high aggressive personality traits than those for low aggressive personality traits. ( $p = .05$ )

This hypothesis is concerned with the direction of aggressive personality as a determining factor in the frequency of shoplifting. Information on this came from items IX and X in the questionnaire. This information is summarized in Table XV which is based on Mann-Whitney U test. The aggressive personality traits are divided at the medium into high and low categories. Means of shoplifting frequencies with respect to these two categories are included for more elucidation. The table indicates that frequencies of shoplifting for high aggressive personality traits are significantly higher than those for low aggressive personality traits at .026 level of significance. We reject the null hypothesis in this case.

TABLE XV

DIFFERENCE IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY  
BY AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS\*

Aggressive Personality	n	Mean	z	p
High	755	3.51	1.954	.026
Low	754	.72		

\* Based on Mann-Whitney U test.

H<sub>7</sub>: Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting in different situations (as measured by the size of campus town).  
(p = .05)

This hypothesis seeks the relationship of shoplifting behavior as a dependent variable with criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting as an independent variable when situation as measured by the size of campus town is controlled. More specifically, the hypothesis seeks the degree and the significance of correlation of shoplifting in different campus towns. Information on this came from responses to item VIII pertaining to criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting, item X questioning about the shoplifting frequency and the code for campus town on the first page of the questionnaire. Four different Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients were computed as presented in Table XVI. As is evident, none of them was found to be significant at .05 level. In this case the null hypothesis is tenable.

TABLE XVI

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH CRIMINOGENIC ATTITUDES IN DIFFERENT CAMPUS TOWNS\*

	Campus Towns in Increasing Size Order			
	1	2	3	4
n	367	379	389	374
r	.060	.068	.079	.085
t	1.141	1.241	1.520	1.631
p	.191	.167	.093	.091

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

H<sub>8</sub>: Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting for different aggressive personality traits. (p = .05)

Hypothesis 8 seeks the relationship between the frequencies of shoplifting behavior as a dependent variable and the criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting as an independent variable. Only this time different aggressive personality traits are controlled. More specifically, this hypothesis seeks the degree and the significance of association between shoplifting frequencies and the criminogenic attitudes of those students who fall in different quartile categories of aggressive personality traits. The hypothesis called for information from responses to items VIII pertaining to criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting, item IX which measures aggressive personality traits, and item X which throws light on the frequency of shoplifting. Table XVII, which is based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis, shows that no correlation between shoplifting frequencies and criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting is significant for any quartile of aggressive personality scores at .05 level of significance. Null is, therefore, tenable and we reject hypothesis 8 at .05 level of significance.

H<sub>9</sub>: Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with aggressive personality traits in different situations (as measured by size of campus towns). (p = .05)

Like the above two hypotheses, this hypothesis also treats shoplifting behavior as a dependent variable seeking its relationship with aggressive personality traits as the independent variable by controlling situation as measured by size of campus town. Information on this came from item IX pertaining to aggressive personality traits, item X which is concerned with the shoplifting frequencies and the code used for campus towns in the questionnaire. Table XVIII presents four

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients computed for students from four different campus towns. None of these correlation coefficients is significant at .05 level of significance. Hypothesis 9 is, therefore, not tenable and the null is accepted in this case.

TABLE XVII

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH  
CRIMINOGENIC ATTITUDE FOR DIFFERENT  
AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS

	Aggressive Personality Score Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	377	377	377	378
r	.061	.073	.082	.081
t	1.141	1.333	1.550	1.550
p	.191	.121	.093	.093

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis

$H_{10}$ : Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with aggressive personality traits for different criminogenic attitudes towards shoplifting. ( $p = .05$ )

Like the previous one, this hypothesis seeks to discover the relationship between shoplifting frequencies as a dependent variable and aggressive personality traits as an independent variable. Only this time, criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting are controlled. More specifically, this time, attention is focused on the association of shoplifting frequencies with the aggressive personality traits as they

fall in four quartile categories of criminogenic attitude scores. For this hypothesis information came from responses to item VIII on attitudes toward shoplifting, item IX which is about aggressive personality traits, and item X which is pertaining to shoplifting behavior. Table XIX presents four Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients. None of these correlation coefficients is significant at .05 level. We, therefore, reject hypothesis 10 and accept the null in this case.

TABLE XVIII

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH  
AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS IN  
DIFFERENT CAMPUS TOWNS\*

	Campus Towns in Increasing Size Order			
	1	2	3	4
n	367	379	389	374
r	.059	.070	.081	.086
t	1.141	1.330	1.522	1.531
p	.191	.121	.093	.091

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

TABLE XIX

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH AGGRESSIVE  
PERSONALITY TRAITS FOR DIFFERENT  
CRIMINOGENIC ATTITUDES\*

	Criminogenic Attitude Score Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	377	377	377	378
r	.062	.069	.080	.080
t	1.141	1.340	1.522	1.522
p	.191	.121	.093	.093

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

H<sub>11</sub>: Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with criminogenic attitudes for relatively high aggressive personality traits in relatively high urban situation (as measured by the size of campus town). (p = .05)

After having looked at the association of shoplifting frequency with one independent variable while controlling the other, attention is focused in this hypothesis on measuring the association of the dependent variable, i.e., shoplifting frequency with one independent variable, i.e., attitudes toward shoplifting, while controlling the two other independent variables, i.e., aggressive personality traits and the situation (as measured by the size of campus town). Because of the nonparametric nature of the data no control measures could be used other than constructing four independent tables, each presenting the data from one campus town. Thus, having controlled the situation, each table contains controls for the aggressive personality quartiles while

focusing on the association of shoplifting frequencies with the criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting. Tables XX, XXI, XXII, and XXIII, which are based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis, summarize the data to test this hypothesis. Table XX contains the data from Eastern Illinois University at Charleston, which is the smallest town in the sample (population 10,505). As the table indicates the correlation between shoplifting and criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting for any aggressive personality quartile is not significant at .05 level of significance.

TABLE XX

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES FOR DIFFERENT AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY  
TRAITS IN CHARLESTON (SIZE 1)\*

	Aggressive Personality Score Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	92	92	92	91
r	.130	.178	.178	.179
t	1.311	1.268	1.268	1.273
p	.092	.107	.107	.101

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

Again Table XXI, containing the data from MacMurray College at Jacksonville which is the second smallest town in the sample (population 21,691), shows that the correlation between shoplifting



frequencies and criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting for any aggressive personality quartile is not significant at .05 level of significance.

TABLE XXI

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES FOR DIFFERENT AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY  
TRAITS IN JACKSONVILLE (SIZE 2)\*

	Aggressive Personality Score Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	95	95	95	94
r	.113	.177	.179	.179
t	1.311	1.268	1.273	1.273
p	.092	.101	.101	.101

\* Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

Table XXII contains information from Wisconsin State University at LaCrosse which is the third smallest or the second largest town in the sample (population, 47,575). As the table indicates in this third smallest town, there is no significant correlation at .05 level between the shoplifting frequency and criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting for the first two quartiles of aggressive personality traits. However, a rather low ( $r = .249$ ), but significant at .05 level, correlation appears in the third quartile of the aggressive personality. The same

amount of correlation exists for the fourth quartile of the aggressive personality.

TABLE XXII

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES FOR DIFFERENT AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY  
TRAITS IN LACROSSE (SIZE 3)\*

	Aggressive Personality Score Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	97	97	97	98
r	.169	.179	.249	.249
t	1.143	1.273	1.673	1.673
p	.133	.101	.047	.047

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

Table XXIII presents the data from Bradley University at Peoria which is the largest town in the sample (population, 103,162). As the table indicates, the correlation between shoplifting frequencies and criminogenic attitudes is not significant at .05 level for the first quartile of aggressive personality traits. However, a low ( $r = .321$ ), but significant at .05 level, correlation appears for the second quartile of the aggressive personality traits. The same correlation increases to .412 for the third aggressive personality quartile and is significant at .01 level. The same correlation is still higher

( $r = .551$ ) for the fourth quartile of the aggressive personality traits and is also significant at .01 level.

TABLE XXIII

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES FOR DIFFERENT AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY  
TRAITS IN PEORIA (SIZE 4)\*

	Aggressive Personality Score Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	93	93	94	94
r	.191	.321	.412	.551
t	1.523	1.699	2.377	2.386
p	.133	.043	.009	.009

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

To summarize the findings of the above four tables, it is found that the correlations between shoplifting frequency and criminogenic attitudes are low and non-significant for any of the aggressive personality quartiles of the two smaller campus towns, but it is found that the frequency of shoplifting varies significantly with criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting for high and even for relatively low aggressive personality traits in larger campus towns. This finding goes beyond confirming our hypothesis; hypothesis 11 is, therefore, tenable and we reject the null.

H<sub>12</sub>: Frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with aggressive personality traits for relatively high criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting in relatively high urban situation (as measured by the size of campus town). (p = .05)

After having traced the correlation between shoplifting frequencies and the criminogenic attitudes while controlling the other two independent variables, in this hypothesis attention is focused on the correlation between the shoplifting frequencies and the aggressive personality traits with the controls provided for the other two independent variables. As was done above, because of the nonparametric nature of the data, four separate tables were constructed to test this hypothesis also, each table containing the information from one campus town. Each table contains information on the correlation between shoplifting frequencies and the aggressive personality traits for each criminogenic attitude quartile. Tables XXIV, XXV, XXVI, and XXVII present this information. Table XXIV contains information from Eastern Illinois University at Charleston, the smallest town in the sample. As the table indicates, none of the correlations between shoplifting frequencies and aggressive personality traits for any criminogenic attitude quartile is significant at .05 level. Again Table XXV, which contains information about MacMurray College at Jacksonville, the second smallest town in the sample, shows that none of the correlations between shoplifting frequencies and aggressive personality traits for any criminogenic attitude quartile are significant at .05 level.

Table XXVI contains information from Wisconsin State University at LaCrosse, which is the second largest campus town in the sample. As the table indicates, for the first two quartiles of criminogenic attitudes the correlations between shoplifting frequencies and aggressive

TABLE XXIV

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH AGGRESSIVE  
PERSONALITY TRAITS FOR DIFFERENT CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES IN CHARLESTON (SIZE 1)\*

	Criminogenic Attitude Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	92	92	92	91
r	.064	.071	.071	.073
t	1.294	1.313	1.571	1.571
p	.100	.101	.081	.081

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

TABLE XXV

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH AGGRESSIVE  
PERSONALITY TRAITS FOR DIFFERENT CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES IN JACKSONVILLE (SIZE 2)\*

	Criminogenic Attitude Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	95	95	95	94
r	.067	.064	.080	.079
t	1.297	1.311	1.581	1.569
p	.101	.101	.079	.079

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

TABLE XXVI

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH AGGRESSIVE  
PERSONALITY TRAITS FOR DIFFERENT CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES IN LACROSSE (SIZE 3)\*

	Criminogenic Attitude Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	97	97	97	98
r	.078	.081	.278	.299
t	1.647	1.571	1.671	1.665
p	.058	.081	.049	.049

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

TABLE XXVII

VARIATION IN SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY WITH AGGRESSIVE  
PERSONALITY TRAITS FOR DIFFERENT CRIMINOGENIC  
ATTITUDES IN PEORIA (SIZE 4)\*

	Criminogenic Attitude Quartiles			
	1	2	3	4
n	93	93	94	94
r	.088	.245	.543	.561
t	1,570	1,712	2,391	2,378
p	.081	.041	.009	.009

\*Based on Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis.

personality traits are low and are not significant at .05 level. However, the same correlation for the third and the fourth quartiles of criminogenic attitudes, though still low (.278 and .299 respectively), is significant at .05 level.

Table XXVII contains information from Bradley University at Peoria which is the largest town in the sample. As the table indicates, the correlation between shoplifting frequencies and aggressive personality traits is not significant at .05 level for the first quartile of criminogenic attitudes. However, a low ( $r = .245$ ), but significant at .05 level, correlation is found for the second quartile of the criminogenic attitudes. The same correlation increases to .543 for the third quartile of the criminogenic attitudes and is significant at .01 level. This correlation further increases to .561 for the 4th quartile of criminogenic attitudes and is significant at .01 level.

To summarize the findings of the above four tables, it is found that the correlations between shoplifting frequencies and aggressive personality traits are low and non-significant for any criminogenic attitude quartile for the two smaller campus towns; but it is found that frequencies of shoplifting vary significantly with aggressive personality traits for high and even relatively low criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting in relatively larger campus towns. This finding actually goes beyond proving our hypothesis. The null hypothesis is, therefore, not tenable in this case.

#### Patterns of Shoplifting Among College Students

Shoplifting behavior in society is a universe in itself. Shoplifting behavior of the college students is only a sub-universe thereof.

It is suggested here that it is through studying the sub-universes that one may be able to estimate the larger universe of any given crime in society. Thus, this less ambitious effort may only be a prelude to more ambitious attempts by future researchers.

There are, at least, three questions which one can raise about the structure of the universe of any crime. First is the question of the number of proportions of criminals. Second is the question of the frequency of crime; and third is the question of the extent of loss incurred by the crime. All these questions are posed in the questionnaire and are answered systematically by the data as analyzed in the following pages.

#### How Many

How many students are involved in shoplifting? Item X was included in the questionnaire to answer this question which simply seeks to determine what proportion of college students engage in the behavior of shoplifting. This is a double-barrelled question. On one hand it seeks the absolute number or proportion of those who had ever engaged in shoplifting since they came to college, and on the other hand it seeks to determine the relative number or proportion of students who shoplifted during the semester covered by the study. Item X in the questionnaire was, therefore, divided in two parts. Item  $X_1$  relates to the absolute number or proportion of the shoplifters, and item  $X_2$  pertains to the relative proportion of the shoplifters during the semester studied. As is evident, both questions belong to the same generic issue: How many are involved? And yet, they are distinct from each other because whosoever was engaged in shoplifting since he or she came



to college must not have done this act during the semester studied and vice versa.

Tables XXVIII, XXIX, and XXX are constructed to compute the absolute proportions of shoplifters in the sample. Table XXX, which is based upon the information contained in Tables XXVIII and XXIX, shows that 691 out of a total of 1,509 or 46.37% of the students in the sample committed shoplifting at least once since they came to college. This is the absolute proportion of shoplifters in the sample. A confidence interval computed at .05 level shows that the universe percentage lies between  $\pm 5.234$  from 46.37 the sample percentage computed above ( $t = 1.871$ ). This means, the sample representativeness granted, the absolute percentage of shoplifters among college going population in this society is between 41.136 and 51.604. The same table also shows that the absolute proportion of girl shoplifters (48.16%) is slightly higher than that of boys (44.58%). The difference between the two proportions is not significant at .05 level ( $t = .472$ ). However, it is found that the proportion of student shoplifters from larger town campuses (55.43%) is significantly larger at .05 level ( $t = 6.915$ ) than the proportion of student shoplifters (37.31%) from small town campuses. The last column in Table XXX shows that the absolute proportion of shoplifting students grows steadily from 8.81% in the first semester to 69.62% in the 8th and the last semester in college. This addition with each semester in college suggests that as a student goes through semesters in college, each semester adds to the number of his cohorts who committed shoplifting, so that in each succeeding semester there is a higher proportion of student shoplifters than that in the preceding semester.

TABLE XXVIII

NUMBER AND PROPORTION TO TOTAL BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
AT LEAST ONCE SINCE THEY CAME TO COLLEGE (SMALL TOWN CAMPUSES)

Semesters in College		Eastern Illinois University			MacMurray College			Total		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	N	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	3	5
	%	4.31	7.31	5.81	5.10	4.00	4.50	4.70	5.65	5.17
2	N	4	3	7	3	3	6	7	6	13
	%	14.11	12.85	13.48	10.17	12.50	11.33	12.14	12.67	12.40
3	N	6	6	12	4	5	9	10	11	21
	%	20.81	23.19	22.00	15.09	21.37	18.23	22.95	22.28	22.61
4	N	8	7	15	7	6	13	15	13	28
	%	27.13	29.32	28.22	33.33	26.79	30.50	30.23	28.05	29.14
5	N	10	12	22	9	10	19	19	22	41
	%	40.25	57.98	49.11	54.37	40.00	42.68	42.81	48.99	45.90
6	N	11	14	25	10	10	20	21	24	45
	%	47.97	70.00	58.98	50.00	41.15	45.52	48.98	55.57	52.27
7	N	12	14	26	12	11	33	24	25	49
	%	50.00	59.31	54.60	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	54.65	52.32
8	N	13	16	29	13	13	26	26	29	55
	%	54.89	64.35	59.12	63.00	50.10	56.55	59.94	47.22	53.58
Total	N	65	74	139	73	69	142	138	143	281
	%	34.43	40.88	37.65	38.82	36.12	37.47	36.12	38.50	37.31

TABLE XXIX

NUMBER AND PROPORTION TO TOTAL BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
AT LEAST ONCE SINCE THEY CAME TO COLLEGE (LARGE TOWN CAMPUSES)

Semesters in College		<u>Wisconsin State University</u>			<u>Bradley University</u>			<u>Total</u>		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	N	3	3	6	4	2	6	7	5	12
	%	11.11	12.51	11.81	16.71	9.51	13.11	13.91	11.01	12.46
2	N	4	5	9	6	4	10	10	9	19
	%	16.66	21.31	18.98	24.71	27.10	25.90	20.68	24.20	22.44
3	N	8	7	15	10	9	19	18	16	34
	%	30.12	27.91	29.01	40.12	36.00	38.06	35.12	31.95	33.53
4	N	12	13	25	14	14	28	26	27	53
	%	43.51	65.00	54.25	49.35	56.01	52.68	46.43	60.50	53.46
5	N	15	15	30	17	18	35	32	33	65
	%	65.35	58.71	67.03	85.00	87.11	86.05	75.17	72.91	74.04
6	N	17	17	34	18	19	37	35	36	71
	%	67.01	81.30	74.15	70.91	91.21	81.06	68.96	86.25	77.60
7	N	18	19	37	19	20	39	37	39	76
	%	71.89	62.33	67.11	95.00	80.00	87.50	83.44	71.16	72.30
8	N	19	20	39	21	20	41	40	40	80
	%	76.00	90.99	83.49	84.71	90.99	87.85	80.35	90.99	80.62
Total	N	96	99	195	109	106	215	205	205	410
	%	47.71	59.05	53.38	58.39	56.59	57.49	53.05	57.82	55.43

TABLE XXX

NUMBER AND PROPORTION TO TOTAL BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
AT LEAST ONCE SINCE THEY CAME TO COLLEGE (TOTAL SAMPLE)

Semesters in College		Small Town Campuses			Large Town Campuses			Total		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	N	2	3	5	7	5	12	9	8	17
	%	4.70	5.65	5.17	13.91	11.01	12.46	9.30	8.33	8.81
2	N	7	6	13	10	9	19	17	15	32
	%	12.14	12.67	12.40	20.68	24.20	22.44	16.41	18.43	17.42
3	N	10	11	21	18	16	34	28	27	55
	%	22.95	22.28	22.61	35.12	31.95	33.53	29.03	27.11	28.07
4	N	15	13	28	26	27	53	41	40	81
	%	30.23	28.05	29.14	46.43	60.50	53.46	38.33	44.27	41.30
5	N	19	22	41	32	33	65	51	55	106
	%	42.81	48.99	45.90	75.17	72.91	74.04	58.94	60.90	59.92
6	N	21	24	45	35	36	71	56	60	116
	%	48.98	55.57	52.27	68.96	86.25	77.60	58.97	70.90	64.93
7	N	24	25	49	37	39	76	61	64	125
	%	50.00	54.65	52.32	83.44	71.16	72.30	66.72	62.90	64.81
8	N	26	29	55	40	40	80	66	69	135
	%	59.94	47.22	53.58	80.35	90.99	80.62	70.14	69.10	69.62
Total	N	138	143	281	205	205	410	343	348	691
	%	36.12	38.50	37.31	53.05	57.82	55.43	44.58	48.16	46.37

Tables XXXI, XXXII, and XXXIII are constructed to show the relative proportion of student shoplifters during the semester under study. Table XXXIII which is based on information contained in Tables XXXI and XXXII shows that during the semester under study 17.26 of the total students in the sample engaged in shoplifting at least once. The confidence interval computed to estimate the universe proportion shows that the universe proportion falls between  $\pm .96\%$  from 17.26 at .05 level ( $t = 1.910$ ). Girls relative proportion 16.85% is slightly lower than that of boys with 17.67%. The difference between the two is not significant at .05 level ( $t = .126$ ). However, the relative proportion of student shoplifters from large town campuses (28.23%) is found to be significantly larger at .05 level ( $t = 3.210$ ) than the proportion of student shoplifters from small town campuses (6.29%). The last column in Table XXXIII shows that starting with a low of 8.81%, the proportion of student shoplifters grows to a maximum of 32.26% in the 6th semester after which it declines to 15.36% in the 7th semester and further to 6.51% in the 8th and last semester. Thus, while the absolute proportion of student shoplifters is cumulative, the relative proportion shows a maximum in the sixth semester after which it declines toward the end of the semesters in college.

Taken together the above two sets of information explain:

1. Close to 50% of college students shoplift at least once during their college career.
2. During any given semester over all about 17% students engage in shoplifting at least once.

TABLE XXXI

NUMBER AND PROPORTION TO TOTAL BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
AT LEAST ONCE DURING THE SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (SMALL TOWN CAMPUSES)

Semesters in College		Eastern Illinois University			MacMurray College			Total		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	N	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	3	5
	%	4.31	7.31	5.81	5.10	4.00	4.50	4.70	5.65	5.17
2	N	2	1	3	2	1	3	4	2	6
	%	8.61	3.62	6.11	7.31	6.20	6.75	7.96	4.91	6.43
3	N	2	2	4	1	2	3	3	4	7
	%	9.13	7.20	8.16	3.22	7.23	5.22	6.17	7.21	6.69
4	N	2	3	5	2	1	3	4	4	8
	%	10.10	13.81	11.95	10.11	4.51	7.31	10.10	9.16	9.63
5	N	2	4	6	2	3	5	4	7	11
	%	7.14	20.10	13.62	10.01	8.91	9.46	8.57	14.50	16.53
6	N	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	3	5
	%	5.21	10.00	7.60	4.10	4.51	4.35	4.65	7.25	5.95
7	N	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2
	%	0.00	3.81	1.95	3.80	0.00	1.90	1.90	1.95	1.92
8	N	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	3
	%	4.32	4.22	4.27	0.00	3.70	1.80	2.16	3.96	3.06
Total	N	11	16	27	10	10	20	21	26	47
	%	6.10	8.75	7.42	5.45	4.88	5.16	5.77	6.81	6.29

TABLE XXXII

NUMBER AND PROPORTION TO TOTAL BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
AT LEAST ONCE DURING THE SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (LARGE TOWN CAMPUSES)

Semesters in College		Wisconsin State University			Bradley University			Total		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	N	3	3	6	4	2	6	7	5	12
	%	11.11	12.51	11.81	16.71	9.51	13.11	13.91	11.01	12.46
2	N	2	2	4	5	4	9	7	6	13
	%	9.30	10.51	9.90	24.12	14.70	19.41	16.71	12.60	14.65
3	N	5	5	10	5	5	10	10	10	20
	%	16.62	20.32	18.47	20.01	20.01	20.01	18.31	20.16	19.23
4	N	8	5	13	8	9	17	16	14	30
	%	33.41	25.01	29.21	34.71	33.50	34.10	34.06	29.29	31.67
5	N	10	10	20	13	12	25	23	22	45
	%	48.73	40.60	44.66	58.33	54.12	56.21	53.53	47.36	51.44
6	N	13	10	23	15	16	31	28	26	54
	%	50.00	49.70	49.80	60.21	74.41	67.31	55.10	62.05	58.57
7	N	7	6	13	9	5	14	16	11	27
	%	27.32	18.51	23.41	49.42	20.00	34.71	38.37	19.25	28.81
8	N	1	3	4	2	3	5	3	6	9
	%	4.01	13.32	8.66	9.20	13.32	11.26	6.60	13.32	9.96
Total	N	49	44	93	61	56	117	110	100	210
	%	25.06	23.81	24.43	34.09	29.95	32.02	29.57	26.88	28.23

TABLE XXXIII

NUMBER AND PROPORTION TO TOTAL BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
AT LEAST ONCE DURING THE SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (TOTAL SAMPLE)

Semesters in College		Small Town Campuses			Large Town Campuses			Total		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	N	2	3	5	7	5	12	9	8	17
	%	4.70	5.65	5.17	13.91	11.01	12.46	9.30	8.33	8.81
2	N	4	2	6	7	6	13	11	8	19
	%	7.96	4.91	6.43	16.71	12.60	14.65	12.33	8.75	10.52
3	N	3	4	7	10	10	20	13	14	27
	%	6.17	7.21	6.69	18.31	20.16	19.23	12.24	13.68	12.96
4	N	4	4	8	16	14	30	20	18	38
	%	10.10	9.16	9.63	34.06	29.29	31.67	22.08	19.22	20.65
5	N	4	7	11	23	22	45	27	29	56
	%	8.57	14.50	16.53	53.63	47.36	51.44	31.10	30.93	31.01
6	N	2	3	5	28	26	54	30	29	59
	%	4.65	7.25	5.95	55.10	62.05	58.57	29.87	34.65	32.26
7	N	1	1	2	16	11	27	17	12	29
	%	1.90	1.95	1.92	38.37	19.25	28.81	20.13	10.60	15.36
8	N	1	2	3	3	6	9	4	8	12
	%	2.16	3.96	3.06	6.60	13.32	9.96	4.38	8.64	6.51
Total	N	21	26	47	110	100	210	131	126	257
	%	5.77	6.81	6.29	29.57	26.88	28.23	17.67	16.85	17.26



### Frequency of Shoplifting

Information about the second question - that of the frequency of shoplifting - came from responses to item XI in the questionnaire. Actual and mean frequencies are presented in Tables XXXIV, XXXV, and XXXVI. Table XXXVI which is based on the information contained in Tables XXXIV and XXXV shows that the total number of actual incidents of shoplifting in the sample was 1,434. The marginal computations show that the mean frequency of shoplifting per cell in the sample was 22.4. Dividing 22.4 the mean frequency per cell in the sample into 23.57 the mean number of cases per cell in the sample (Table IV) gives us .95 which is the shoplifting frequency per student in the sample during the semester under study. A confidence interval constructed around this mean shows that the universe mean may fall between  $\pm .101$  from this mean at .05 level ( $t = 2.011$ ). The same table shows that the girls' mean frequency per cell in the sample is 23.31, which is slightly higher than that of the boys with 21.50. The difference between the two means is not significant at .05 level ( $t = .325$ ). Table XXXV shows that the mean frequency of shoplifting in urban campuses is 50.50 which is far higher than 4.31, the mean frequency per cell in non-urban campuses (Table XXXIV). The difference between the two is significant at .001 level ( $t = 8.291$ ). Table XXXVI also indicates that the mean frequency of shoplifting per cell for the first semester students in the sample is 8.5. This continuously increases until it reaches a maximum of 35.75 for the 5th semester students in the sample, after which it declines to 14.88 for the 8th or the last semester students.

TABLE XXXIV

SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
DURING THE SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (SMALL TOWN CAMPUSES)

Semester in College	<u>Eastern Illinois</u>			<u>MacMurray</u>			<u>Total</u>			<u>Mean</u>			Mean
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
1	2	2	4	2	3	5	4	5	9	2.0	2.5	4.5	2.25
2	3	1	4	3	4	7	6	5	11	3.0	2.5	5.5	2.75
3	3	4	7	4	5	9	7	9	16	3.5	4.5	8.0	4.00
4	8	11	19	8	9	17	16	20	36	8.0	10.0	18.0	9.00
5	10	9	19	10	9	19	20	18	38	10.0	9.0	19.0	9.50
6	4	6	10	4	5	9	8	10	18	4.0	5.0	9.0	4.50
7	0	2	2	3	0	3	3	5	8	1.5	2.5	4.0	2.00
8	1	1	2	0	2	2	1	1	2	0.5	0.5	1.0	.50
Total	31	36	67	34	37	71	65	73	138	32.5	36.5	69.0	34.50
Mean	3.88	4.50	8.38	4.25	4.63	8.88	8.13	9.13	17.25	4.06	4.56	8.63	4.31

TABLE XXXV

SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
DURING THE SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (LARGE TOWN CAMPUSES)

Semester in College	<u>Wisconsin State</u>			<u>Bradley University</u>			<u>Total</u>			<u>Mean</u>			Mean
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
1	12	14	26	17	16	33	29	30	59	14.5	15.0	29.5	14.75
2	20	19	39	25	29	54	45	48	93	22.5	24.0	46.5	23.25
3	31	29	60	37	33	70	68	62	130	34.0	31.0	65.0	32.50
4	50	53	103	49	66	115	99	119	218	49.5	59.5	109.0	54.50
5	52	61	113	65	70	135	117	131	248	88.5	65.5	124.0	62.00
6	57	60	117	61	59	120	118	119	237	59.0	59.5	118.5	59.25
7	40	49	89	49	56	105	89	105	194	49.5	51.5	97.0	48.50
8	21	18	39	37	41	78	58	59	117	29.0	29.5	58.5	29.25
Total	283	303	586	340	370	710	623	673	1296	316.5	386.5	648.00	324.00
Mean	35.38	37.88	73.25	42.50	46.25	88.75	77.88	84.13	162.00	38.94	42.06	81.00	50.50

TABLE XXXVI

SHOPLIFTING FREQUENCY BY SEX AND SCHOOL OF THOSE WHO SHOPLIFTED  
DURING THE SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (TOTAL SAMPLE)

Semester in College	<u>Small Town Campuses</u>			<u>Large Town Campuses</u>			<u>Total</u>			<u>Mean</u>			Mean
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
1	4	5	9	29	30	59	33	35	68	8.25	8.75	17.00	8.5
2	6	5	11	45	48	93	51	53	104	12.75	13.25	26.00	13.00
3	7	9	16	68	62	130	75	71	146	18.75	17.75	36.50	18.25
4	16	20	36	99	119	218	115	139	254	28.75	34.75	63.50	31.75
5	20	18	38	117	131	248	137	149	286	34.25	37.25	71.50	35.75
6	8	10	18	118	119	237	126	129	255	31.50	32.25	63.75	31.88
7	3	5	8	89	105	194	92	110	202	23.00	27.50	50.50	25.25
8	1	1	2	58	59	117	59	60	119	14.75	15.00	29.75	14.88
Total	65	73	138	623	673	1296	688	746	1434	172.00	186.50	358.50	179.25
Mean	8.13	9.13	17.25	77.88	84.13	162.00	86.00	93.25	179.25	21.50	23.31	44.81	22.40

### Loss Incurred by Shoplifting Among College Students

This is the third question raised about the universe of shoplifting. Here loss is measured in terms of values of shoplifted items in dollars. The answer to this question came from item XII in the questionnaire. Tables XXXVII, XXXVIII, and XXXIX are constructed for this purpose. These tables are based on the information about the total value in dollars of the items shoplifted during the semester. Table XXXIX, which is based on the information contained in Tables XXXVII and XXXVIII, shows that the total loss incurred by the shoplifting students in the sample during this one semester under study was \$2,972.00, or close to three thousand dollars. Marginal computation shows that the mean loss incurred per cell in the sample was \$46.40. This divided by 22.4, the mean frequency of shoplifting per cell in the sample, gives us the mean loss of \$2.07 per case of shoplifting in the sample.

Because, as computed above, the shoplifting frequency per student in the sample is .953 or very close to 1, we may say that the mean loss incurred per student per incident in the sample was \$2.07. A confidence interval constructed around this mean loss per frequency at .05 level shows that the universe mean may be off by  $\pm .56$  ( $t = 2.003$ ).

Table XXXIX also indicates that \$47.18 or the mean loss incurred by girls per cell in the sample is slightly larger than that of boys with \$45.63. Difference between the two is not significant at .05 level ( $t = .372$ ).

Table XXXVIII indicates that the mean loss incurred per cell in the large town campuses is \$84.06, which is far larger than \$8.75, the mean loss incurred per cell in the small town campuses (Table XXXVII).

TABLE XXXVII

TOTAL DOLLAR VALUE OF ITEMS SHOPLIFTED DURING THE  
SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (SMALL TOWN CAMPUSES)

Semester in College	<u>Eastern Illinois</u>			<u>MacMurray</u>			<u>Total</u>			<u>Mean</u>			Mean
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
1	4	3	7	3	7	10	7	10	17	3.5	5.0	8.5	4.25
2	5	2	7	8	7	15	13	9	22	6.5	4.5	11.0	5.50
3	5	4	9	16	9	25	21	13	34	10.5	6.5	17.0	8.50
4	15	20	35	10	20	30	25	40	65	12.5	20.0	32.5	16.25
5	15	13	28	18	15	33	33	28	61	16.5	14.0	30.5	15.25
6	25	9	34	10	12	22	35	21	56	17.5	10.5	28.0	14.00
7	0	2	2	8	0	8	8	2	10	4.0	1.0	5.0	2.50
8	2	3	5	0	10	10	2	13	15	1.0	6.5	7.5	3.75
Total	71	56	127	73	80	153	144	136	280	72.0	68.0	140.0	70.00
Mean	8.88	7.00	15.88	9.13	10.00	19.13	18.00	17.00	35.00	9.00	8.50	17.50	8.75

TABLE XXXVIII

TOTAL DOLLAR VALUE OF ITEMS SHOPLIFTED DURING THE  
SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (LARGE TOWN CAMPUSES)

Semester in College	<u>Wisconsin State</u>			<u>Bradley University</u>			<u>Total</u>			<u>Mean</u>			Mean
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
1	23	32	55	36	39	75	54	71	120	29.5	35.5	60.0	30.00
2	55	35	90	57	61	118	112	96	208	56.0	48.0	104.0	52.00
3	60	61	121	81	73	154	141	134	275	70.5	67.0	132.50	66.75
4	91	85	176	93	121	214	184	206	390	92.0	103.0	195.0	97.50
5	105	135	240	145	131	276	250	266	516	125.0	133.0	253.0	126.50
6	120	125	245	117	137	254	237	262	499	118.5	131.0	249.50	124.75
7	95	81	176	110	138	248	205	219	424	102.5	109.5	212.00	106.00
8	39	34	73	89	78	167	128	112	240	65.0	56.0	120.0	60.00
Total	588	586	1174	728	788	1516	1316	1376	2692	653.0	688.0	1346.0	673.00
Mean	73.5	73.25	146.75	91.00	98.50	189.50	164.5	171.75	336.25	82.25	88.88	168.13	84.06

TABLE XXXIX

TOTAL DOLLAR VALUE OF ITEMS SHOPLIFTED DURING THE  
SEMESTER UNDER STUDY (TOTAL SAMPLE)

Semester in College	<u>Small Town Campuses</u>			<u>Large Town Campuses</u>			<u>Total</u>			<u>Mean</u>			Mean
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
1	7	10	17	59	71	120	66	81	147	16.5	20.25	36.75	18.38
2	13	9	22	112	96	208	125	105	230	31.25	26.25	57.50	28.75
3	21	13	36	141	136	275	162	147	309	40.5	36.75	77.25	38.63
4	25	40	65	184	206	390	209	246	455	52.25	61.5	113.75	56.88
5	33	28	61	250	266	516	283	294	577	70.75	75.3	144.25	72.13
6	35	21	56	237	262	499	272	283	555	63.0	70.75	138.75	69.38
7	8	2	10	205	219	424	213	221	434	53.25	55.25	108.50	54.25
8	2	13	15	128	112	240	130	125	255	32.5	31.25	68.75	34.38
Total	144	136	280	1316	1376	2692	1460	1512	2972	315.0	378.0	743.00	371.50
Mean	18.00	17.00	35.00	164.5	171.75	336.25	182.5	18.75	371.25	45.63	47.18	92.81	46.40



Difference between the two means is significant at .001 level ( $t = 8.691$ ).

Table XXXIX also shows that the mean loss incurred by shoplifting in the sample increases from a low of \$18.38 for the first semester students to a maximum of \$72.13 for the 5th semester students in the sample after which this declines to \$54.25 for the 7th semester students and further to \$34.38 for the 8th or final semester students in the sample.

#### Summary of Findings on the Structure of Shoplifting Universe

The above information shows that the absolute proportion of those who ever shoplifted since they came to college is slightly over 46%, but the relative proportion of those who were actively engaged in shoplifting during the semester under study was close to 17%. No significant differences are found to exist between the sexes with respect to absolute and relative proportions of student shoplifters, frequencies of shoplifting and the losses incurred by shoplifting, even though girls score consistently higher in each respect except for the relative proportion of shoplifters during the semester under study. However, students from urban campuses are found to score consistently and significantly higher than the ones from the nonurban campuses in each respect. Also, the breakdown of students in the sample according to their semester classification in the college shows that with the exception of the absolute proportion of shoplifting students, which is cumulative, shoplifting behavior shows a maximum for the 5th and 6th semester students in each respect.

Mean frequency of shoplifting is found to be slightly less than one per student and the mean loss incurred per incident of shoplifting per student is found to be slightly above two dollars.

## CHAPTER VI

### INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

Scientific enquiry which can start with building a theory and developing a methodology does not stop at the collection of the data. To complete a scientific research one has to, further, look into the meanings of this analysis and whether or not these meanings fit the meanings conveyed by the theory. It is only when there is a complete fit between the two that one may generalize from the analysis of the data, and to the extent that the data does not conform with the theory some modifications have to be made in the theory or it has to be rejected depending on how good the fit is. Keeping this in mind, effort is made in this chapter to interpret the data on shoplifting among college students in terms of the theoretical model developed in this study to explain crime causation and crime selection.

#### Limitations

But, before we even try to compare these findings with the theoretical model, we may look into some of the weaknesses which might contaminate to a greater or a lesser extent these generalizations.

First, the method of self report as used in criminology has its own weaknesses. Some of the advantages of this method over the use of official statistics on crime have already been discussed in the preceding pages. Its limitations are now discussed in this section.

In any method of self report, especially in the one which aims at discovering the "hidden" pattern of interaction like sex, and crime, there is a probability that the total response will under-represent the true universe. As Goode and Hatt pointed out, there is considerable controversy among social scientists as to whether responses to anonymous questionnaires are frank.<sup>1</sup> One may get some relief from the assumption that in a group in which individuals came out of their own choice to respond to the questionnaire, there seems to exist sufficient interest among these individuals toward the research. This may result in more frank responses from them. Still, an individual in a group filling out a questionnaire along with his or her friends and acquaintances around may not be fully assured of complete anonymity which is so true in the case of response to the mailed questionnaire.<sup>2</sup> The dilemma of under-representation, then, remains unsolved. The greater amount of confidence which one may have in the method of self report is only relative to the use of official statistics on crime.

Second is the question of the representativeness of the sample. With 1,509 cases, the sample size seems to be adequate, therefore no test for adequacy of the sample was given. Yet, in spite of the seeming adequacy of sample, confidence in the adequacy remains an unknown quantity.

Moreover, adequacy of the sample alone does not imply complete representativeness of the sample. Representativeness of the sample means adequate sample size plus sufficient stratification of the sample in accordance with the complex structure of the universe. Random sampling in science does not simply mean reaching a population bias free and pick a small part of it. In fact, any random sampling takes into

account all the possible and known differences inside the given universe and to select adequately as to the size from each different component of that universe. This is exactly what was not possible to do in the case of the sample drawn for this study because of lack of resources on the part of the writer. The sample was drawn only from four colleges, which are too few to adequately represent all the colleges in the society. This seems to be a serious limitation on generalization from the averages computed on per college basis. Moreover, all these colleges are situated in roughly the northern half of the midwest which is too limited a culture area to cover the whole college subculture in the society. Also, only two dichotomies - one urban/nonurban and the other private/state - were used to control for the differences among colleges; whereas, they may also differ along such dichotomies as denominational/nondenominational, coeducational/noncoeducational, agricultural and mechanical/liberal arts and sciences, and so on. All these differences in colleges are expected to affect the attitude and behavior of students. Insofar as these factors were not considered there is something left to be accounted for in the representativeness and hence in the randomness of the sample.

Third is the question of generalization from the findings of shoplifting among college students about the universe of crime in society. As mentioned above, shoplifting among college students is a subuniverse of shoplifting in general which is in itself a subuniverse of crime in society. Even if the data from shoplifting among college students fit the model explaining crime in general, there still have to be many more adequate numbers of representative studies on different crimes to generalize from them with confidence.

Thus, the findings of this study are not completely bias free. They have their own weaknesses. What follows, then, must be read keeping in mind the above limitations.

### Discussion

Because this project is mainly concerned with the etiology of crime, the main focus of attention in this chapter will be on the interpretation of the etiological data analyzed in the last chapter. Toward the end discussion is included on the structure of the universe of crime under study. However, little generalization can be expected from this discussion because of lack of any model to compare these findings with and because, as will be evident soon, any universe of crime has its own particular structure and this is how it differs from other crimes. The structure of the universe of shoplifting among college students may not coincide and may even differ markedly from the more general structure of shoplifting in society. This point will be further elaborated upon later.

### Etiology

The model developed in the preceding pages deals with three factors which are exclusively necessary for the selection and commission of crime. These are:

1. Situation in terms of its ecological setting which is conducive for a limited number of crimes.
2. Attitude which favors the commission of some specific crime and which is provoked by the presence of the specific criminogenic object in the ecological setting of the situation, and,
3. Aggressive personality which weighs the degree of opportunity provided by the situation in terms of its ecological setting.

The exclusive necessity of the above three factors was presented in Hypothesis 1. Thus Hypothesis 1, after it is accepted, isolates these three factors from a bunch of other factors which may be generally expected to affect student behavior in society but which, after being rejected as irrelevant, establish the exclusive importance of these three factors in shoplifting. These factors which we rejected by accepting Hypothesis 1 are all objective and include the nature of home town, nature of college, family background, and sex. They may play important roles in affecting the subjective characteristics of the students. But this is beyond the point. What is more relevant is that they do not seem to have any direct bearing on the shoplifting behavior of the college students.

Hypotheses 2, 5, and 6 were only logical extensions and further elaborations of Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2, dealing with situation (as measured by the size of campus town), together with Hypothesis 5 dealing with criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting and Hypothesis 6 dealing with aggressive personality traits of the students, determine the direction of the influences of these three factors taken individually on the shoplifting behavior of the students. It is established that larger size campus towns, higher criminogeny toward shoplifting in attitude, and higher amount of aggression in personality, taken individually are associated with higher frequency of shoplifting. Hypotheses 1, 2, 5, and 6 taken together still do not assign causation to any one of these three factors. What is established is only this, that the above three factors in themselves taken individually are most conducive of all factors pertaining to the shoplifting behavior of the college students.

Not to side track but only to establish the source(s) of criminogenic attitude toward shoplifting among college students, Hypotheses 3 and 4 were formulated in order to verify the assumption that criminogenic attitudes toward specific objects are subculture bound. More specifically Hypothesis 3 was formulated in order to prove the existence of criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting in the college subculture, and Hypothesis 4 was formulated to prove that the college subculture is a factor in generating attitudes toward shoplifting. Hypothesis 3 was accepted and shows that when different crimes are rank ordered in seriousness shoplifting stands close to the bottom as rated by the students. Hypothesis 4 was accepted and proves that college subculture is a factor in generating criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting with the other two factors, i.e., size of home town and size of campus town, which are also found to be significant in generating these attitudes. But, far from challenging our model, this finding on one hand reinforces the belief in the statement made in developing the theoretical frame of reference that the subcultural segments in a complex society are not encapsulated wholes. Rather they are partly overlapping and keep their doors open for a two-way traffic of influences among neighboring segments. On the other hand this finding not only confirms the role a situation plays in provoking criminogenic attitudes but also adds that situation (size of home town and size of campus town in this case) may generate criminogenic attitudes that may find refuge in a certain subculture which may itself be raising attitudes of the same breed.

Hypotheses 7 through 12 were the ones seeking causal relationship between the three independent variables isolated above and the



shoplifting behavior of the students treated as a dependent variable. More specifically, Hypotheses 7 through 10 seek causation by pairing the independent variables. The untenability and the subsequent rejection of these four hypotheses confirms the proposition which rejects causation assigned to any one or any two of the above factors.

Hypotheses 11 and 12 are the most important ones in the whole study. As accepted they prove that shoplifting frequency is positively associated with the three independent variables only when they are considered together. However, the data analyzed above go beyond simply proving these hypotheses. The fact that in Peoria, the largest campus town in the sample, highly significant correlations are found even for the second quartiles of the aggressive personality and criminogenic attitudes (this fact that could not be borne out by the data testing hypotheses 7 through 10) means that as a situation becomes more criminogenic in terms of its ecological setting, shoplifting occurs even for those who have a relative low aggressive personality and also for those who have relatively low criminogenic attitudes. But the opposite is not found to be true, i.e., high aggressive traits or high criminogenic attitudes are not associated with high frequency of shoplifting in smaller campus towns. This proves that the criminogenic situation plays a significant role in the commission of crime relative to the other two - the subjective factors. There are two questions which may be raised here. First, does a highly criminogenic situation momentarily accentuate the criminogenic subjective traits of the students so much as to allow them to shoplift? Second, as a situation becomes highly criminogenic, do students shoplift in spite of their relatively low criminogenic subjective traits?

This brings us directly into the explanation of what is exactly the mechanism involved in the process of perception of situation. Simply to assert that attitudes and personality traits of the actor are involved in this process does not give us any clue as to how they interact with the situation. In fact, as will be evident soon, the two questions raised above are directly connected with this problem and in answering these two questions we may get sufficient insight to look into the very process of perception of situation which makes the selection as well as the commission of an act possible.

In answering these questions we see that in the light of the existing social psychological literature it is hard to believe that unless one is in a situation of strain operating in the direction contrary to his subjective controls, he would act in the direction contrary to them.<sup>3</sup> This situation at one pole may be a consequence of an outright application of naked force. At the other pole it may result from more subtle influences exerted on the actor in artificially simulated situations.<sup>4</sup> In between these two extremes may occur all kinds of strainful situations including the one as noted by White in the street corner gangs<sup>5</sup> or the one which may create ambivalence on the part of the actor toward the alter.<sup>6</sup> Thus, there are many situations with all kinds of strains in our world of social interaction. The situations may be classified in two types according to the nature of strains they contain. One of these situations contains strain which may frustrate or upset the actor's subjective characteristics including his personality traits and attitudes and the resultant perception so that they may have the effect of making the person deviate from his own subjective belief and judgement or he may quit the situation if he is

free to do so. We may call this factor, to borrow Merton's terminology, strain toward deviance<sup>7</sup> or the negative strain and this situation a negative situation.

On the other hand are situations containing strains which may reinforce or accentuate the pre-existing subjective character of the actor. We may call this strain, to borrow Sumner's terminology, strain toward consistency<sup>8</sup>, or positive strain and this situation a positive situation.

It must be emphasized here that situations may be negative or positive not in themselves as such but only relative to the subjective characteristics of the actor. It follows that a situation may be negative for actor A but the same situation may be positive for actor B depending upon the respective actor's subjective character. Thus, all situations which we find ourselves in within society, are judged as negative or positive because they are perceived as such by the individual actors involved. The perception of situation, then, involves the strain exerted by the situation on the subjective characteristics of the actor. There may be different degrees of the situational strain interacting with different levels of subjective factors and this may explain the individual differentials in the resultant perception of the same situation. A situation perceived as negative is not good for participation and a situation perceived as positive is good for participation. Most often, we try to avoid negative situations which strain our subjective character in the opposite direction and we continually seek the positive situations which may gratify or allow expression to and thus reinforce our subjective orientation.<sup>9</sup> If one cannot at all avoid being in a negative situation, depending upon the relative

strength of his subjective character and the objective strain in the situation, he may either enter into a continuous overt or covert conflict, or he has to make an adjustment to it by reshaping his subjective characteristics including his attitudes which may change momentarily without much effort and the personality which may take a much longer period of time.

In criminology which generally displays a lag in keeping pace with progress in its parent disciplines, one only has to be reminded of the more important explanations which emphasize the controls exerted by either personality or by attitude so much so that these subjective factors are assigned causation meaning complete control over the ensuing criminal behavior. The fact that we face the dilemma of differential response in the application of these theories is not to deny any control on the part of these factors. It simply means that these controls are not sufficient. This was one of the assumptions which led the writer to develop the three dimensional model above. This brought the element of situation in the forefront at equal footing with the subjective factors. As the above findings assign a relatively more important role to the situation in shoplifting, we may now proceed to analyze the strain contained in the criminogenic situation of student shoplifting.

As mentioned above, a criminogenic situation, by definition, is one which is conducive to committing crime, and as it was found in connection with Hypothesis 4, situation partly in form of size of campus town affects the shoplifting attitudes of the students. It follows that the criminogenic situation of large cities is conducive to shoplifting. It is conducive because it strains attitudes of college

students into making a positive perception of itself. In the absence of any evidence to the effect that shoplifting by college students is a group or a gang phenomenon, strain toward shoplifting in large town situations seems to generate from the numerous small and large stores where items for sale are displayed in such a manner as to invite acquisition on the part of the visitors. These invitations toward acquisition may strain in varying degrees the attitude of college students so that their already existing high criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting may be excited and the low ones may be momentarily accentuated.

The above discussion explains the interaction between attitudes and situation in the process of perception and the more important role which the situation plays in this process specifically in the context of shoplifting by college students. However, excitement and accentuation of the shoplifting attitudes and the resultant positive perception of the shoplifting situation still does not mean the commission of shoplifting by students. Attitudes and situational strain only explain the selection of objects and the predisposition of students to interact with these objects, with the intention of acquiring these objects without paying for them. This is only one phase of the perception of the situation, i.e., judgement of the situation as negative or positive. The other process which starts at the end of the process of selection involves the perception of situation as being good or not good for acquiring the object without paying for it. This phase of the perception contains interaction of the situational strain in terms of its opportunity structure with the personality constellation, more specifically the aggressive traits - high or low - which the students possess. The role which aggressive personality plays in daring to break the

recognized rules of interaction has already been discussed in the preceding pages and the data in general support the necessity of aggressive personality in the commission of shoplifting. However, findings as analyzed in Table XXIII (page 90) show that as a situation becomes highly criminogenic, even those with low aggressive traits venture to shoplift. In the absence of any scientific evidence that personality traits also shift momentarily (as attitudes may) under strains generated by a specific situation,<sup>10</sup> it is logical to conclude that as a situation becomes highly criminogenic in terms of opportunity, students engage in shoplifting in spite of their low aggressive personality traits. This shows the different degrees in which situational strains and the personality traits may interact in making a decision to act along the line demarcated by the interaction of situational strain and attitudes. A highly criminogenic situation may outweigh the effect of the low aggressive personality. Logically, we can say that a high aggressive personality may outweigh the effect of a low criminogenic situation. But this is not supported by the data presented above. This proves the more important role which situation plays specifically in the context of shoplifting by college students.

In answering the first question raised above, we may say that students shoplift as a result of momentary excitement and accentuation in their shoplifting attitudes. In answering the second question, we may say that as a situation becomes highly criminogenic, students may engage in shoplifting in spite of their low aggressive personality traits. The two answers combined together explain that as situation becomes highly criminogenic for shoplifting it momentarily excites and accentuates the shoplifting attitudes of college students so that even

those with relatively low aggressive personality traits may make the decision to shoplift.

The above discussion explains that the shoplifting behavior of college students which is a consequence of perception of situation as positive and good for shoplifting is, in fact, an end product of a process. So is any human behavior - an end product of a process. Cohen has put it more succinctly.

Human action, deviant or otherwise, is something that develops in a tentative, groping, advancing, backtracking, sounding out process. People taste and feel their way along. They start doing something and end up doing another. They extricate themselves from progressive involvement or become further involved to the point of commitment.<sup>11</sup>

To sum up our discussion on the etiology of shoplifting among college students, we found that

1. Shoplifting occurs in an objective situation.
2. Shoplifting occurs in an objective situation after it has been perceived as criminogenic for shoplifting.
3. Perception of situation as criminogenic for shoplifting involves:
  - a. An objective situation with an ecological setting which contains strain toward acquisition and strain toward action for acquisition.
  - b. Criminogenic attitudes of students toward shoplifting which are excited and accentuated by the situational strain toward acquisition.
  - c. Aggressive personality traits of students which respond to the situational strain toward action for acquisition.
4. All three of these factors are necessary to explain the shoplifting behavior of college students.
5. Of these three factors criminogenic situation of shoplifting outweighs the influence of relatively low criminogenic attitudes and relatively low aggressive personality of the students involved.

The last proposition in the above paradigm should be read with caution. After all, shoplifting is one of the many crimes which occur in society. Some other crime may call for a different combination of the three factors discussed above. In some crime aggressive personality may outweigh the influences exerted by attitudes and situation. In some other crime yet, attitudes may play the most important role. However, the fact remains that these three factors must be considered in interaction with each other. It is probably too risky to explain the triggering of an action in terms of man's physical and bio-chemical traits and it is quite futile to explain it in terms of such ill defined concepts as human will. Most probably something which we call human will is nothing more than a function of these three factors interacting together.

#### The Universe of Student Shoplifting

One great contribution of Sutherland was that he conceived of crime in terms of subcultures.<sup>12</sup> He did so not in the sense that there is a criminal subculture and a conforming subculture as some criminologists came to believe later. Sutherland did so in the sense that various subcultures have their own respective patterns of crime as well as conformity. This is the point which was elaborated in developing the theoretical frame of reference in the preceding pages. Again, this does not mean that a given crime defines a subculture. In fact, as Matza pointed out,<sup>13</sup> a criminal act is a tiny fraction of what is generally going on in a subculture. To define a subculture in terms of a crime contained in it, is to subject the subculture to stereotyping.



Insofar as this is true, the structure of any particular crime reflects the structure of the subculture rather than the other way around. If the same crime is found in more than one subculture, all these subcultures should be taken into account to explain the structure of the crime. Thus the social structure of shoplifting among college students with its differentials of sex, size of campus town and semester in college, only reflects the values which generate attitudes as they interact with other etiological factors at different levels in the general role structure of the college structure. It does not reflect the structure of any non-student subculture and it only partly represents the structure of the shoplifting universe in society in general. College students at different levels in the college subculture engage in doing many things as a result of the specific combinations of their attitudes, personality traits, and the situation involved. Out of these many things which they do, college students also engage in shoplifting in varying frequency at these different levels as their values translated into attitudes enter into a specific combination with their aggressive personality traits in shoplifting situations.

Most probably shoplifting among college students is one of the expressions of the deviant values which generally develop in the college subculture. After all, colleges, at least in the western society, are agents of change in the area of arts, science, technology, and philosophy. This creates a general deviant environment in which everything conventional may be questioned. There are a number of scientific studies which explain this very character of the college subculture. Francis has described the values of college students as being idealistic, deviant and equalitarian as regards sex, race, and ethnicity.<sup>14</sup>

Weinberg found that idealism among students reinforces their deviant tendencies and that sex and race differentials are not significant in this regard.<sup>15</sup> There are different ways in which deviant values could find expression. Goldwin found that the intensity of deviant attitudes among college students is a significant factor in sexual deviance, illicit use of drugs, and participation in campus demonstrations.<sup>16</sup> Probably shoplifting is yet another expression of the same provided that the aggressive personality traits and the situation allow that expression.

In the light of the above discussion we may say that even though nearly 50% of the college students may engage in the act of shoplifting at least once, yet only about 17% in any given semester are able to gratify their deviant values in terms of shoplifting. These values are far better expressed in urban campus towns than in non-urban campus towns. Boys and girls are about equally able to do so. Also, it is quite evident that as one gets more immersed in the deviant values of the college subculture, the frequency of shoplifting increases toward the middle semesters of college life after which this frequency declines as a result of reference change. Further, the mean shoplifting frequency per student being very low - close to only one per student - shows that shoplifting among college students is not one of the important ways of expressing deviant tendencies. Also, the fact that the mean loss incurred by shoplifting is very low, i.e., close to \$2.00 per incident, shows that students do not shoplift for economic reasons but only to satisfy their deviant urges which may be gratified, possibly, in many other ways.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1955). See Chapter 12.

<sup>2</sup>For more elaboration on this point see, Mildred Parten, Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures (New York: Harper and Row, 1950), Chapter 11.

<sup>3</sup>Social psychological literature in general subscribes to this point of view. For a better discussion on this topic see, Leon Festinger and J. Merrill Carlsmith, "Cognitive Consequences of Forced Compliance," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 58 (1959), pp. 203-210.

<sup>4</sup>Small group experiments are generally conducted to see the effect of artificially induced strains on individual judgement, attitude and behavior. For instance, see, Morton Deutch and Harold B. Gerard, "A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences Upon Individual Judgement," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 51 (1955), pp. 629-636. Also, Muzafer Sherif, "Group Influences Upon the Formation of Norms and Attitudes," in Guy Swanson, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene Hartley, eds., Readings in Social Psychology (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1952), and Solomon E. Asch, "Effects of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgement," in Readings in Social Psychology, *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup>William F. White, Street Corner Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943).

<sup>6</sup>Parsons, 1951.

<sup>7</sup>Merton, 1938.

<sup>8</sup>William Graham Sumner, Folkways. New York. Mentor Books, 1907 (New York: New American Library, 1960), pp. 5-6.

<sup>9</sup>For further elaboration of this point see, Bernard Berleson and Gary A. Steiner, Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964); also Judson Mills, Eliot Araonson and H. Robinson, "Selectivity in Exposure to Information," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LIX (September, 1959), pp. 250-253; and David O. Sears and Jonathan L. Freedman, "Selective Exposure to Information: A Critical Review," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XXXI (Summer, 1967), pp. 194-213.

<sup>10</sup> Personality as a rather stable constellation of different traits is a result of a long process of socialization. Even though sociologists may differ with psychiatrists and many Freudian psychologists on the width of the environment responsible for this socialization, yet there is a general agreement that personality develops and changes not from day to day situations, but because of the persistence of an environment straining in any particular direction(s). For a better discussion on this topic see, Marie Jahoda, Current Concepts of Positive Mental Health, Joint Commission on Mental Health and Illness, Monograph Series No. 1 (New York: Basic Books, 1968).

<sup>11</sup> Albert K. Cohen, "The Sociology of Deviant Act: Anomie Theory and Beyond," American Sociological Review, Vol. I (February, 1965), p. 8.

<sup>12</sup> Sutherland, 1939.

<sup>13</sup> Matza, 1964.

<sup>14</sup> John W. Francis, Social Structure and Social Movements (New York: The Free Press, 1967).

<sup>15</sup> Lincoln P. Weinberg, Crime and Punishment in Urban Society (New York: Random House, 1969).

<sup>16</sup> David Goldwin, The College Unrest (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969).

## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary

This project was aimed at the etiology of crime which occupies a central place in the discipline of criminology. Human interest in the explanation of crime is probably as old as the human society itself. Lately there have been voluminous publications on this subject in the areas of psychiatry, psychology, sociology, and social work, not to mention the general interest and concern as reflected in the lay literature and our mass media.

There are two fundamental questions in criminology. The first is the question of crime causation or why people commit crime; and the second is the question of crime selection or why and how people select a particular crime. Both questions belong to the same generic issue - etiology of crime. We are not simply interested in asking why people act in society. Our interest, in fact, lies in the question of why and how people come to act as they do. Likewise, we are not interested in asking only why people commit crime, but in analyzing the action of a person who embezzled or killed or shoplifted and so on. Unfortunately, a great bulk of the literature on criminology fails to grasp the importance of this point. Only in the late 1950's was the dual nature of this etiological question pointed out in the sociological literature on crime.

Probably ignoring this aspect of the explanation of human behavior has brought about what has come to be known in criminology as the dilemma of differential response, i.e., our theory is never a sufficient explanation and each time research is conducted different results are obtained from the data. This insufficiency and the resultant differential response in the research in criminology has at least one more source. This is the fact that criminologists have looked at crime and conformity as being genetically different from each other. Crime has been traditionally regarded as an antisocial act and conformity is seen as prosocial. This only reflects the general human tendency among the criminologists to dichotomize the universe of our experience into good and bad, black and white, desirable and undesirable. This native criminological wisdom forces us to explain the deviant act as different from the conforming act; whereas the fact is that both crime and conformity are social acts insofar as they both obtain their respective meanings only in the context of society. An act viewed as good or bad for us is believed to be desirable or undesirable from our point of view. But an act is termed as crime or non-crime only as a result of our labelling process, and this labelling does not affect the inherent quality of either act as being social. This approach of separating criminal behavior from the rest of the universe of social action resulted in the reductionist explanation whereby the criminal act is analyzed only in terms of personality, or only in terms of attitude or only in terms of situation. Naturally we face the dilemma of differential response because none of these factors sufficiently explains human behavior even though each one of them may be a necessary factor.

The above considerations were taken into account while developing the etiological model for this project. The very first step was to locate or develop a meaningful theory of social action. Thomas' theory of the Definition of Situation was a great guide and relief in this regard. His theory adequately explains the selection of action. As mentioned above, the two variables which Thomas used, i.e., attitude of the actor and the social situation provide specificity. A situation limits the choice of action through the objects it contains and the attitude of the actor who finds himself in the situation has a probability of picking only some specific object(s) from this situation to act with or act upon. Still Thomas could not explain the element which triggers the action after the actor is predisposed to act on some line of action demarcated by the interaction of situation and the attitude of the actor. Thomas handled this part of the explanation of human behavior rather ambiguously, assigning it to the bio-chemical and physical differentials of the individual actor. Writing about fifty years later, it is not very difficult for us to see that the missing element in Thomas' model was the subjective factor defined in psychiatry and also in psychology as personality which has great potentiality for a certain type of behavior and which has been so much overemphasized that it has been assigned causation all by itself. While reviewing Thomas' theory of the Definition of Situation, it became apparent that an adequate theory of social behavior, in order to explain selection as well as triggering the action, must put the factors of the situation, attitude and personality together. An adequate answer in one proposition to these twin etiological questions should, by its very logic, do away with the dilemma of differential response. Further,

this dilemma has to decrease, if for no other reason, simply because the reliability of the theory must increase with the increase in number of relevant variables.

Having developed a workable model of social behavior, it must not be very difficult to conceive of a general theory of crime. Selection could be assigned to the ecological setting of a situation which may contain object(s) which the potential criminal perceives through his attitudes which are thus attracted, excited and accentuated. However, the decision to trigger the action which is going to be labelled as crime is not an ordinary decision to make. It is not possible for every person to act criminally. To do this one has to be aggressive enough to defy the existing order and to neutralize the fear of being caught and be punished later. In this connection the role which aggressive personality plays has been emphasized more than any other, especially in the psychological literature on crime. This trait has been found to be quite common among juvenile delinquents and other criminals as well.

On the basis of the above reasoning it was hypothesized that crime originates in the attitude perpetuated in the subculture to which the actor belongs and which differentially orients its participants toward the criminal law of society. The situation conceived in terms of an interactional ecological setting contains some object(s) which excite the attitude of the actor. If the attitude of the actor predisposed him to act in contravention to some aspect of the criminal law in society, this attitude is called criminogenic attitude and the situation perceived as positive, meaning thereby that it excites and accentuates this attitude, is the criminogenic situation. The criminogenic



attitude and the criminogenic situation together make the selection of the criminal act possible. At this point the actor is in full knowledge of the criminogeny in his attitude and the situation, and he is now a potential criminal. Because the selection is a result of conscious criminal predisposition, therefore it is hypothesized that there must be sufficient aggressiveness as a trait in the personality constellation of the actor to enable him to neutralize the fear and the apprehensions that may arise relative to the opportunity structure in the ecology of the situation. If the aggressive traits of the actor succeed in doing this, the criminal action has a high probability of being triggered. This is how an aggressive personality becomes a criminogenic personality - only in combination with criminogenic attitude and criminogenic situation. All by itself aggressiveness as a personality trait only has latent potentiality for different kinds of behavior in society. Crime being such a tiny fraction of the total social behavior in society, it is evident that aggressive personality most often helps generate conforming behavior rather than criminal behavior in society. One only has to see how aggressiveness can help a football team make the touchdown; how an aggressive strategy may be used for a military exploit; and how an aggressive leader may lead his society toward reforms and change.

The above explanation of crime has much in common with other theories put forth previously. For instance, it emphasizes the importance of the purely sociological factor of situation as did Cloward and Ohlin and later Matza. It also includes attitude of the potential criminal which has subcultural or associational origins, as was done by Sutherland and later by Cohen. It also emphasizes the role played in

crime by aggressive personality, as is found in a number of psychological studies on crime. The difference is that the present model does not take into account these factors in ones or twos. Rather, all of these factors are seen acting in combination. Approaching the problem from this direction, a social scientist does not have to lean any more on such explanations as physical and biochemical differentials in human behavior - an area which has never been explored by any social scientist and which does not seem to provide any theoretical leads, even in biology. This approach also solves the dilemma of the human will. Lawyers, judges, and other jurists generally make use of this term to explain the causation of crime. In criminology this term is lately introduced by Matza who went back to the classical approach which is essentially an approach of the legal reforms as represented by Beccaria and Voltaire. Both jurists and their followers in criminology who use this term do not even attempt to define it. This creates the ambiguity and the vagueness which, by the way, has become so endemic in the legal language that our law remains susceptible to the lawyer's manipulation and reinterpretation. This ambiguity in the legal language may be partly responsible for the maladministration of justice which Beccaria and Voltaire were fighting against and which Matza thought is the origin of criminal reaction in society. The dilemma of human will was attacked by Farris who asserted that when we are not able to give a logical or an empirical explanation, it is quite convenient to fall back on such terminology as "human nature" and "human will." But the dilemma of human will becomes less than a mystery if we look at it as a function of attitude, situation, and personality interacting together. From this perspective human will does not look

like an initial state of commitment from which one may leap into action. Rather, the will to act in terms of the above three factors, is seen as subsuming a process which may increase or decrease in intensity, which may reach the point of commitment or may disappear altogether, depending upon the different degrees in which the above three factors combine.

In order to test this general model explaining criminal behavior, the method of self report was preferred over the use of official statistics on crime or the use of an apprehended criminal population. This was done, among other reasons, mainly due to the fact that the subjective factors, especially attitudes which occupy a central place in the above model, have a great probability of shifting in intensity or disappearing altogether in the post-crime situation after the criminal actor has entered into interaction with the law enforcement authorities. This method called for drawing of the sample from the free population and administering the subjects a questionnaire aiming at discovering the etiological factors of a crime selected for study. Because of the subcultural origins of attitude in the above model, it was decided to locate a rather distinct subculture whence to draw the sample to study one of the crimes which the subculture is generally supposed to contain. Because of its rather distinct character as a subculture in society and partly due to its general deviant character, college subculture was selected for study. Subculture of college students is quite well known for its more relaxed rules of sex behavior, illicit use of drugs, and more recently for rather violent protest movements. Shoplifting, which has long been a part of the college subculture but has had very little exploration, was selected for this etiological

study to test the above model.

A four-page questionnaire was perfected after a series of pretests, which, besides refining certain items in the questionnaire, also helped determine the nature of the sample as to its racial character. Decision was made to draw a uniracial sample, preferably all white, because the pretest results did not show any consistency when multi-racial samples were used to respond to certain items, especially the ones on criminogenic attitude. This inconsistency in the response and the resultant low reliability coefficient required the use of a uniracial sample. It seems as though nonwhite students, when in the middle of a white crowd, and when they do not have a chance to congregate together in one corner, do tend to be inconsistent in their responses. This is something which should be explored to refine the methodology of social research.

The sample was designed to be equally divided in 64 cells pertaining to four colleges, two sexes, and eight semesters in college. It was originally decided to include at least 25 cases in each cell yielding a sample size of 1,600. Sampling started with picking randomly 35 cases for each cell from student directories in the four Midwestern colleges. Thus, more than 2,200 letters of request were mailed to the students from these four colleges which were selected so that two of them are in smaller towns and two of them are in larger towns, while at the same time two of them are state institutions and two of them are non-sectarian private colleges. After an abortive attempt to collect the data in January, 1969, which failed because of severe disturbances in one of these colleges, the sample was finally drawn toward the end of the spring semester, 1969. Fortunately, there were no difficulties

at this time of the year and this postponement of one full semester in drawing the sample also gave the writer a chance to follow up the request letters through more letters of persuasion, each time emphasizing the role these students could play in making this project a success and reminding them again of the date they were supposed to complete the questionnaire. This time local fraternities and sororities along with the respective student governments and the student activity boards extended their help to publicize this project. The total number of those who attended these four sessions in four colleges was 1,571. Out of these 1,571 filled out questionnaires, 62 were rejected because of incomplete and occasionally rather irrelevant response. Those who were requested but could not attend these sessions were not contacted again, as the sample size of 1,509 was considered to be adequate and because insufficient time remained for further solicitation. This method of inviting students to attend the sessions to fill out the questionnaires did have a risk of not many students responding to the request letters. The fact that the turnout still gave the adequate sample size attests to the superiority of this procedure over the mailed questionnaire which often fails to persuade enough. Due to this fact, the method of mailed questionnaire generally faces a risk of high absentee rate and has a great probability of excluding many who through little more persuasion could otherwise respond to the request and yield valuable information. Persuasion before the actual response may pose the question of exaggeration in the response. But, on the other hand, filling out a questionnaire about the hidden aspects of social life, in the presence of friends and other acquaintances, poses the dilemma of under-response. It is expected that the two have negated each other.

However, there is no possibility of tracing any of these biases one way or the other, and this limitation on the study had to be accepted as being inherent in any method of self-report.

Twelve hypotheses guided the analysis of the data which was done in two stages, each of which employed different statistical tests and required separate statements and subroutines in the computer analysis. The objectives of the first stage analysis were to locate the effect of intra-attribute differences of each variable on the frequency of shoplifting; to locate the effect of intra-attribute differences of each variable on the shoplifting attitudes of the students; and to isolate the statistically significant factors related to shoplifting from other extraneous factors which might otherwise have a confounding effect on the findings. It was found that college subculture is the most important source in development the criminogenic attitudes toward shoplifting. At the same time, however, situation in the form of campus town and in the form of home town is also found to be significantly affecting this attitude of the students. This finding goes beyond simply proving the subcultural origins of the criminogenic attitude of students. As explained above, this assigns more importance to the role which situation plays in the commission of shoplifting. The same data also proves that criminogenic attitude of college students toward shoplifting, criminogenic situation for shoplifting, and aggressive personality traits of college students are statistically significant factors related to the frequency of shoplifting.

The objective of the second stage analysis was to compute the significance of association of shoplifting frequency with the above three variables, first by pairing these independent variables and then

putting all three of them together. When paired together, shoplifting frequency has been found not to correlate significantly with any one of them. However, when shoplifting frequency is allowed to vary with one of them while controlling the intra-attribute differences of the other two, significant association was discovered for higher levels of criminogenic attitude and aggressive personality. As for the situation, it proved to be playing a much more important role than the two subjective factors. It was found that as situation becomes highly criminogenic for shoplifting, significant association appears even for those with lower criminogenic attitude and relatively lower aggressive traits. The opposite was not found to be true, i.e., those with higher criminogenic attitudes or those with higher aggressive traits do not show significant results in relatively low criminogenic situations. This finding coupled with the one above that the situation seems to affect the shoplifting attitudes makes us conclude that probably as a situation becomes highly criminogenic it accentuates momentarily the low criminogenic attitudes; and those persons finding themselves in a highly criminogenic situation for shoplifting with their shoplifting attitudes momentarily accentuated, engage in shoplifting despite their relatively low aggressive personality traits.

This finding shows that most probably shoplifting by the college students is a situational crime in which the subjective factors of student do play important roles and yet they seem to be overwhelmed by the highly criminogenic situation. Some other crime or even shoplifting in some other subculture may not display the same importance of situation relative to the other two factors. In some other crime criminogenic attitudes may supercede the other two and in some crimes,

aggressive personality may play the most important role. Further studies using this model may thus help taxonomize crime in terms of attitude or situation or aggressive personality, so that we may be able to talk of attitude crimes, situational crimes, or personality crimes. This fact seems to be especially important for the discipline of social work and other rehabilitation programs which still try to concentrate upon changing the "criminal personality" in the case of every criminal or juvenile delinquent.

One great advantage of the method of self report is that, sample adequacy and the instrument reliability granted, it supplies additional information - on the patterns of crime under study. This is something which cannot be discovered with reliability by using the official statistics on crime. It was found that the absolute proportion of those students who had ever shoplifted since they came to college is above 46%. Girls with about 48% are slightly more than boys with about 44%; but the difference between the two is not found to be significant. On the other hand, the relative proportion of students who had ever shoplifted during the semester under study was only about 17%. Girls' relative proportion (16.84%), again, is found to be slightly higher than that of boys with 16.62%. Difference between the two proportions is not found to be significant. While sex differences in the above two proportions are not found to be significant, urban/nonurban differences are found to be significant.

Total mean frequency of shoplifting during the semester under study was 22.4 per cell in the sample. Girls' mean (23.31) was slightly higher than that of boys with 21.5. The difference between the two is not found to be significant. However, mean frequency in the urban



campus town was 40.5 per cell, which is found to be significantly higher than that in nonurban campuses (4.31). Further computations show that the over-all mean frequency of shoplifting in the sample was .953 or very close to 1 per person.

Analysis in the preceding pages also shows that the loss incurred by shoplifting by college students in terms of dollars was 46.4 per cell in the sample. Girls incurred more loss (47.18) than did the boys (45.62). The difference between the two is not significant. On the other hand, loss incurred in the urban campuses (84.06) is significantly higher than that in the nonurban campuses (8.75). Further computations show that the mean loss incurred by students per person in the sample is \$2.07. Because, as computed above, mean frequency of shoplifting per person in the sample is very close to 1, the mean loss incurred per incident of shoplifting per student is approximately \$2.07.

Further and more important, marginal computations in the analysis of patterns of shoplifting show that with the exception of the absolute proportion of shoplifters (which is cumulative and unilinear), all other, i.e., relative proportion of shoplifters, frequency of shoplifting and loss incurred by shoplifting, show maximum in the middle semesters of the college, after which these figures decline toward the end of the college career. As long as shoplifting among college students could be regarded as only an expression of the values and interaction patterns which develop in the college subculture, the above-mentioned trends of attaining maxima during the middle semesters most probably tells us about the shifting attitudes and the resultant intensity of participation by students in the college subculture. More specifically, the above trends probably reflect the degree of participation on the

part of the students and change in their attitude toward participation in the college culture as they move from the first few semesters in college to the last few semesters. It seems more logical to believe that as they are passing through their last few semesters in college, students tend to change their reference and orient themselves more toward the adult world.

### Conclusions

In concluding this project the following observations seem worthy of mention:

1. Crime is not antisocial behavior. To treat crime as antisocial behavior in sociological analysis is to deviate from the term "social" as defined in sociology.
2. To treat crime as antisocial behavior is partly responsible for the reductionist approach which is one of the sources of the dilemma of differential response.
3. It follows that a general theory of criminal behavior should be embedded in a general theory of social behavior which can be sufficiently explained in terms of cultural predispositions, ecology of the situation, and the personality trait.
4. In generating social behavior the cultural structure has the function of shaping criminogenic or non-criminogenic attitudes. Social structure has the function of providing a situational setting which may be perceived as criminogenic or non-criminogenic, and personality structure has the function of triggering the criminal or non-criminal action.

5. In the context of criminal behavior relative to any existing criminal code, these are only the attitudes which can be generically distinguished from non-criminogenic attitudes. Criminogenic attitudes define a situation as criminogenic which may not otherwise be inherently distinguished from the non-criminogenic situation. Criminogenic attitudes together with the criminogenic situation makes the selection of crime. Interacting with criminogenic attitudes and the transformed criminogenic situation, aggressive personality, which otherwise may not be criminogenic, becomes criminogenic and triggers the criminal action.

6. In the process of generation of social behavior, selection of behavior comes first. It is followed by the triggering of the action. Likewise, in the process of generation of criminal behavior, selection of crime comes first and triggering of crime comes next.

7. If by causation one means to say the origin of crime, then the answer is obvious. Crime originates in the actor's attitude of which the principle source is the subculture with which the actor identifies himself in society. However, as long as any social action can be conceived of as an end product of a process originating in an actor's attitude, the question as to why people commit crime is irrelevant and probably misleading. It only reflects the bias in our lay thinking which generally fails to see any continuum on which the origin of an action and its actual performance are situated at the opposite poles. The answer to this question necessarily develops into a mono-causal explanation in which cause and effect are confounded together so as to obscure and deny relevant intervening variables which exist between the two. When applied to the cases in which intervening variables must be taken into account, this approach becomes another source of the

dilemma of differential response. It is obvious that those who have the predispositions to originate an action do not necessarily do so and those who do so, do not necessarily finish it. In this regard probably the most relevant question is: How do people commit crime? This seems to be a more pertinent question which subsumes a process and is capable of taking into consideration the intervening variables as they enter into the process at different levels and in different degrees. This is what one may call The Process Approach or The Principle of Continuity.

8. Even though shoplifting by college students can be described as a situational crime, yet situation must not be confused with the causation of this crime. Causation can be assigned only to the whole process which successfully ended with the act of shoplifting. Every student who performed this act could be able to do so only by going through this process successfully. Also, many of the other students who could not perform this act, can be conceived of as having engaged in this process. Only they could not manage to finish it because of lack of a criminogenic situation or because of lack of sufficient aggressiveness in their respective personalities or because of lack of both.

9. It follows that, the effects of situation and personality held constant, the distribution of shoplifting frequency in the college subculture reflects the distribution and shift in intensity of students' attitudes toward shoplifting and toward participation in the role structure of the college subculture as is reflected by sex and semester differentials.

10. The higher intensity of shoplifting behavior in the middle semesters of the whole span of the undergraduate college subculture,

most probably, reflects the deeper immersion and integration of students in the college life. This gives us a clue to explain that, as Durkheim pointed out in connection with suicide, the probability of conformity or deviance relating to the social code in society varies with the level of immersion of the individual in his subculture which differentially predisposes him toward crime as well as conformity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. BOOKS

- Alexander, F. and H. Straub. The Criminal, The Judge, and The Public. rev. ed. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1956.
- Asch, Solomon E. "Effects of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgement." Readings in Social Psychology. Eds. Guy Swanson, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene Hartley. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1952.
- Barron, Milton K. The Juvenile in Delinquent Society. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1954.
- Beccaria, Caesar. An Essay on Crime and Punishment. Philadelphia: P. H. Nicklin, 1891.
- Becker, Howard S. Outsiders. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. The Otherside. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1965.
- Berleson, Bernard and Gary A. Steiner. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- Cameron, Mary Owen. "Court Responses to Shoplifting." Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective. Eds. Earl Rubington and Martin S. Weinberg. New York: Macmillan Co., 1968.
- Carr-Sanders, Hermann Mannheim, E. C. Rhodes, eds. Young Offenders. London: MacMillan Co., 1965.
- Cloward, Richard A. and Lloyd E. Ohlin. Delinquency and Opportunity. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.
- Cohen, Albert K. "A General Theory of Subcultures." Delinquency, Crime, and Social Processes. Eds. Donald R. Cressey and David A. Ward. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. New York: The Free Press, 1955.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Sociology Today. Eds. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cotrell. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Cole, Stephan and Harriet Zuckerman. "Inventory of Empirical and Theoretical Studies of Anomie." Anomie and Deviant Behavior. Ed. Marshall B. Clinard. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Cressey, Donald R. and David A. Ward, eds. "Delinquent Subcultures: Theory and Recent Research." Delinquency, Crime, and Social Processes. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labor in Society. Paris, 1890.
- Farris, Ellsworth. The Nature of Human Nature. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937.
- Feldman, David. "Psychoanalysis and Crime." Mass Society in Crisis. Eds. Bernard Rosenberg, Israel Gerver, and F. William Howton. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Francis, John W. Social Structure and Social Movements. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- Freidlander, K. "Latent Delinquency and Ego Development." Searchlights in Delinquency. Ed. K. R. Eissler. New York: Harper and Row, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Psychoanalytic Approach to Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Harper and Row, 1945.
- Goldwin, David. The College Unrest. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Goode, William J. and Paul K. Hatt. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.
- Guttmacher, Manfred S. "The Psychiatric Approach to Crime and Correction." Criminal Psychology. Ed. Richard W. Nice. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1965.
- Healy, W. "The Family Environment and Delinquency." American Handbook of Psychiatry. Ed. S. Arieti. New York: Free Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and A. Bronner. New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment. New Haven, Conn., 1936.
- Hewitt, Lester E. and Richard L. Jenkins. Fundamental Patterns of Maladjustments: Dynamics of Their Origin. Springfield, Ill.: State Printer, 1946.
- King, Albert A. Crime and Marginality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

- Kinsey, Alfred C., Wardell B. Pameroy, and Clyde E. Martin. Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. Philadelphia: W. B. Sanders Co., 1948.
- Lander, Bernard. Toward an Understanding of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.
- Lowrey, Leonard G. "Delinquent and Criminal Personalities." Personality and the Behavior Disorder. Ed. John M. Hunt. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.
- Maestro, M. T. Voltaire and Beccaria as Reformers of Criminal Law. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.
- Matza, David. Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- McIver, Robert. Ramparts We Guard. New York: Harper and Row, 1938.
- Merton, Robert K. "Anomie, Anomia, and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior." Anomie and Deviant Behavior. Ed. Marshall B. Clinard. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Social Structure and Social Theory. New York: Free Press, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Social Theory and Social Structure, rev. ed. New York: Free Press, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. Continuities in Social Research. New York: Free Press, 1950.
- Monachesi, Elio. "Caesar Beccaria." Pioneers in Criminology. Ed. Herman Maunheim. Chicago: Quadrangle Book Co., Inc., 1960.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. Social Psychology, rev. ed. New York: The Dryden Press, 1958.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1951.
- Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
- Rose, Arnold M. Sociology: The Study of Human Relations. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1967.
- Sellin, Thorsten and Marvin E. Wolfgang. The Measurement of Delinquency. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Shaw, Clifford R. The Jack Roller. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Henry D. McKay. "An Ecological Analysis of Chicago." Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1942.



- Sherif, Muzafer. "Group Influences Upon the Formation of Norms and Attitudes." Readings in Social Psychology. Eds. Guy Swanson, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene Hartley. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Carolyn Sherif. An Outline of Social Psychology, rev. ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1956.
- Stonequist, Everret V. The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict. New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1937.
- Sumner, William Graham. Folkways. New York: Mentor Books, 1907. (New York: New American Library, 1960).
- Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey. Principles of Criminology. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939.
- Thomas, W. I. Primitive Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937.
- Thrasher, Fredrick M. The Gang. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Weinberg, Lincoln P. Crime and Punishment in Urban Society. New York: Random House, 1969.
- White, William F. Street Corner Society. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E. "Cessar Lombroso." Pioneers in Criminology. Ed. Herman Maunheim. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1960.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- Blumer, Herbert. An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecky's "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America". Social Science Research Council. New York, 1939.
- Gardner, John A. and David J. Olson. "Gambling and Political Corruption." Task Force Report: Organized Crime. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Jahoda, Marie. Current Concepts of Positive Mental Health. Joint Commission on Mental Health and Illness. Monograph Series No. 1. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

President's Report on Delinquency and Crime. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D. C., 1968.

Sellin, Thorstein. Culture Conflict and Crime. Bulletin 41. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1938.

Thomas, W. I. and Florian Znaniecki. Polish Peasant in Europe and America, 2nd ed., Vol. 1, as quoted in Edmond H. Volkart, ed. Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas in Theory and Social Research. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951.

#### C. PERIODICALS

Allen, Donald E. and Harjit S. Sandhu. "Alienation, Hedonism, and Life Vision in Juvenile Delinquency." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 58 (1968).

\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_. "Family Effect, Religion, and Personal Income in Juvenile Delinquency." Social Forces, Vol. 46 (December, 1967).

"An Interview with Henry L. Giardano, Commissioner, U. S. Bureau of Narcotics." The American Legion Magazine, Vol. 76, No. 1 (January, 1967), pp. 37-41.

Beatti, Ronald H. "Problems of Criminal Statistics in the United States." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 57 (July, 1966), pp. 178-186.

Bryan, James. "Apprenticeship in Prostitution." Social Problems, Vol. 12 (Winter, 1965), pp. 287-297.

Chilton, Ronald J. "Delinquency Area Research: Baltimore, Detroit, and Indianapolis." American Sociological Review, Vol. 29 (1964), pp. 71-83.

Cohen, Albert K. "The Sociology of Deviant Act: Anomie Theory and Beyond." American Sociological Review, Vol. 30 (February, 1965), p. 8.

\_\_\_\_\_ and James F. Short, Jr. "Research in Delinquent Subcultures." The Journal of Social Issues, XIV (1958), p. 38.

Cressey, Donald R. "Epidemiology and Individual Conduct: A Case from Criminology." The Pacific Sociological Review, Vol. 3 (Fall, 1960), pp. 47-54.

Deutch, Morton and Harold B. Gerard. "A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences Upon Individual Judgement." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 51 (1955), pp. 629-636.

"Drug on Campus." Time, July 5, 1968, pp. 31-32.

Dubin, Robert. "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure: Continuities in Social Theory." American Sociological Review, Vol. 24 (April, 1959), pp. 147-164.

Festinger, Leon and J. Merrill Carlsmith. "Cognitive Consequences of Forced Compliance." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 58 (1959), pp. 203-210.

Goode, William J. "Illegitimacy, Anomie, and Cultural Penetration." American Sociological Review, Vol. 13 (1941), pp. 910-925.

Hajda, John. "Alienation and Integration of Student Intellectuals." American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (October, 1961), pp. 258-277.

Harseh, Alfred C. and Robert A. Davis. "Personality Traits and Conduct of Institutionalized Delinquents." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Vol. 29 (July, 1938), pp. 241-244.

Kobrin, Solomon. "The Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas." American Sociological Review, Vol. 16 (October, 1951).

McClosky, Herbert and John H. Schaar. "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy." American Sociological Review, Vol. 30 (February, 1965), pp. 14-39.

Merton, Robert K. "Social Structure and Anomie." American Sociological Review, Vol. 3 (October, 1938), pp. 672-682.

Miller, Walter A. "Violent Crime in City Gangs." Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 343 (March, 1966), pp. 97-112.

Mills, Judson, Eliot Aronson, and H. Robinson. "Selectivity in Exposure to Information." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LIX (September, 1959), pp. 250-253.

Nye, F. Ivan and James F. Short, Jr. "Scaling Delinquent Behavior." American Sociological Review, Vol. 22 (June, 1957), pp. 326-331.

Park, Robert Ezra. "Marginal Man." American Journal of Sociology (Spring, 1926), pp. 154-161.

Parsons, Talcott. "The Position of Sociological Theory." American Sociological Review, Vol. 13, No. 2 (April, 1948), pp. 156-164.

Reiss, Albert and Levis Rhodes. "An Empirical Test of Differential Association Theory." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. I (January, 1964), pp. 5-18.

Reiss, Ira L. "Social Class and Campus Dating." Social Problems, Vol. 13 (1965), pp. 193-205.

- Riley, Matilda White and Samuel H. Flowerman. "Group Relations as a Variable in Communication Research." American Sociological Review, Vol. 16 (1961), pp. 174-180.
- Rocesky, George C. "Alienation and Adult Criminality." Canadian Journal of Science, Vol. 43 (December, 1968), pp. 245-253.
- Sears, David O. and Jonathan L. Freedman. "Selective Exposure to Information: A Critical Review." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XXXI (Summer, 1967), pp. 194-213.
- Seeman, Melvin and John W. Evans. "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting." American Sociological Review, Vol. 27 (1962).
- Short, James F., Jr. "Differential Association and Delinquency." Social Problems, Vol. 4 (January, 1957).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Differential Association as a Hypothesis: Problem of Empirical Testing." Social Problems, Vol. 8 (Summer, 1960), pp. 14-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Romon Rivera, and Ray A. Tennyson. "Perceived Opportunities, Gang Membership, and Delinquency." American Sociological Review, Vol. 30 (February, 1965), pp. 56-67.
- Smigel, Erwin O. "Public Attitudes Toward Stealing as Related to the Size of Victim Organization." American Sociological Review, Vol. 21 (June, 1956), pp. 320-327.
- Srole, Leo F. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study." American Sociological Review, Vol. 21 (December, 1956), pp. 695-701.
- Stanfield, Robert. "The Interaction of Family Variables and Gang Variables in the Etiology of Delinquency." Social Problems, Vol. 13 (Spring, 1966), pp. 411-417.
- Stratton, R. "Differential Identification and Attitudes Toward Law." Social Forces, Vol. 46 (December, 1967), pp. 252-262.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. "Crime and Business." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. CCXVII (1941), pp. 112-118.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "White Collar Criminality." American Sociological Review, Vol. 5 (1940).
- Sykes, Gresham M. and David Matza. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." American Sociological Review, Vol. 22 (December, 1957), pp. 664-670.
- Wood, Arthur L. "Social Organization and Crime in Small Wisconsin Communities." American Sociological Review, Vol. 7 (1942), pp. 40-46.

## D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Guilbert, James G. "Urbanism and Crime: A Reformulation." (unpub. M. S. thesis, Western Michigan University, 1967).

Form 3.S

Dear Friends:

This questionnaire is a part of a doctoral research project. More often social science research has to probe into those aspects of social life which are generally considered to be private and personal. However, quite often patterns of social life do not become visible and little can be done about the solution of social problems unless we look into these "invisible" aspects of the lives of individuals. Because it is necessary to make your response a part of this project as well as assure you complete anonymity no questions which may disclose your identity are included in the following. Success of this project depends upon the honesty of your response and the right answers you choose.

Thank you for your cooperation.

## PART A.

## I. What is the size of your home town?

1. Less than 1,000 ( )
2. 1,000 or more ( )
3. 10,000 or more ( )
4. 20,000 or more ( )
5. 30,000 or more ( )
6. 40,000 or more ( )
7. 50,000 or more ( )
8. 100,000 or more ( )
9. 1,000,000 or more ( )

## II. What is your sex?

1. Male ( )
2. Female ( )

## III. When you were in high school with whom did you live?

1. Natural parents ( )
2. Mother and stepfather ( )
3. Father and stepmother ( )
4. Mother, only ( )
5. Father, only ( )
6. Other relatives ( )

## IV. Please indicate the level of education of your parents. (Mother-M; Father-F)

- |                      | M   | F   |
|----------------------|-----|-----|
| 1. Below high school | ( ) | ( ) |
| 2. High School       | ( ) | ( ) |
| 3. Some college      | ( ) | ( ) |
| 4. College degree    | ( ) | ( ) |
| 5. Graduate degree   | ( ) | ( ) |

## V. Approximately what is the monthly income of your parents?

1. Less than \$500 ( )
2. \$500 - \$1,000 ( )
3. \$1,000 - \$1,500 ( )
4. \$1,500 - \$2,000 ( )
5. \$2,000 - \$2,500 ( )
6. More than \$2,500 ( )

## VI. How many semesters have you completed in college?

- |       |        |
|-------|--------|
| 1-( ) | 6-( )  |
| 2-( ) | 7-( )  |
| 3-( ) | 8-( )  |
| 4-( ) | 9-( )  |
| 5-( ) | 10-( ) |



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 5. Patricia Brown's boy firend threatened to break-up with her when he learned that she stole a small package of cosmetics from a store.  | Highly disapprove<br>Disapprove<br>Neither approve<br>nor disapprove<br>Approve<br>Highly approve |
| 6. Johnny Spring generally steals plates, cups, saucers spoons and ash trays from the college cafeteria for his domestic use.   | Highly disapprove<br>Disapprove<br>Neither approve<br>nor disapprove<br>Approve<br>Highly approve |
| 7. Donna Lee went to buy a shirt from the Student Union dress shop. She did not like the shirt but loved a beautiful scarf which she put under her raincoat and walked away.                  | Highly disapprove<br>Disapprove<br>Neither approve<br>nor disapprove<br>Approve<br>Highly approve |
| 8. Dennis Karlson generally provides himself with food by stealing butter, bread, or a piece of steak while buying eggs and vegetables at the market.   | Highly Disapprove<br>Disapprove<br>Neither approve<br>nor disapprove<br>Approve<br>Highly approve |
| 9. Dennis' roommate will not shoplift. He does not feel that shoplifting is bad but that being caught is.   | Highly disapprove<br>Disapprove<br>Neither approve<br>nor disapprove<br>Approve<br>Highly approve |
| 10. The Dean of Students of Stephans College is very conscious about the reputation of the school. He has recommended that students who are caught shoplifting be dismissed from the college. | Highly disapprove<br>Disapprove<br>Neither approve<br>nor disapprove<br>Approve<br>Highly approve |



IX. Response to the following items are divided into two categories; agreement and disagreement. Please check only one of the boxes. Disregard the numbers in the brackets. They are codes.

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| (28) 1-When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back just for the principle of it. | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |
| (30) 2-At times I feel like swearing.  | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |
| (39) 3-At times I feel like smashing things.   | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |
| (536) 4-It makes me angry to have people hurry me.   | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |
| (381) 5-I am said to be hot-headed.  | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |
| (269) 6-I can easily make people afraid of me and I sometimes do it for the fun of it.         | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |
| (145) 7-At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.                                | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |
| (96) 8-I quite often have heated discussions and quarrels with my family.                      | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |
| (7) 9-At times I have an urge to do something harmful or shocking.                             | Agree ( )<br>Disagree ( ) |

#### Part C

X. Did you ever take anything from a store without paying for it:

- |                                | Yes | No  |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1. Since you came to College   | ( ) | ( ) |
| 2. During the present semester | ( ) | ( ) |

XI. If the answer to No. X is "yes", please indicate in the space given below how many times during the present semester did you take something without paying for it. ( )

XII. During the present semester what is the total value of the item(s) you took without paying for it:

- |                         |      |                         |       |
|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|-------|
| 1. I have not taken any | ( ); | 4. between \$6 and \$25 | ( );  |
| 2. less than \$1        | ( ); | 5. more than \$25       | ( ) . |
| 3. between \$1 and \$5  | ( ); |                         |       |
-

VITA

Ilyas Ba-Yunus

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: SHOPLIFTING AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS: A STUDY IN THE  
SOCIOLOGY OF CRIME

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Citizen of Karachi, Pakistan, born December 17,  
1932, the son of Mr. G. Mahmood and Zubeda Ba-Yunus.

Education: Graduated from Osmania University High School,  
Aurangabad, India, in June 1947; received the Bachelor of  
Arts degree from University of Karachi, Pakistan in 1952,  
and Master of Arts degree in 1955. Attended the University  
of Minnesota from 1960 to 1962 and received a Master of Arts  
degree in 1964, and a Master of Arts degree from Northern  
Illinois University in 1968.

Professional Experience: Lecturer in geography, University of  
Karachi, 1955-1960; instructor in geography at Winona State  
College, 1962-64; faculty assistant in sociology at Northern  
Illinois University, 1964-65; and a graduate teaching assist-  
ant at Oklahoma State University, 1965-66; appointed as  
instructor in sociology at Oklahoma State University, 1967-68,  
and as an assistant professor in sociology at Bradley  
University, 1968 to the present.