

AN EMPIRICAL EXPLICATION OF ISSUES
IN CONTAINMENT THEORY

By

JANET RUTH LONG

Bachelor of Arts
Oral Roberts University
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1972

Master of Science
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1973

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
July, 1976

Thesis
1976 D
L848e
cop. 2



AN EMPIRICAL EXPLICATION OF ISSUES
IN CONTAINMENT THEORY

Thesis Approved:

Richard Dadd

Thesis Advisor

W. Cunningham (by Gene Huff)

Larry M. Berlin

Keith D. Barnes

Norman D. Dushan

Dean of the Graduate College

964204

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to the following people who have in some way helped me to arrive at this stage of my educational career:

To my parents, Bill and Ruth Baldwin who always seem to have a word of faith and encouragement to keep me going.

To my father who knew that somehow in life his daughter seems to accomplish the goals she sets.

To Anne and Walter Long for their continued support.

To my husband, Dave, who would not let me quit when so many times I thought it to be an excellent idea.

I would also like to express a special thanks to those individuals who have made their lasting contribution to my educational perspective and have communicated the view that there is more to an education than classwork and a few papers. They have shown me that an education is a life style and I am just beginning; thank you to:

Dr. Richard Dodder, my committee and dissertation chairman whose insights, patience and friendship made this possible. Dr. Werner Gruninger, Dr. Larry Perkins and Dr. Keith Harries, whose various areas of interest comprised a special input in completing this dissertation.

I would also like to thank the administrators and instructors of various high schools and juvenile treatment centers whose time and interest allowed me to obtain the data necessary for this study.

Also, a special thanks to Dr. Paul Inbody and his wife Helen and to Dr. Sherry Cobett who were instrumental in my beginning this particular

degree. They convinced me first that I could do it, and second that I must do it, or waste future potential contributions to myself and others.

Finally, thank you to Mrs. Eileen Garrison whose many hours of typing made this research a reality on paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM.	1
Introduction and Statement of the Problem	1
Propositions to be Tested	3
Organization of the Paper	4
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	5
Introduction.	5
Components of Containment.	5
Past Containment Research.	8
The Influence of Sex	18
III. METHODOLOGY.	20
Introduction.	20
The Sample.	20
A Statement of the Propositions	28
Delimiting Terms.	29
The Questionnaire	31
Limitations of the Study.	45
IV. TESTING THE PROPOSITIONS	48
Introduction.	48
Correlations of the Seven Containers With Each Other.	48
Means of the Seven Containers and Delinquency	49
Propositions.	53
V. FURTHER EXPLORATIONS	83
Introduction.	83
Sex of the Respondent	84
Year in School.	84
Church Attendance	86
Number of Delinquent Friends.	86
Father's Occupation	87
Summary	88
VI. SUMMARY, INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	89
Introduction.	89
Summary	90

Chapter	Page
Interpretations	95
Conclusions	98
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	101
APPENDIX.	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	22
II. Means of Self-Reported Delinquency and Official Involvement with the Law Among Institutionalized Versus Non-Institutionalized Respondents by Sex	27
III. Self Perception Scale by Items	33
IV. Goal Orientation Scale by Items	34
V. Frustration Tolerance Scale by Items	36
VI. Retention of Norms Scale by Items	37
VII. Internalization of Rules Scale by Items	39
VIII. Availability of Meaningful Roles Scale by Items	40
IX. Group Reinforcement Scale by Items	42
X. Broken Rules Scale by Items	44
XI. Correlation Coefficients of the Seven Containers with each Other for the Total Sample (N=728).	49
XII. Means of the Seven Containers and Delinquency for Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Males and Females	52
XIII. Correlations of Components of Inner Containment with Delinquency (Self-Reported and Official Involvement with the Law)	57
XIV. Results of Regression Analysis Among Inner Containment and Self-Reported Delinquency	59
XV. Results of Regression Analysis Among Inner Containment and Official Involvement with the Law	63
XVI. Correlations of the Components of Outer Containment with Delinquency (Self-Reported and Official Involvement with the Law)	67

Table	Page
XVII. Results of Regression Analysis Among Outer Containment and Self-Reported Delinquency	70
XVIII. Results of Regression Analysis Among Outer Containment and Official Involvement with the Law	73
XIX. Results of Regression Analysis Among Both Inner Containment and Outer Containment and Self-Reported Delinquency	76
XX. Results of Regression Analysis Among Both Inner Containment and Outer Containment and Official Involvement with the Law.	80
XXI. A Correlation Matrix of Containment Components and Delinquency (Self-Reported Delinquency and Official Involvement with the Law) and Demographic Items	85

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

In the past, sociologists have believed that every society contains members that deviate from the expected norms and values. Consequently, various theories have been proposed to suggest causes of deviant behavior, or delinquency. The objective of this investigation is to continue the research in the area of delinquency, and in particular, in the area of containment theory and delinquency. One problem is that little research has been done in the area of containment theory. It is, therefore, believed that the study can be seen as a contribution in the growing field of delinquency research.

The first major concept, or area of concern, is the concept of self and its ability as a controlling agent which channels individuals behavior into given normative expectations. Researchers [Dinitz, Scarpitti, and Reckless, 1962:517] have concluded that there is tangible evidence that a "good" self concept, a product of favorable socialization, insulates a boy from delinquency. A poor self concept, however, gives no resistance to delinquent companions or delinquent subcultures. Therefore, the first major area to be discussed in this investigation is the self in relation to its ability as a controlling agent.

It has also been stated [Reckless, 1967:475-476] that the self is composed of four components: a favorable self perception, goal

direction toward approved behavior patterns, frustration tolerance and retention of norms. As our society becomes increasingly complex and mobile, it is thought that these four aspects of the self make it possible for individuals to contain themselves, or function effectively within the given established norms. There has been no previous research undertaken concerning the strength of the four components of the self and little research has been done on any of the four components except self concept or self perception.

The second area of concern is that of external containment [Reckless, 1967:470] which consists of three components: the ability of groups to get their members to conform to norms and expectations, the availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement through acceptance, supportive relationships and the creation of a sense of belonging. It has been stated [Reckless, 1967] that if an individual exhibits these components, then there should be less delinquency.

The purpose of this study is to investigate which component or combination of components is the best predictor of delinquent behavior. It is not known if inner containment or outer containment is a better predictor of delinquency. Therefore, data has been gathered from seven institutions: four high schools and three institutional homes for male and female delinquents. Both males and females will be considered in this study because studies in the past tend to neglect the female delinquent. We do not know if the female delinquent is motivated by the same components in containment theory as is the male. It has recently been suggested [Bardwick, 1971:90-98] that within our society, male and female socialization may take varied forms. This may have some effect on the components of containment theory.

The relationships among the components in inner or outer containment have not been specified. Past research is uncertain whether or not the lack of a given component may cause an individual to be increasingly prone to delinquent behavior, or which component might be strengthened to insulate the individual from future delinquent acts. And, because past research has not been concerned with females and containment, it is not known whether containment is the same for males and females.

Propositions to be Tested

Therefore, from the review of the literature concerning containment theory, the following propositions will be tested:

P₁: There will be a negative correlation between the components of inner containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms) and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law).

P₂: The elements of inner containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

P₃: There will be a negative correlation between the components of outer containment (conformity to, or internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement) and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law).

P₄: The components of outer containment (conformity or internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

P₅: The components of both inner containment and outer containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

Organization of the Paper

In order to achieve the goals of this study, Chapter II will present a review of literature related specifically to containment theory. The nature of containment will be explained as well as past studies testing the variables of containment theory. A section concerning the sex of the respondent and its possible influence on this study will also be presented. Chapter III will present a description of the sample and a statement of the propositions to be tested. It will also include a list of terms in containment theory and their delimited meanings. In addition, Chapter III will present a description of the questionnaire employed and the seven scales constructed by the author specifically to measure the seven components of containment theory (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) and one scale constructed to measure rules frequently broken by the respondent, or a self-reported measure of delinquency. Chapter IV will discuss the techniques used to analyze the data. The propositions will again be presented as well as a presentation of the results of the analyzed data pertinent to each of the five propositions. Any data not specifically mentioned in the propositions will also be briefly explored (Chapter V). Finally, in Chapter VI, the findings will be interpreted and limitations of the study will be presented.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature related to various possible influences on delinquent acts is explored in this chapter. Specific attention is given to inner containment and the aspect of self and outer containment, or the individual's relation to groups. The review of literature reveals the findings of previous research on the subject. It is also necessary to research previous literature concerning both the male and female socialization processes. A preliminary look at the literature suggests that certain aspects of one's life may contribute to the amount of delinquent acts committed. These aspects will be considered in the form of research propositions and will be discussed in the following chapter.

Components of Containment

Since this is a study which involves both inner containment and outer containment, we are concerned with how these elements are formed within the individual and the relation of the two elements to each other. The central concepts of containment theory are: outer containment, inner containment, physiological and psychological pushes and the social atmosphere or pressures and pulls. Outer or external containment [Reckless, 1967:470] is the ability of the society, the state, the tribe, the village, the family, and other nuclear groups to hold the individual

within the bounds of accepted norms and expectations. It assumes that society and particular nuclear groups contain, steer, shield, divert, support, reinforce, and limit its members. This may include norms and expectations, customs, rules and laws. The theory, therefore, assumes that individuals are presented with a set of norms for different age groups, for males and females and for various statuses. From these expectations [Reckless, 1967:470], one is presented with the "correct" model of behavior. When discussing outer containment, it is also necessary to assume that deviant, illegal and immoral behavior exists in most societies and that a society usually produces effective conformers.

There are three major aspects [Reckless, 1967:470-471] of external containment for modern, mobile societies. Groups provide various rules of behavior and expect conformity to these rules. If a group can successfully get its members to internalize or conform to these rules, then external containment has occurred; violations are held at a tolerable level. Secondly, in addition to presenting the individual with rules and limitations, groups must also provide one with meaningful roles and activities. These roles may range from the family to a peer group to an educational situation. Roles limit behavior and when there are no roles or few roles present, then the individual is left on his own to establish limits on behavior.

A third component of external containment [Reckless, 1967:471] is that of group reinforcement. This includes: a sense of belonging and identity, supportive relationships and acceptance by the group. This component comes primarily from nuclear groups; the family or a peer group. This is also called incorporation or integration of the individual. If one has a sense of belonging, acceptance and support, then one is more likely to stay within the given norms of society.

Inner containment [Reckless, 1967:475] is the ability of the person to follow expected norms and, therefore, to direct himself. It involves the individual personality's need to live up to expectation of others. It may include the aspect of shaming. For example, "you ought to be ashamed of yourself." Inner containment may also include those phenomena which may threaten the self image or make one feel guilty. It is one's stake in conformity, or one's moral nature. It is manifested on a continuum from strong to weak self control.

Reckless [1967:475] states that the self increases in significance as a controlling agent as a society becomes more diverse, alienated and impersonal, and as the individual spends an increasing amount of time away from home base. Increased impersonalization means that the self must exert greater directional control. There are certain components of the self which strengthen it to resist deflection from societal norms. These components make it possible for the individual to contain himself in a modern, mobile environment. They are: a favorable self concept, goal orientation or aspiration level, level of frustration tolerance and retention of norms.

The first component of self, according to Reckless [1967:475], is the favorable self perception. The individual who perceives his own responsibility will act responsible. A favorable self concept aids in following approved standards of behavior. The person who perceives himself as honest, reliable and helpful will most likely act that way.

Goal direction [Reckless, 1967:476] is the second component of self which gives high directional capability. Capability for inner direction is the result of focusing on such approved goals as education and job improvement. This is especially true when goals involve long range

planning and effort. This insures against deviance because of the necessity to conform to socially approved methods to obtain the goals. Related to goal orientation is one's aspiration level which should consist of realistically obtainable goals.

The third self factor [Reckless, 1967:476] is that of frustration tolerance. This tolerance should be able to withstand pressures, failure and disappointments. Containment theory assumes that a high frustration tolerance will insulate the individual against being diverted from his course. It enables a person to be more in control of the situation.

The last component [Reckless, 1967:476] of inner containment is retention of norms. This retention is the result of adherence, acceptance, commitment, identification with, legitimation of laws, codes, values, customs and institutions. It is, therefore, assumed that self containment is a personal internalization of models of behavior. Ordinary strength and ordinary weakness in self containment represents a normal range of self development. An abnormal manifestation would be extreme rigidity of character. This may be the result of faulty development.

Past Containment Research

The research that led Reckless to many of his conclusions was done in Columbus, Ohio, with sixth grade boys. This [Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray, 1956:744-746] was a longitudinal study in which there was follow up research done on approximately the same sample. Reckless, with the cooperation of many schools in a high delinquency area, was able to test factors which he thought cushioned a boy against delinquency, or left a

boy vulnerable to deviant behavior in the growing up process.

In order to obtain his sample [Reckless, Dinitz, Murray, 1956:744] thirty sixth grade teachers were asked to nominate those white boys in their classes who, in their opinion, would not ever experience police, or juvenile court contact. The final sample was composed of 125 "good" boys; "good" referring to the least likelihood of police contact. In order to not totally rely on the decisions of the teachers, the boys were given a series of administered scales which included:

- (1) the delinquency proneness test,
- (2) social responsibility scales of the Gough California Personality Inventory (C.P.I.),
- (3) an occupational preference instrument, and
- (4) a test measuring the boy's concept of self, his family, and other interpersonal relationships.

The 125 boys [Reckless, et al., 1956:745] who were nominated as being "good" saw themselves as law abiding and obedient individuals who conformed to the expectations of those in authority.

Both the delinquency vulnerability (D_e) test and the social responsibility (R_e) test [Reckless, et al., 1956:746] seem to justify their selection as "good" boys. They indicated that they would keep out of trouble at all costs. They tried to conform to expectations of teachers, parents, and others. They did not conceive of themselves as heading for juvenile court or trouble. They also indicated a liking for school. Factors which they felt kept them out of trouble were: parental direction, non-deviant friends, and work.

The second phase of this research project occurred the following year [Reckless, Dinitz and Kay, 1957:566]. It consisted of white sixth grade boys in the highest delinquency areas of Columbus, Ohio. These

boys, however, were nominated by their teachers as heading for contact with the police and courts. They are then compared with the boys in the same classrooms previously nominated as "good" boys. In most respects, the social background characteristics of the two sets of respondents were not significantly different. One fact should be mentioned: some of the "bad" boys had a home life that was characterized by conflict and few activities shared by all members. These boys were more likely to have come from broken homes. In regard to their own self evaluation, they perceived themselves as likely candidates for future delinquency.

Since both groups of boys come from a high delinquency area, Reckless [Reckless, Dinitz and Kay, 1957:570] concluded that there must be another factor that leads some to deviant actions and others to conforming behavior. He interpreted from his results that this insulating component is the self image. That is, if a boy has a good, or positive, self image then this will insulate him against delinquency, and a boy with a bad, or negative self concept will be prone to delinquency. While Reckless does not say specifically which people make the most difference in helping to form a boy's self concept, he does point out that it is formed somewhere in relation to the primary group. This theory, therefore has some relationship to reference group theory. He [Reckless, 1957:571] states:

The differential perceptions on the part of both the boys and their mothers strongly suggests that one of the pre-conditions of law-abiding or delinquent conduct is to be found in the concept of self and others that one has acquired in his primary group relationship.

If in reality, the concept of self is an insulating factor against delinquent behavior, then conforming behavior should continue throughout a person's life, providing that there is an internalization of a good

self concept. To test this hypothesis, Reckless did a follow-up study four years later and presents an assessment of the present state of insulation of the original "good boys." From the original sample of 125 boys, 103 were located and restudied. Most of the boys were now sixteen years old. In retesting, the Short-Nye scale [Scarpitti, Murray, Dinitz and Reckless, 1960:556] was added, which measures the boy's rejection of his mother, and his perception of rejection by his mother. The researchers also had access to delinquency records of the boys that were compiled in the four years between the studies.

The results seem to lend credence to his earlier conclusions. The good boys again stated [Scarpitti, Murray, Dinitz and Reckless, 1960: 557] that their home life was stable and that they enjoyed school. The boys continued to define themselves as good boys and are still defined as good by others despite the fact that they have, for the most part, remained in high delinquency areas. This follow-up study leads the researchers to conclude [Scarpitti, et al., 1960:558] that "once a favorable self image has been internalized by pre-adolescents, with respect to friends, parents and school and the law, there is every reason to believe that it is as difficult to alter as a delinquent self image."

The last phase of this research project was done by Dinitz, Scarpitti, and Reckless [1962:515-517]. They compiled a cross group analysis of the developments occurring during the past four years. Of the 99 good boys who were still in school, all but four were again nominated as being likely to avoid future contact with the police. There was a contrast in the court records of the two groups. Only four of the 103 insulated boys have one minor complaint for delinquency, while 37 of the 70 vulnerable boys had frequent contact with the court during the four

year period. There was also a marked difference in favor of the insulated boys on the scales measuring concept of self.

The researchers [Dinitz, et al., 1962:517] concluded that there is tangible evidence that a good self concept, a product of favorable socialization, insulates a boy from delinquent while a poor self concept gives no resistance to deviancy, delinquent companions or delinquent subcultures. They feel that the favorable self concept acts as an inner buffer, or containment against delinquency.

Jensen [1972:8-9] believes outer and inner containment to be classifications for variables which have been termed by social theorists in the past as one's stake in conformity or commitment to conformity. Being attached to conventional role models, values and beliefs and possessing a self image based in conventional society will "pull" a boy toward non-delinquent activities. Therefore, he concludes [1972:10] that "one's psychological investment in conformity as measured by level of self-esteem should have an effect in situations of both strong and weak outer containments." However, his findings did not support this. He found that delinquency and self esteem are related only at those times where others are also more likely to react.

Other authors [Tangri and Schwartz, 1967:182-190] have also done delinquency research with the self concept variable in an attempt to analyze Reckless' studies. The authors concede that Reckless and his colleagues have contributed research that has been of crucial importance to delinquency literature.

Reiss [1951:196] has defined delinquency as "the behavior consequent to the failure of personal and social controls to produce behavior in conformity with the norms of the social system to which legal penalties

are attacked." He states that "personal control" is when the individual refrains from meeting his needs in ways conflicting with community norms. Therefore, the individual possesses a strong inner containment. "Social control" is the ability of groups to make norms effective, or strong outer containment. The terms by which his concepts are stated, therefore, may also be called inner containment and outer containment, so that Reckless' views seem to parallel those of Reiss. They are in agreement that delinquency may be seen as a functional consequence of the type of relationship established among the personal (inner containment) and the social (outer containment) controls.

They are also in agreement concerning the significance of the primary group. Reckless stated that [1957:570] there is a strong possibility that one of the preconditions of law-abiding or delinquent conduct is found in the self concept which is acquired in the primary group relationship. Reiss [1951:198] states that the primary groups are the basic institutions for the development of personal controls. Primary groups exercise social control over the non-delinquent child by providing non-delinquent social roles and by employing techniques which make non-delinquent norms and rules effective. Reiss also theorizes [1951:203] that the nature and strength of personal controls (or inner containment) are an index of the person's definition of how he will act in certain situations.

Another author [Hirschi, 1969] has done delinquency research in relation to control theories. He believes that if an individual's bond to society is weak or broken, then a delinquent act will occur. There are four major elements to an individual's bond which should be mentioned in order to relate Hirschi's work to other containment or control theorists.

Attachment [Hirschi, 1969:16-17] is the first element of the bond. Attachment refers to one's sensitivity to others. This attachment to others results from internalization of norms, conscience, and superego. According to Reckless [1967:475-477] this is labeled "inner containment" of the individual. Nye [1958:5-7] refers to this same element as "inner control" and "indirect control." According to Reiss [1951:204], attachment is one element of "personal controls." Lastly, Briar and Piliavin [1965:41] subsume attachment in their discussion of "stake in conformity." Their research is related to Hirschi's second element of an individual's bond: commitment.

Commitment [Hirschi, 1969:20-21] is the idea that an individual makes investments which consume time and energy such as education or a business enterprise. One's investment, therefore, consists of a commitment. If deviant behavior is evident, one must consider the costs of deviant behavior and the possible loss of the initial investment. Reckless [1967] considers this commitment to be those factors in an individual's external containment.

Involvement [Hirschi, 1969:21-23], or engrossment in conventional activities may also be considered as a part of control theory. It assumes that one may simply be too busy following a conventional pattern of behavior to become deviant. This line of reasoning may be seen in the emphasis placed on recreational activities in the army, or larger amounts of homework on the part of the school system to keep individuals away from delinquency. This lack of time to engage in delinquent activities is also accepted by Sutherland [Cohen, 1956:37] who states:

In the general area of juvenile delinquency it is probable that the most significant difference between juveniles who engage in delinquency and those who do not is that the latter are provided abundant opportunities of a conventional type.

for satisfying their recreational interests, while the former lack those opportunities or facilities.

Matza and Sykes [1961:712-719] have suggested that delinquents have the values of a leisure class and refer to delinquents in reference to their system of values. Therefore, the leisure of the adolescent produces a set of values which may lead to delinquency.

The last element [Hirschi, 1969:23-26] of the bond is that of belief. The control theory assumes that existence of a common value system within the society or group whose norms are being violated. If both the deviant and the non-deviant believe the deviant act is wrong, then it is necessary to consider why one commits the deviant act and the other does not. Consider the possibility that the deviant rationalizes his behavior so that he can believe in the rule and violate it at the same time. This theory has been advanced by Cressey [1953] in regard to embezzlement and by Matza and Sykes [1957:664-670] in regard to delinquency and neutralization.

Hirschi [1969:229], as does Reckless, states that the absence of control increases the likelihood of delinquency regardless of the presence of group traditions of delinquency. All of Reckless' studies of good and bad boys indicate that involvement with parents is significant. This belief is also held by Hirschi. He states [Hirschi, 1969:83] that, "...the bond of affection for conventional persons is a major deterrent to crime." The stronger the bond, the more likely the person is to take it into account when and if he contemplates a criminal act. If there is a physical or psychological separation from parents, then the gang or peers may take their place. Reckless [1967:311] believes that companionship is one of the most important, universal causes of crime and delinquency among males.

It is evident, therefore, that one's relationship to parents is significant when discussing delinquent behavior. If a child [Hirschi, 1969:108] does not care or think about the reactions of his parents, their control over him is reduced. It is also significant to note that those who report less communication with parents do poorer in school. Failure of success in school may retard the level of intimate, personal communication within the family. Therefore, the family as a control element may partially depend on the performance of the child in school. Reckless placed the family and the school in the external containment. It is, therefore, necessary to discuss the school when analyzing delinquency.

If the school [Hirschi, 1969:110] is able to command one's attachment, involvement, and commitment, then a minimum of delinquent acts should occur. Hirschi [1969:132] discusses a causal chain in regard to delinquency. The chain runs from academic incompetence to poor school performance to disliking school to rejection of the school's authority to the commission of delinquent acts. It is suggested that the academically competent are less likely to be delinquent because they have prospects for the future which they do not wish to jeopardize. Reckless [1956 and 1957] also found this to be true and incorporated this into inner containment as "retention of norms" and "goal direction."

Another aspect should be discussed: attachment to peers in relation to deviant acts. Bad companions, deviant groups, or prestige individuals are labeled by Reckless [1967] as "pulls," as previously stated. Hirschi [1969:159] states that boys with a large stake in conformity and delinquent friends rarely commit a delinquent act. Therefore, goal direction has more power than peer pulls according to Hirschi. Evidence

supports the view that stake in conformity affects one's choice of friends.

When discussing delinquency and commitment to conformity, one should consider the research of Briar and Piliavin [1965]. They discuss the importance of social institutions such as the family and school as instruments of control on the delinquent motives of boys. Presumably, all boys are subject to these motives, but express them in overt behavior only when the controlling potential for these institutions is not realized. There are a variety of conditions which can serve as a basis for development of commitment to conformity: a belief in God, affection for conventionally behaving peers, occupational aspirations, ties to parents, desire to perform well in school, punishment associated with arrest.

Briar and Piliavin [1965:41], however, also agreed with research done by Reckless when they state that of all these conditions, the most important is that of the relationship of the youth to his parents. In most families, parents may withdraw love to maintain control and authority. A child is still dependent upon them for a source of affection and will conform to their expectations in order to obtain approval. It may then be recognized that a punitive parent who does not reward conformity with affection may undermine the basis for voluntary compliance. Lastly, Briar and Piliavin [1965:41] state: "It is likely that failure to develop conformity commitments through the desire to satisfy parental expectations reduces the probability that the youth will develop such commitments in other social contexts." Therefore, they are also supporting the need for external containment, with emphasis on the element of parental holding power.

Matza and his theory of delinquency and drift are also related to containment theory. He maintains [Matza, 1964] that delinquent youth are not committed to oppositional values and norms, but in fact that both delinquents and non-delinquents view illegal behavior as "wrong." Sykes and Matza [1961:712-713] state:

Many delinquents are essentially in agreement with the larger society, at least with regard to the evaluation of delinquent behavior as "wrong." Rather than standing in opposition to conventional ideas of good conduct, the delinquent is likely to adhere to the dominant norms in belief but render them ineffective in practice by holding various attitudes and perceptions which serve to neutralize the norms as checks on behavior.

Matza [1964:50] states that delinquent acts occur as a result of extenuating circumstances, but those who perform such acts are not "committed" to them as misdeeds. If Matza is correct [Hindelang, 1970:505], and delinquents are not committed to their misdeeds, then their approval of an act should be similar to the approval expressed by non-delinquents.

The Influence of Sex

Recently, researchers have begun to think that sex roles are significant in the shaping of the personality. If there actually is a difference between the male and female socialization process, then inner containment and outer containment may not be the same for each. Women [Warrior, 1971:248] have been found to have lower goal aspirations, to be less self-assured, less self-confident, and a lower opinion of themselves in general. This may indicate a weaker inner containment.

Studies [Warrior, 1971:248-249] utilizing the Allport and Vernon Study of Values find that masculine thinking is more oriented in terms of the self, while feminine thinking is oriented more in terms of the environment. She states that masculine thinking anticipates rewards and

punishments determined more as a result of the adequacy or inadequacy of the self, while feminine thinking anticipates rewards and punishments determined more as a result of the friendship or hostility of the environment. She also found masculine thinking to be associated more with a desire for personal achievement; feminine thinking was found to be associated more with a desire for love and friendship. The relationship to delinquency of such things as higher or lower frustration tolerance for females has not been explored. These above mentioned orientations leads one to believe that possibly males have a stronger outer containment, while females have a stronger inner containment.

Another study done by Bardwick [1971] found that females are more likely to conform, to be rewarded for goodness, and to remain dependent on others for self-esteem. Higher self-esteem based on being loved also emphasizes the external environment, or outer containment. Males, however, are more likely to be rewarded for achievement, to have to struggle for a sense of autonomy against parental pressure; with a higher self-esteem based on achievement. These facts emphasize the significance of goal direction, retention of norms, and a favorable self-perception of inner containment.

Containment theory [Reckless, 1967:470] assumes an environment where individuals are presented with a set of norms for different age groups, for males and females and for persons of various statuses. This study seeks to clarify various norms for males and females in relation to containment and delinquency.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The problem of this study is that we do not know the relationship between inner containment and outer containment as well as the components of each in regard to both male and female delinquents. Therefore, an objective of this paper is to explore this knowledge vacuum. A survey of related literature suggests a series of propositions to be evaluated. It also provides evidence for the necessity of this study because of the lack of empirical investigation in the area.

In order to test the propositions, data has been collected, through the use of an appropriate questionnaire that elicits information from students in regard to each proposition. The information is original data taken from high school students for this particular study.

The Sample

The data for this study was collected in the fall and spring of 1975-1976 from a variety of juvenile institutions. Institutions were chosen partly because of their demographic characteristics (size of town and racial composition, etc.) and mostly because of their accessibility to this writer. To increase the variety of the respondents in relation to race and socio-economic status, seven institutions were chosen: four high schools and three correctional institutions. Among the four high

schools, the first is primarily lower class urban, the second is middle class urban, the third is lower class rural, and the fourth is middle class rural. The three correctional institutions represent both privately and publically funded institutions for both males and females. Six hundred and sixty respondents are taken from the high schools and sixty-eight are from juvenile correctional institutions in Oklahoma. This sample therefore, includes respondents with characteristics that may extend along the range of possible variations in relation to the containment components. A total of 736 questionnaires were distributed and collected. Eventually, nine questionnaires were not used in this analysis because of incomplete information. Therefore, the total sample size is 727.

The first section of the questionnaire is concerned with various demographic information about the subjects. This includes sex, year in school, race, church attendance, number of close friends that have recently been picked up by the police, father's occupation and official delinquency. Many of these variables are not necessary to test the propositions in this study, but they are significant in that they provide information and insight into the characteristics of the samples included in this study.

Concerning sex of the respondent (see Table I), 321 (44.3%) are male and 404 (55.72%) are female, totalling 725. In relation to year in school, 58 (8.3%) of the respondents are freshmen, 329 (46.8%) are sophomores, 197 (28%) are juniors, 108 (15.4%) are seniors, and 11 (1.6%) reported themselves to be in the category of "other".

Regarding race, 142 (19.6%) of the respondents are black, 3 (.41%) are Chicanos, 41 (5.7%) are Indians, 535 (73.9%) are white.

TABLE I
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Characteristics Categories	Non Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Sex	282(38.8)*	374(51.4)	39(5.5)	30(4.3)	727(100.0)
Year in School					
Freshman	16(5.8)	19(5.3)	11(28.9)	12(40.0)	58(8.3)
Sophomore	118(43.2)	185(51.4)	15(39.8)	11(36.7)	329(46.8)
Junior	86(31.5)	97(26.9)	7(18.4)	5(16.7)	195(28.0)
Senior	51(18.7)	56(15.6)	1(2.6)		108(15.4)
Other	2(.7)	3(.8)	4(10.5)	2(6.7)	11(1.6)
Race					
Black	60(21.4)	70(18.7)	7(17.95)	4(13.3)	141(19.6)
Chicano	2(.7)		2(2.6)		4(0.4)
Indian	13(4.6)	21(5.6)	1(5.1)	5(16.7)	40(5.7)
White	204(72.9)	280(75.0)	29(74.4)	21(70.0)	534(73.9)
Other	1(.4)	2(.5)			3(0.4)
Church Attendance					
Never	38(13.6)	19(5.1)	2(5.1)	4(13.3)	63(8.9)
Few time/year	85(30.4)	93(25.1)	12(30.8)	13(43.3)	203(28.3)
Once a month	27(9.7)	35(9.5)	3(7.7)	4(13.3)	69(9.6)
Several times/ month	37(13.3)	71(19.2)	9(23.0)	4(13.3)	121(16.8)
Every week	69(24.7)	90(24.3)	12(30.8)	4(13.3)	175(24.3)
Several times/ week	23(8.2)	62(16.7)	1(2.6)	1(3.3)	87(12.1)
Friends Recently Picked up by Police					
None	151(54.7)	243(66.0)	5(12.8)	6(20.7)	405(56.7)
1 or 2	60(21.7)	78(21.2)	14(35.9)	5(17.2)	157(21.9)
3 or 4	18(6.5)	14(3.8)	2(5.1)		34(4.7)
5 or more	47(17.0)	33(8.9)	18(46.2)	18(62.1)	116(16.5)
Father's Occupa- tion					
Unskilled	25(9.1)	35(9.7)	1(2.8)		66(9.3)
Semi-skilled	61(22.2)	80(22.2)	13(37.1)	5(19.2)	159(22.9)
Service worker	25(9.1)	35(9.7)	3(8.6)	1(3.8)	64(9.2)
Skilled worker	69(25.1)	95(26.4)	9(25.7)	9(34.6)	182(26.1)
Office worker	24(8.7)	22(6.1)	4(11.4)	5(19.2)	55(7.9)
Manager (small owner)	35(12.7)	44(12.2)	1(2.8)	2(7.7)	82(11.9)
Professional (B.A.)	11(4.0)	19(5.3)	2(5.7)	4(15.4)	36(5.2)
High level owner execu- tive	4(1.4)	13(3.6)			17(2.4)
Professional (advanced degree)	21(7.6)	17(4.7)	2(5.7)		40(5.7)

TABLE I (con't)

Characteristics Categories	Non-Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Official involve- ment with the law					
Never	137(49.6)	280(77.6)	1(2.6)	4(13.3)	422(59.6)
Questioned	74(26.8)	52(14.4)	4(10.3)	3(10.0)	133(18.9)
Taken into custody	19(6.9)	8(2.2)	4(10.3)	1(3.3)	32(4.7)
No hearing, under super- vision	16(5.8)	5(1.4)	1(2.6)		22(3.1)
Hearing in juvenile court	16(5.8)	6(1.6)			22(4.7)
Placed under supervision by juvenile court	12(4.3)	6(1.6)	7(17.9)	1(3.3)	26(3.7)
Committed to an institution	2(.7)	4(1.1)	22(56.4)	21(70.0)	49(6.9)
Self Reported Delinquency					
Has drunk beer, wine or liquor					
Never	41(15.1)	80(22.6)	2(5.1)	1(3.3)	124(17.4)
1 or 2 times	60(22.1)	110(29.7)	7(17.9)	3(10.0)	180(25.3)
3 or 4 times	25(9.2)	32(8.7)	2(5.1)	1(3.3)	60(8.4)
5 or more	145(53.5)	148(39.9)	28(71.8)	25(83.3)	346(48.5)
Has taken things worth \$20 or more (not incl. automobile)					
Never	200(74.6)	327(89.6)	8(20.5)	16(53.3)	551(78.3)
1 or 2 times	47(17.5)	27(7.4)	10(25.6)	8(26.7)	92(13.1)
3 or 4 times	12(4.5)	2(.6)	6(15.4)	1(3.3)	21(2.9)
5 or more	9(3.)	9(2.5)	15(38.5)	5(16.7)	38(5.7)
Has forged a check					
Never	250(91.6)	355(97.3)	28(71.8)	25(83.3)	658(93.1)
1 or 2 times	12(4.4)	8(2.2)	7(17.9)	2(6.7)	29(4.1)
3 or 4 times	5(1.8)			1(3.3)	6(0.8)
5 or more	6(2.2)	2(.6)	4(10.3)	2(6.7)	14(0.9)

* Numbers in parentheses are percentages.

Church attendance was also included for possible future research. Sixty-four (8.9%) of the respondents never go to church, 204 (28.3%) attend church service a few times a year, 69 (9.6%) attend church service about once a month, 121 (16.8%) attend church service several times a month, 175 (24.3%) attend church service every week, 87 (12%) attend church service several times a week.

Another item included in the first section of the questionnaire is "How many of your close friends have recently (within the last year) picked up by the police?" Responding to the first choice (see question 5 in the Appendix), 405 (56.7%) of the respondents reported that none of their friends had been picked up by the police within the last year, 157 (22%) had one or two close friends picked up by the police within the last year, 34 (4.8%) had three or four close friends picked up by the police within the last year and 118 (16.6%) had five or more close friends that were picked up by the police within the last year.

Sixty-one (8.8%) of the respondents reported their fathers to be an unskilled worker (see question in Appendix), 160 (23%) have a semi-skilled father, 64 (9.2%) report their father to be a service worker (policeman or fireman), 182 (26.1%) report a father that is skilled (a carpenter, plumber, etc.), 55 (7.9%) report their father to be a salesman, bookkeeper, or officer worker, 83 (11.9%) report their father to be an owner, manager, partner of a small business, lower level governmental official, or military commissioned officer. Thirty-six (5.2%) report their father to be a professional -- requiring a bachelor's degree, and 17 (2.4%) report their father to be an owner, high-level executive -- large business or high-level governmental agency. Lastly, 40 (5.7%) report their father to be a professional requiring an advanced college

degree (doctor, lawyer, etc.).

Responses regarding formal involvement with the law range along a continuum from "I have been committed to an institution" (see question 7 in the Appendix). Four hundred and twenty-two (59.6%) subjects checked "I have never been involved with law enforcement authorities," 134 (18.9%) checked "I have been questioned by the police, but never taken into custody." Thirty-three (4.7%) checked "Although I have never had a hearing in juvenile court, I have been placed under the supervision of a guardian or probation officer." Another 22 (3.1%) checked "I have had a hearing in juvenile court." Twenty-six (3.7%) checked "The juvenile court has placed me under supervision of a guardian or other authority" and 49 (6.9%) checked "I have been committed to an institution." This last item is interesting in that 68 of the respondents were visited in the institutions in which they are living. Therefore, 19 respondents living in institutions did not consider themselves committed to an institution.

The data have also been divided by sex of the respondents and whether or not the respondent is currently institutionalized. This is included because of a specific interest in this study concerning the possible variety of outcomes of containers in relation to sex of the subject.

This sample does not appear to be one of extremes, but represents the normal range of responses possible in the total population. Concerning "friends recently picked up by the police," both non-institutionalized males and females have a reasonable proportion of friends that have been picked up (males equal 55.3% of their friends and females equal 33.9% of their friends have recently been picked up by the police). Non-institutionalized individuals therefore, are not completely sheltered

from delinquent behavior.

When considering the self-reported measure of delinquency, three items of the total scale were chosen to gain insight into the delinquency of this sample. In regard to "have you ever drunk beer, wine or liquor?" one finds that again, non-institutionalized individuals have engaged to a large degree in this delinquent behavior. Among non-institutionalized males, 62.7% have drunk beer, wine or liquor three or more times. Among institutionalized males, 76.9% have drunk beer, wine or liquor three or more times. The non-institutionalized females are also not free of this delinquent behavior; 48.6% as opposed to 86.6% of the institutionalized females have drunk beer, wine or liquor.

The incidence of broken rules among non-institutionalized persons does, however, decrease with the severity of the crime. Responding to "Have you ever forged a check?" a small proportion of the non-institutionalized males (8.4%) and females (2.8%) admit to this behavior. Among institutionalized individuals the rate of commission is much higher; 28.2% among males and 16.7% among females.

To further analyze the sample, the means regarding frequently broken rules, or the self-reported measure of delinquency should be mentioned. The possible range of scores is from one to seven with seven being the most delinquent response. When the data are divided by sex (see Table II) concerning self-reported delinquent behavior of non-institutionalized subjects, males tend to be slightly more delinquent ($\bar{x} = 1.8$) than females ($\bar{x} = 1.5$). This is supported by past research in the area of male versus female delinquency. Institutionalized males also tend to be slightly more delinquent ($\bar{x} = 2.6$) than institutionalized females ($\bar{x} = 2.2$). When the total sample is analyzed concerning self-reported

delinquency the mean is 1.7. As one would expect, institutionalized males and females break rules more frequently than non-institutionalized males and females.

TABLE II
FREQUENCY OF SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY AND OFFICIAL
INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW AMONG INSTITUTIONALIZED
VERSUS NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED RESPONDENTS
BY SEX

	Institutionalized		Non-Institutionalized		Total
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Self-Reported Delinquency	2.6	2.2	1.8	1.5	1.7
Official Involvement with the Law	5.7	5.5	2.1	1.4	2.1

As research would indicate, institutionalized males and females are more officially involved with law. The mean for institutionalized males is 5.7 and for females is 5.5; institutionalized males are slightly more involved than institutionalized females with the law. Again, non-institutionalized males ($\bar{x} = 2.1$) are more involved with the law than non-institutionalized females ($\bar{x} = 1.4$).

Therefore, in all categories, males are more delinquent than females and institutionalized males and females are more delinquent than non-institutionalized males and females in relation to self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law.

A Statement of the Propositions

After a survey of the literature related to containment theory and delinquent behavior, the following propositions were decided upon for exploration in this particular study:

P₁: There will be a negative correlation between the components of inner containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation, and retention of norms) and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law).

P₂: The components of inner containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation and retention of norms) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

P₃: There will be a negative correlation between the components of outer containment (conformity to or internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement) and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law).

P₄: The components of outer containment (conformity to or internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

P₅: The components of both inner and outer containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

Each of these propositions will be analyzed separately five times. First, the total sample will be considered concerning each proposition.

Next the data will be divided by sex of the respondent and whether or not the respondent is institutionalized. Therefore, after the total sample is considered, then institutionalized males and institutionalized females and non-institutionalized males and females will be considered in relation to each proposition. Each of these five analyses will also be divided into self-reported delinquency and official delinquency.

Delimiting Terms

It is necessary to explain exactly what is meant by various terms used within this study. In clarification or delimiting terms, the first term is that of delinquency. Delinquency in this particular study is the self-reported response of each subject concerning frequently broken rules (the last section of the questionnaire; see the Appendix), and official involvement with the law (see question number 7 in Appendix).

Outer containment [Reckless, 1967:470] is the holding power of the group. The group may be society, the family, the village, the tribe or any other nuclear group that holds the individual within the bounds of valued norms and expectations. According to Reckless, outer containment contains three main components: conformity to or internalization of rules, the availability of meaningful roles and activities, and reinforcement by groups through supportive relationships, acceptance, and a sense of belonging.

Conformity to, or internalization of rules [Reckless, 1967:470] refers to whether or not a group or organization can get its members to comply to established rules. Compliance to the rules is emphasized as a prerequisite to conformity whether or not the regulations have been internalized. Conformity occurs when there are a minimum number of

infractions or when violations are held to tolerable proportions.

Meaningful roles [Reckless, 1967:471] and activities may consist of occupational, recreational, educational, performance, or task roles. According to Reckless, there is a lack of meaningful roles for teenagers, young people and senior citizens. Roles define the range and limits of behavior.

Reinforcement by groups [Reckless, 1967:471] refers to significant, supportive relationships, acceptance, and a sense of belonging and identity. These containing elements are provided by nuclear groups and small organizations. Within these groups, the individual is seen as a person who is consequently provided with a social base of action.

Inner containment [Reckless, 1967:475] is the ability of the person to follow expected norms and to direct himself. Inner containment is composed of four components: a favorable self image, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, and retention of norms. A favorable self image is held when a person conceives of himself as a responsible person, conceives of himself as operating within limits, and perceives of himself as reliable, honest, helpful, cooperative.

Goal orientation [Reckless, 1967:476] refers to the orientation of the person to socially approved goals such as education, savings, job improvement, accomplishments in the arts, social causes, civil rights, or helping others. Goal orientation is especially significant when long range goals are involved, implying sacrifice and effort to obtain these goals. Socially approved long range goals require a person to conform to societal norms.

Frustration tolerance [Reckless, 1967:476] is the capability to withstand adversity, pressure from others, failure and disappointment.

It is assumed that one with a high frustration tolerance will not be diverted from socially approved goals.

Retention of norms [Reckless, 1967:476] involves adherence and commitment to, acceptance of and identification with values, norms, laws, customs and codes.

The Questionnaire

The research instrument that was administered in this study was developed by this author after it became apparent that other appropriate instruments needed for these specific areas of concern did not exist (see Appendix). Eight separate scales were developed to test the seven components of containment theory and self-reported delinquency. Because of the length of the questionnaire, twelve items per scale were decided upon initially. Each item is stated to make it relevant to the respondents now in a high school setting. Within each scale items are stated in a negative as well as a positive direction.

In the first section -- items one through seven -- the questions are concerned with demographic information about the respondent. The next two sections of the questionnaire are concerned with the scales constructed specifically for this study. The second section -- items eight through ninety-three -- is representative of a Likert Type Scale with a choice of seven responses (Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree). According to Phillips [1966:185]:

The Likert procedure for obtaining summated ratings provides some indirect evidence as to the existence of a partial order in the property itself. The item analysis procedures increases the degree of homogeneity or internal consistency in the set of items. Although this provides no guarantee that only one property is being measured by the set of items, it seems likely that it does serve to eliminate many of those items that provide measures of different properties.

The third section - items ninety-four through one hundred and seventeen -- is a modified form of the Nye-Short Scale of delinquency.

Twelve items composing each scale were developed in relation to each of the seven variables to be tested. It was hoped that after each of the twelve items was analyzed for each scale, that ten items per scale would remain. Items were analyzed by the means of the Statistic Analysis Program (the CORR Procedure). This procedure results in univariate descriptive statistics and product-moment correlation coefficients between the items which make up each scale.

For each pair of numeric variables, the procedure can print the product-moment correlation coefficients, its significance probability, and the number of observations contributing to the correlation coefficient. The significance probability of a correlation coefficient that large or larger in absolute value would arise by chance were the random variables truly independent. That probability is based on the assumption that the values are realization of random variables having a bivariate normal distribution [Barr and Goodnight, 1972:208].

The second section of the questionnaire is designed to measure each of the seven variables of containment theory: self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms; internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement. The following is a presentation of the scales and items which include the original and the final correlations (product-moment correlation coefficients). The respondents self-perception as well as the other six variables is operationalized by constructing a scale of twelve possible items. Each respondent was asked to indicate a degree of acceptance or rejection of the item by circling an appropriate response in relation to "how you feel about yourself." Tables III through X present the items included (numbered as they appear on the final questionnaire) and the original and final correlation coefficient (r) means standard deviations and possible ranges.

TABLE III
SELF PERCEPTION SCALE BY ITEMS

Items	Original and Final r Value N = 728
77. I accept myself the way I am.	.59
44. I am proud of the qualities I have.	.66
32. I am glad to be the person I am.	.66
91. I have a high opinion of myself.	.66
55.* I am an irresponsible person.	-.40
16. Most of the time I like myself.	.60
21. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	.47
84.* I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	.50
48. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	.67
8.* I certainly feel useless at times.	-.46
15.* At times I think I am no good at all.	-.52
17. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.	.64
Original Scale and Final Scale: Mean	5.1
Standard Deviation	.99
Possible Range	1-7

*This is an intentionally reversed item on the questionnaire.

All twelve items in the Self Perception Scale resulted in a moderate to high correlation. Each item is significant beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. These twelve items, therefore, comprise the measurement scale of self perception for this study.

TABLE IV
GOAL ORIENTATION SCALE BY ITEMS

Items		Original r Value	Final r Value
		N = 728	
36.	It is important to help in trying to improve things.	.58	.60
63.	It is desirable to show concern for those people less fortunate, or those who need assistance.	.57	.59
39.	A formal education is an important part of life.	.51	.52
14.	It is important to have a creative hobby in which you try to do well.	.39	.41
37.	It is important to save for the future.	.57	.59
85.	It is important to excell in your job in order to improve or gain promotions.	.53	.55
78.	To identify with a cause is an important part of life.	.53	.55
31.	The really worthwhile things in life require sacrifice.	.49	.51
60.*	Education is not necessary; the way to get ahead is through "connections".	-.45	-.45
35.	I often save my allowance for something I've always wanted.	.44	.44
75.	I know what I want to do with my life.	.42	.43
42.*	I would rather decide things as they come rather than always plan ahead.	-.28	
<u>Original Scale</u>		<u>Final Scale</u>	
Mean	5.5	Mean	5.5
Standard Deviation	.84	Standard Deviation	.88
Possible Range	1-7	Possible Range	1-7

* This is an intentionally reversed item on the questionnaire.

Item forty-two of the Goal Orientation Scale (I would rather decide things as they come rather than always plan ahead) resulted in a low correlation in relation to the eleven other items. The items were analyzed a second time without this low correlation and the final r correlations presented above are the result. Each of the final items is significant beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. These eleven items, therefore, comprise the measurement scale of goal orientation in this study.

TABLE V
FRUSTRATION TOLERANCE SCALE BY ITEMS

Items	Original and Final r Value N = 728
28. I cope well with failure.	.53
49.* The hassles of life really get to me.	-.37
43. I am often the last one to give up trying something.	.47
24. I keep trying when things don't work out.	.55
25. There's no such thing as a problem that can't be solved.	.50
52. I keep a rosy outlook even when life seems to be a series of disappointments.	.53
23. I am not depressed when I fail.	.41
30. I persevere under pressure and adversity from others.	.44
79. I keep studying the subjects in which I have not done well.	.43
76.* I tend to let others persuade me to do things I think are wrong.	-.33
20. I finish tasks I start, even when they are not very important.	.49
12. I am not depressed by temporary setbacks or disappointments.	.47
<u>Original and Final Scale:</u> Mean	4.4
Standard Deviation	.86
Possible Range	1-7

*This is an intentionally reversed item on the questionnaire.

All twelve items in the Frustration Tolerance Scale resulted in a moderate to high correlation. Each item is significant beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. These twelve items, therefore, comprise the measurement scale of frustration tolerance in this study.

TABLE VI
RETENTION OF NORMS SCALE BY ITEMS

Items	Original r Value		Final r Value	
	N = 728			
87. One should be actively engaged in some kind of disciplined productive activity.	.52		.53	
69. You should work hard for success and recognition of achievements.	.55		.56	
54.* You are asking for trouble if you try to help everyone who asks for aid.	-.32			
11. All people, regardless of race or religion, are entitled to and should receive equal social privileges.	.47		.50	
47. In order to be successful in life you should obtain as much schooling as possible.	.55		.54	
67. In their actions, people should consider whether or not their behavior will be acceptable to others.	.53		.53	
72. It's best to do things according to the rules.	.64		.63	
59. For the most part, justice is done by the police.	.22			
40.* It's okay to get around the law if you don't get caught.	-.59		-.61	
80. A nation deserves its citizens loyalty at all times.	.55		.56	
19. We should respect the achievements of our forefathers.	.55		.57	
58.* To get ahead, you must sometimes do things that are not right.	-.47		-.50	
<u>Original Scale</u>		<u>Final Scale</u>		
Mean	5.1	Mean	5.2	
Standard Deviation	.91	Standard Deviation	.96	
Possible Range	1-7	Possible Range	1-7	

*This is an intentionally reversed item on the questionnaire.

Within the Retention of Norms Scale, items fifty-four (You are asking for trouble if you try to help everyone who asks for aid) and fifty-nine (For the most part justice is done by the police) resulted in low correlations in relation to the other ten items. The scale was then re-analyzed excluding the two low correlations and the final r correlations presented above are the result. Each item is significant beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. These ten items, therefore, comprise the measurement scale of retention of norms in this study.

TABLE VII
INTERNALIZATION OF RULES SCALE BY ITEMS

Items		Original r Value	Final r Value
		N = 728	
34.	I usually follow rules established by my parents.	.57	.58
27.	I usually follow the rules set up by the school.	.67	.68
70.	I know my parents have expectations of me.	.41	.42
51.	I return from a date at a time my parents have agreed on.	.54	.55
81.*	I sometimes eat candy or drink pop in class.	-.32	-.34
50.*	I am often absent from school.	-.44	-.46
92.	I turn my homework in on time.	.57	.59
45.	I complete assignments given to me by my teacher.	.60	.61
64.*	I sometimes smoke within the school building.	-.50	-.51
22.	I keep my room clean because my parents want me to.	.37	.36
71.	I usually do what my friends expect me to do.	.25	.41
82.	I follow some rules even when I do not believe in them.	.41	
<u>Original Scale</u>		<u>Final Scale</u>	
Mean	4.88	Mean	4.93
Standard Deviation	.92	Standard Deviation	13.80
Possible Range	1-7	Possible Range	1-7

*This is an intentionally reversed item on the questionnaire.

Within the Internalization of Rules Scale, item seventy-one (I usually do what my friends expect me to do) resulted in a low correlation

in relation to the other eleven items. The scale was then re-analyzed excluding the original low correlation and the final r correlations presented above are the result. Each item is significant beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. These eleven items, therefore, comprise the measurement scale of internalization of rules in this study.

TABLE VIII
AVAILABILITY OF MEANINGFUL ROLES SCALE BY ITEMS

Items		Original r Value	Final r Value N = 728
93.	I am consulted in family decisions.	.53	.57
88.	I have a voice in school policies.	.51	.50
73.	I meet requirements for a class office.	.55	.58
62.	I have the skills necessary for school sports or to be a cheerleader.	.48	.57
38.	Part-time jobs are too demanding.	.26	
61.	If I wanted to find a part-time job, I could.	.57	.50
26.	I meet the requirements if I want to go to college.	.51	.60
13.	The school has meaningful activities available to me.	.46	.50
74.	My family offers meaningful roles to me.	.46	.55
41.	My friends consult me when making decisions.	.32	.43
46.	Activities offered by the school require more ability than I have.	.20	
68.	My friends offer meaningful roles to me.	.04	.46
<u>Original Scale</u>		<u>Final Scale</u>	
Mean	4.1	Mean	4.6
Standard Deviation	.73	Standard Deviation	1.05
Possible Range	1-7	Possible Range	1-7

Within the Availability of Meaningful Roles Scale, items thirty-eight (Part-time jobs are too demanding) and forty-six (Activities offered by the school require more ability than I have) resulted in low correlations in relation to the other items. This scale was then re-analyzed, excluding the low correlations, and the final r correlations presented above are the result. Each item is significant beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. These ten items, therefore, comprise the measurement scale of availability of meaningful roles.

TABLE IX
GROUP REINFORCEMENT SCALE BY ITEMS

Items	Original and Final r Value N = 728
83.* I often feel left out.	-.40
10. My parents praise me when I deserve it.	.50
86. People seem to like me.	.58
56. My parents care about my grades.	.45
18. If I am performing publically (in the arts or sports) my parents attend the activity.	.50
33.* Often my parents are too busy to listen to me.	-.47
89. In general, I am supported by the school for my efforts.	.42
9. There are many people who call me their friend.	.48
65. My friends accept me for myself.	.52
53. My friends appreciate my accomplishments.	.55
66. I usually feel accepted by my teachers.	.54
57.* My friends are often too busy to listen to me.	-.45
Original and Final Scale: Mean	5.0
Standard Deviation	.88
Possible Range	1-7

*This is an intentionally reversed item on the questionnaire.

All twelve items in the Group Reinforcement Scale resulted in moderate correlations. Each item is significant beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. All twelve items therefore comprise the measurement scale of group reinforcements in this study.

The third section of the questionnaire (see Appendix) is designed

to measure the respondents self-reported delinquent behavior, as well as the number of companions that were with him at the time of the delinquent act. Respondents were asked, as a self-reporting measure, to respond to the frequency that they may have broken rules. This scale, consisting of the even numerals -- items ninety-four to one hundred and sixteen -- gave the respondents four choices: (1) never __, (2) once or twice __, (3) 3 or 4 times __, (4) 5 or more times __. Table VIII presents the items included (numbered as they appear on the final questionnaire) and the original and final correlation coefficients (r), means, standard deviations and possible ranges.

TABLE X
BROKEN RULES SCALE BY ITEMS

Items	Original and Final r Value N = 728
94. Ever driven a car without a driver's license or permit (do not include driver's training)?	.45
96. Ever drunk beer, wine or liquor?	.60
98. Ever purchased beer, wine or liquor?	.64
100. Ever defied parents authority (for example: running away from home or hitting them)?	.54
102. Ever forged a check?	.52
104. Ever severely "beat up" or assaulted someone?	.64
106. Ever been placed on school probation?	.61
108. Ever vandalized (seriously damaged) property that did not belong to you?	.72 .72
110. Ever taken things (worth less than \$20) that did not belong to you?	.68
112. Ever taken a car without the owner's permission (other than your parents or parents of friends)?	.61
114. Ever taken things (worth \$20 or more) that did not belong to you (do not include automobiles)?	.74
116. Ever buglarized (broken into) a house or a car to take things that did not belong to you?	.73
<u>Original and Final Scale:</u> Mean	1.7
Standard Deviation	.55
Possible Range	1-4

This original scale of Broken Rules resulted in high correlations on all twelve items. Each item is significant beyond the .01 level of

statistical significance. These twelve items, therefore, comprise the measurement scale of broken rules, or the measure of self-reported delinquency.

From the previously listed scales, the regression procedure and correlation coefficients were then decided upon to analyze the data. This procedure and the results in relation to the propositions will be discussed in the following chapter.

Limitations of the Study

The sample in this study is limited because of the effect of the Buckley-Pell Amendment and lack of accessibility to the school systems. Because of this amendment regarding the privacy of students, administrators of high schools were reluctant to allow a researcher to administer a questionnaire concerning delinquency. As a result, for the most part, the sample came from high schools with this writer relying on informal acquaintances (teachers in the classroom) to administer the questionnaire. There was an attempt, however, to maximize the diversity of the respondents by choosing high schools of different demographic characteristics (income, race, etc.). The high school sample, therefore, consists of those students present on a given day and those students in the particular subjects taught by the teacher known by this author. This would limit the generalizability of this study.

The high school sample (N=660) was much larger than the sample from the juvenile institutions (N=68). Therefore, the statistics needed for statistical significance change dramatically. This study, however, attempts to focus on trends, or the extent of a relationship. It is believed that a larger sample among institutionalized respondents would

produce the same patterns found with the smaller sample of respondents.

There also was a loss of eight subjects. Six of the questionnaires were incomplete and could not be analyzed in this particular study. Two of the questionnaires, when keypunched on IBM cards, were spindled and mutilated by the computer card sorter and could not be salvaged. This was, however, a small loss of subjects considering the final sample size ($N=728$).

The instrument employed to gather the data for this study consists of eight original scales. Initially, items were sorted and reduced from approximately thirty items per variable, in an attempt not to duplicate information. Because of the number of variables to be measured (eight), the length of the questionnaire administered to high school students was a consideration in that there would be a possibility of boredom with a long questionnaire or incomplete questionnaires. The scale for each variable, therefore, was limited to twelve items per scale. From these twelve items, it was hoped that ten to twelve items per scale would remain after statistical analysis. In some cases, original items had to be thrown out because of low correlations. The Self Perception Scale, the Frustration Tolerance Scale, the Group Reinforcement and the Self-Reported Delinquency Scale resulted in twelve item scales. The Goal Orientation Scale and the Internalization of Rules Scale lost one item and the Retention of Norms scale and the Availability of Meaningful Roles Scale lost two items each.

When operationalizing the variables in this study and attempting to gather data concerning each variable, it must be remembered that the instrument is measuring the respondents perception of his inner and outer containment. Concerning the subjects outer containment, they were

asked about rules they were given to follow and whether or not they followed these rules. There was no attempt made to contact and observe each subject to verify that rules were actually being followed.

There was also an attempt to measure delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law). Some administrators, especially those of juvenile institutions, seemed to think that these scales were a chance for the respondent to "brag" or exaggerate his past experiences. Again, these measures of delinquency are the respondents perception, or perhaps even a wish fulfillment of reality. It was noticed that several subjects living in institutions did not check the item on the questionnaire: "I have been committed to an institution." Also, in attempting to measure delinquency, there were no items concerning drug use included. These items were not included because of the reluctance of Oklahoma high school officials to have the students possibly implicate themselves in illegal activities. There was also a lack of pretesting of the measurement instrument which lends this study to be one of exploration.

CHAPTER IV

TESTING THE PROPOSITIONS

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three major areas of concern. First, there will be a discussion of the correlations of the seven containers (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) for the total sample, which will show the inter-relatedness of the variables. Second, is a presentation of the means of the seven containers mentioned above and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) for institutionalized and non-institutionalized males and females and for the total sample. Third is a presentation of the propositions, the techniques employed to analyze the data, and the final results of the data in relation to each proposition.

Correlations of the Seven Containers

With Each Other

The propositions in this study imply that all of the seven components of containment theory are related to each other. If all of the variables (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) are related to delinquency, as

containment theory implies, then one may assume a positive correlation to each other. In Table XI, all seven containers are related. All are positively related to each other and are significant beyond the .01 level, with a range from .33 to .65.

TABLE XI
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE SEVEN CONTAINERS
WITH EACH OTHER FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE (N=728*)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Self Perception	--	.39	.48	.33	.37	.47	.62
2. Goal Orientation		--	.39	.65	.55	.49	.47
3. Frustration Tolerance			--	.36	.46	.43	.44
4. Retention of Norms				--	.61	.48	.47
5. Internalization of Rules					--	.47	.45
6. Availability of Meaningful Roles						--	.62
7. Group Reinforcement							--

*An r of .07 is significant at the .05 level.

Means of the Seven Containers and Delinquency

The possible range of scores concerning the elements of inner containment and outer containment is from one to seven, with seven being the most positive response. As literature in the area of delinquency indicates, the non-institutionalized males and the non-institutionalized females score higher on the average than institutionalized males and females in relation to inner and outer containment (self perception,

frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement). Institutionalized males and females score higher on the average regarding delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) than non-institutionalized males and females.

Non-institutionalized females have a higher score on the average than non-institutionalized males in four of the seven containers (see Table XII): goal orientation (males=5.4, females=5.6), retention of norms (males=5.1, females=5.4), internalization of rules (males=4.8, females=5.2) and group reinforcement (males=5.0, females=5.1). Frustration tolerance (4.5) and availability of meaningful roles (4.7) is the same for both sexes. Non-institutionalized males are slightly higher on self perception (males=5.2, females=5.1). And as related literature indicates, the non-institutionalized males are more delinquent than non-institutionalized females: self-reported delinquency (males=1.8, females=1.5), and official involvement with the law (males=2.1, females=1.4).

Among male and female institutionalized respondents females score higher on the average in six of the seven containment elements: self perception (males=4.8, females=5.1), goal orientation (males=5.2, females=5.1), internalization of rules (males=4.2, females=4.3), availability of meaningful roles (males=4.3, females=4.6), group reinforcement (males=4.7, females=5.0). Institutionalized males score slightly higher on the average (4.2) than females (4.1) concerning frustration tolerance. Again, males are more delinquent than females: self-reported delinquency (males=2.6, females=2.2) and official involvement with the law (males=5.7, females=5.5).

Non-institutionalized females score higher on the average than institutionalized females on six of the seven containers (see Table XII): frustration tolerance (non-institutionalized females=4.5, institutionalized females=4.1), goal orientation (non-institutionalized females=5.6, institutionalized females=5.5), retention of norms (non-institutionalized females=5.4, institutionalized females=5.1), internalization of rules (non-institutionalized females=5.2, institutionalized females=4.3), availability of meaningful roles (non-institutionalized females=4.7, institutionalized females=4.6), group reinforcement (non-institutionalized females=5.1, institutionalized females=5.0). Self perception is the same on the average for both groups (5.1). Institutionalized females score higher on the average concerning delinquency: self-report delinquency (non-institutionalized females=1.5, institutionalized females=2.2) and official involvement with the law (non-institutionalized females=1.4, institutionalized females=5.5).

Non-institutionalized males score higher on the average than institutionalized males on all seven elements of containment theory: self perception (non-institutionalized males=5.2, institutionalized males=4.8), frustration tolerance (non-institutionalized males=4.5, institutionalized males=4.2), goal orientation (non-institutionalized males=5.4, institutionalized males=5.2), retention of norms (non-institutionalized males=5.1, institutionalized males=5.0), internalization of rules (non institutionalized males=4.8, institutionalized males=4.2), availability of meaningful roles (non-institutionalized males=4.7, institutionalized males=4.3), group reinforcement (non-institutionalized males=5.0, institutionalized males=4.7). Institutionalized males score higher on the average than non-institutionalized males concerning

delinquency: self-reported delinquency (non-institutionalized males=1.8, institutionalized males=2.6) and official involvement with the law (non-institutionalized males=2.1, institutionalized males=5.7).

In summary, the means are similar for all groups. However, non-institutionalized respondents have slightly higher means than institutionalized respondents when the seven containers are considered. The institutionalized respondents however, have somewhat higher scores in the areas of both self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law. Females tend to score higher than males on the seven containers, while males score higher in the area of delinquency than females.

TABLE XII
MEANS OF THE SEVEN CONTAINERS AND DELINQUENCY FOR
INSTITUTIONALIZED AND NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED
MALES AND FEMALES

	Non-Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Self Perception	5.2	5.1	4.8	5.1	5.1
Frustration Tolerance	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.1	4.4
Goal Orientation	5.4	5.6	5.2	5.5	5.5
Retention of Norms	5.1	5.4	5.0	5.1	5.2
Internalization of Rules	4.8	5.2	4.2	4.3	4.9
Availability of Meaningful Roles	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.7
Group Reinforcement	5.0	5.1	4.7	5.0	5.0
Self-Reported Delinquency	1.8	1.5	2.6	2.2	1.7
Official Involvement with the Law	2.1	1.4	5.7	5.5	2.1

Propositions

To analyze the five propositions in this particular study, two specific techniques were chosen. Propositions one and three are analyzed with the results of the CORR PROCEDURE from the Statistical Analysis System. The CORR PROCEDURE [Barr and Goodnight, 1972:208] results in univariate descriptive statistics and product-moment correlation coefficients.

Propositions two, four and five are analyzed using the STEPWISE PROCEDURE, also from the Statistical Analysis System. This procedure is a multiple regression procedure. According to Barr and Goodnight [1972:127], the stepwise procedure can "find which variables of a collection of independent variables should most likely be included in a regression model." This technique may provide one with insights concerning the relative strengths of the relationships between independent variables and a dependent variable. The basic idea of this particular technique [Draper and Smith, 1967:180] is to perform a regression with several variables as a series of straight line regressions. This procedure was chosen because the purpose of this study is to determine which variable in inner containment, and outer containment, and both combined will be the best predictor of delinquency. When the best predictor is then known, each variable will be added separately determining which combination of variables is the best predictor of delinquency. The calculated value of R^2 [Draper and Smith, 1967:220] explains the percentage of variation about the mean in the data. The standardized B value is the standardized weight given to the variable in a regression equation to predict the standardized delinquency value.

The findings relevant to the propositions will be presented. All interpretations and conclusions will be included in the final chapter (Chapter VI). Data for each of the propositions will be considered in five separate categories: the total sample, non-institutionalized males, non-institutionalized females, institutionalized males, and institutionalized females.

P_1 : There will be a negative correlation between the components of inner containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation and retention of norms) and delinquency (self-report and official involvement with the law).

Considering the total sample ($N=728$), for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the four components of inner containment (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms), all correlations are negative; i.e., the higher the score on the containment variable, the lower the score on delinquency. With an N of 728, an r of .07 is significant at the .05 level. All correlations are negative and statistically significant except one (official involvement with the law and frustration tolerance equal $-.05$). The relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms and self-reported delinquency for the total sample are: $-.14$, $-.27$, $-.19$, $-.38$ (see Table XIII). And the relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, and official involvement with the law for the total sample are: $-.08$, 0.14 , 0.05 , 0.24 (see Table XIII).

Regarding non-institutionalized males ($N=282$), for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the four components of inner containment (self perception, goal orientation,

frustration tolerance, retention of norms), all correlations are negative. With an N of 282, an r of .12 is significant at the .05 level. Again, all correlations are negative and statistically significant, except one (official involvement with the law and frustration tolerance equal $-.06$). The relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, and retention of norms are: $-.22$, $-.29$, $-.21$, $-.34$ (see Table XIII). And the relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, and retention of norms, and official involvement with the law for non-institutionalized males are: $-.12$, $-.16$, $-.06$, and $-.28$.

When non-institutionalized females are considered ($N=374$) for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the four components of inner containment (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms), all correlations are negative. With an N of 374, an r of .10 is significant at the .05 level. All correlations are negative and statistically significant, except one (official involvement with the law and frustration tolerance equals $.00$). The relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, and retention of norms and self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized females are: $-.12$, $-.21$, $-.15$, and $-.36$ (see Table XIII). And the relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, and retention of norms and official involvement with the law for non-institutionalized females are: $-.11$, $-.13$, $.00$, and $-.19$.

When institutionalized males are considered ($N=39$), for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the four components of inner containment (self-perception, goal orientation,

frustration tolerance, retention of norms), all correlations are negative. With an N of 39, an r of .31 is significant at the .05 level. Only two of the relationships are statistically significant (self-reported delinquency and frustration tolerance equal $-.44$ and self-reported delinquency and retention of norms equals $-.39$). The relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms and self-reported delinquency for institutionalized males are: $-.11$, $-.29$, $-.44$, $-.39$. The relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms and official involvement with the law for institutionalized males are: $-.05$, $-.06$, $-.17$, $-.06$.

Concerning institutionalized females (N=29), for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the four components of inner containment (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms), all correlations are negative. With an N of 29, an r of .36 is significant at the .05 level. Only one relationship, however is statistically significant (self-reported delinquency and frustration tolerance). The relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms and self-reported delinquency for institutionalized females are: $-.18$, $-.23$, $-.44$, $-.33$ (see Table XIII). The relationships between self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms and official involvement with the law for institutionalized females are: $-.00$, $-.09$, $-.11$, $-.33$.

P₂: The components of inner containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation and retention of norms) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

TABLE XIII

CORRELATIONS OF COMPONENTS OF INNER CONTAINMENT WITH DELINQUENCY
(SELF-REPORTED AND OFFICIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW)

	Non-Institutionalized				Institutionalized				Total	
	Males (N=282)*		Females (N=374)*		Males (N=39)*		Females (N=29)*		(N=728)*	
	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law
Self Perception	-.22	-.12	-.12	-.11	-.11	-.05	-.18	-.06	-.14	-.18
Goal Orientation	-.29	-.16	-.21	-.13	-.29	-.06	-.23	-.09	-.27	-.14
Frustration Tolerance	-.21	-.06	-.15	.00	-.44	-.17	-.44	-.11	-.19	-.05
Retention of Norms	-.34	-.28	-.36	-.19	-.39	-.06	-.33	-.33	-.38	-.24

* With an N of 282, an r of .12 is significant at the .05 level.
 With an N of 374, an r of .10 is significant at the .05 level.
 With an N of 39, an r of .31 is significant at the .05 level.
 With an N of 29, an r of .36 is significant at the .05 level.
 With an N of 728, an r of .07 is significant at the .05 level.

Concerning the total sample (N=728), with inner containment and self-reported delinquency, retention of norms explains .142 of the variation. The other three variables (self-perception, goal orientation and frustration tolerance) do not add to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for the total sample is retention of norms and is weighted by a $-.38$ B value. All four variables added together explain .145 of the variation (see Table XIV).* Self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms are weighted by: $.02$, $-.03$, $-.06$, $-.34$ for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. All four variables together, however, hardly account for more variation (.145) than retention of norms (.142) by itself.

In relation to non-institutionalized males (N=282), with inner containment and self-reported delinquency, retention of norms explains .114 of the variation (see Table XIV). The other variables (self perception and frustration tolerance) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized males is retention of norms, and is weighted by a $-.25$ B value. When goal orientation is added to retention of norms, .125 of the variation is explained and goal orientation is weighted by a $-.14$ B value. All four variables added together explain .131 of the variation. Self

* Note: Because of the amount of information in the table and the length of the variable names, for all regression tables the following terms will designate the seven variables of containment theory:

SELFPER - self perception
 GOALOR - goal orientation
 FRUSTOL - frustration tolerance
 RETNORM - retention of norms
 INTRULE - internalization of rules
 AVAILMR - availability of meaningful roles
 GROUPRE - group reinforcement

TABLE XIV

RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS AMONG INNER CONTAINMENT AND SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

Significant inner containment variables with R^2 .

Non-Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
Males (N=282)	Females (N=374)	Males (N=39)	Females (N=29)	(N=728)
RETNORM (.114)	RETNORM (.136)	FRUSTOL (.190)	FRUSTOL (.191)	RETNORM (.142)
GOALOR, RETNORM (.125)	GOALOR, RETNORM (.136)	FRUSTOL, RETNORM (.250)	FRUSTOL, RETNORM (.259)	FRUSTOL, RETNORM (.145)
SELFPER, GOALOR, RETNORM (.129)	SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RETNORM	SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RETNORM	SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RETNORM	SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RETNORM
SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RETNORM (.131)	(.140)	(.264)	(.262)	(.145)

Best prediction of self-reported delinquency and inner containment variable with standardized B value.

RETNORM (-.25)	RETNORM (-.37)	FRUSTOL (-.34)	FRUSTOL (-.44)	RETNORM (-.38)
GOALOR (-.14)		RETNORM (-.26)		

Total prediction of self-reported delinquency with the four components of inner containment with standardized B values.

SELFPER (-.06)	(.02)	(.15)	(.00)	(.02)
GOALOR (-.09)	(.09)	(-.06)	(-.06)	(-.03)
FRUSTOL (-.06)	(-.03)	(-.40)	(-.39)	(-.06)
RETNORM (-.23)	(-.42)	(-.24)	(-.23)	(-.34)

perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, and retention of norms are weighted by: $-.06$, $-.09$, $-.06$, $-.25$ for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. All four variables added together, however, hardly account for more variation (.131) than retention of norms (.114) or goal orientation added to retention of norms (.125).

Regarding non-institutionalized females ($N=374$) with inner containment and self-reported delinquency, retention of norms explains .136 of the variation (see Table XIV). The other three variables (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized females is retention of norms, and is weighted by a $-.37$ B value. All four variables added together explain .140 of the variation. Self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms are weighted by: $.02$, $.09$, $-.03$, $-.42$ for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. All four variables together, however, hardly account for more variation (.140) than retention of norms (.136) by itself.

Considering institutionalized males ($N=39$) with inner containment and self-reported delinquency, frustration tolerance explains .190 of the variation. When retention of norms is added to frustration tolerance .250 of the variation is explained. The other variables (self perception and goal orientation) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for institutionalized males is frustration tolerance with retention of norms added (.250). Frustration tolerance is weighted by a $-.34$ B value and retention of norms is weighted by a $-.26$ B value. All four variables added together explain .264 of the variation. Self perception, goal orientation, frustration

tolerance and retention of norms are weighted by: .15, -.06, -.40, -.24 for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. The two variables of self perception and goal orientation added to frustration tolerance and retention of norms, however, hardly account for more variation (.264) than frustration tolerance and retention of norms together (.250).

Concerning institutionalized females (N=29) with inner containment and self-reported delinquency frustration tolerance explains .191 of the variation. When retention of norms is added to frustration tolerance .259 of the variation is explained. The other variables (self perception and goal orientation) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for institutionalized females is frustration tolerance with retention of norms added (.259). Frustration tolerance is weighted by a -.44 B value. All four variables added together explain .262 of the variation. Self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms are weighted by: .00, -.06, -.39 and -.23 for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. The two variables of self perception and goal orientation added to frustration tolerance and retention of norms, however, hardly account for more variation .262 than frustration tolerance and retention of norms together, .259.

Concerning the total sample (N=728) with inner containment and official involvement with the law, retention of norms explains .057 of the variation. The other three variables (self perception, goal orientation and frustration tolerance) do not add to the explanation. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for the total sample is retention of norms and is weighted by a -.24 B value. All four variables added together explain .058 of the variation. Self perception, goal

orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms are weighted by: $-.03$, $.02$, $.04$ and $-.26$ for a total prediction of official involvement with the law. All four variables together, however, hardly account for more variation ($.058$) than retention of norms ($.057$) by itself.

In relation to non-institutionalized males ($N=282$) with inner containment and official involvement with the law, retention of norms (see Table XV) explains $.077$ of the variation. The other variables (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for non-institutionalized males is retention of norms, and is weighted by a $-.28$ B value. All four variables added together explain $.080$ of the variation. Self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms are weighted by: $-.02$, $.00$, $.06$, $-.30$ for a total prediction of official involvement with the law. All four variables added together, however, hardly account for more variation ($.080$) than retention of norms ($.077$) by itself.

Concerning non-institutionalized females ($N=29$), with inner containment and official involvement with the law, retention of norms explains $.037$ of the variation (see Table XV). When frustration tolerance is added to retention of norms, $.045$ of the variation is explained. And when self perception is added to those two variables, $.0541$ of the variation is explained. All four variables added together explain $.0543$ of the variation for non-institutionalized females. Retention of norms, however, is the best predictor and is weighted by a $-.21$ B value. For a total prediction of official involvement with the law, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms are weighted: $-.11$, $-.01$, $.15$ and $-.20$.

TABLE XV

RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS AMONG INNER CONTAINMENT AND OFFICIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW

Significant inner containment variables with R^2 .

Non-Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
Males (N=282)	Females (N=374)	Males (N=39)	Females (N=29)	(N=728)
RET NORM (.077) SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RET NORM (.080)	RET NORM (.037) FRUSTOL, RET NORM (.045) SELFPER, FRUSTOL, RET NORM (.0541) SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RET NORM (.0543)	FRUSTOL (.027) SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RET NORM (.061)	RET NORM (.105) SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RET NORM (.136)	RET NORM (.057) SELFPER, GOALOR, FRUSTOL, RET NORM (.058)

Best prediction of official involvement with the law and inner containment variable with standardized B value.

RET NORM (-.28)	RET NORM (-.21) FRUSTOL (.15) SELFPER (-.12)	FRUSTOL (-.17)	RET NORM (-.33)	RET NORM (-.24)
-----------------	--	----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Total prediction of official involvement with the law with the four components of inner containment with standardized B values.

SELFPER (-.02)	(-.11)	(.11)	(-.02)	(-.03)
GOALOR (.00)	(-.01)	(.16)	(.05)	(.02)
FRUSTOL (.06)	(.15)	(-.24)	(.18)	(.04)
RET NORM (-.30)	(-.20)	(-.10)	(-.38)	(-.26)

Considering institutionalized males, with inner containment and official involvement with the law, frustration tolerance explains .03 of the variation (see Table XV). The other three variables (self perception, goal orientation and retention of norms) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for institutionalized males is frustration tolerance and is weighted by a $-.17$ B value. All four variables added together explain .06 of the variation. Self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms are weighted by: .11, .16, $-.24$ and $-.10$ for a total prediction of official involvement with the law. All four variables together, however, hardly account for more variation (.06) than frustration tolerance (.03) by itself.

Regarding institutionalized females, with inner containment and official involvement with the law, retention of norms explains .11 of the variation (see Table XV). The other three variables (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance) do not significantly add to the explanation. The best prediction of official involvement with the law for institutionalized females retention of norms and is weighted by a $-.33$ B value. All four variables added together explain .14 of the variation. Self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms are weighted by: $-.02$, .05, .18, $-.38$ for a total prediction of official involvement with the law. All four variables together, however, hardly account for more variation (.14) than retention of norms (.11) by itself.

P₃: There will be a negative correlation between the components of outer containment (conformity to, or internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) and delinquency (self-

reported and official involvement with the law).

Considering the total sample ($N=728$), for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the three components of outer containment (internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement), all correlations are negative; i.e., the higher the score on the containment variable, the lower the score on delinquency. With an N of 728, an r of .07 is significant at the .05 level. All correlations, therefore, are negative and statistically significant. The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and self-reported delinquency for the total sample are: $-.51$, $-.20$, $-.18$. The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and official involvement with the law for the total sample are: $-.36$, $-.18$, $-.12$.

Regarding non-institutionalized males ($N=282$), for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the three components of outer containment (internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement), all correlations are negative. With an N of 282, an r of .12 is significant at the .05 level. All of the relationships are statistically significant. The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized males are: $-.42$, $-.19$, $-.21$. The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and official involvement with the law for non-institutionalized males are: $-.29$, $-.23$, $-.18$.

When non-institutionalized females are considered ($N=374$), for

delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the three components of outer containment (internalization of rules, availability of meaningful role, and group reinforcement) all correlations are negative. With an N of 374, an r of .10 is significant at the .05 level. All of the relationships are statistically significant except two (self-reported delinquency and group reinforcement equal $-.12$ and official involvement with the law and group reinforcement equal $-.08$). The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized females are: $-.46$, $-.20$, $-.12$. The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and official involvement with the law are: $-.27$, $-.19$, $-.08$.

Concerning institutionalized males ($N=39$), for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the three components of outer containment (internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement), all correlations are negative. With an N of 39, an r of .31 is significant at the .05 level. Only one of the relationships, however, is statistically significant (self-reported delinquency and internalization of rules equals $-.49$). The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and self-reported delinquency for institutionalized males are: $-.49$, $-.21$, $-.24$ (see Table XVI). The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and official involvement with the law for institutionalized males are: $-.01$, $-.04$, $-.03$.

TABLE XVI

CORRELATIONS OF THE COMPONENTS OF OUTER CONTAINMENT WITH DELINQUENCY
(SELF-REPORTED AND OFFICIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW)

	Non-Institutionalized				Institutionalized				Total	
	Males (N=282)		Females (N=374)		Males (N=39)		Females (N=29)		(N=728)	
	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law	Self-reported delinquency	Official involvement w/ the law
Internal-ization of Rules	-.42	-.29	-.46	-.27	-.49	-.01	-.55	-.39	-.51	-.36
Availability of Meaningful Roles	-.19	-.23	-.20	-.19	-.21	-.04	-.16	-.06	-.20	-.18
Group Reinforcement	-.21	-.18	-.12	-.08	-.24	-.03	-.25	-.11	-.18	-.12

* With an N of 282, an r of .12 is significant at the .05 level.
 With an N of 374, an r of .10 is significant at the .05 level.
 With an N of 39, an r of .31 is significant at the .05 level.
 With an N of 29, an r of .36 is significant at the .05 level.
 With an N of 728, an r of .07 is significant at the .05 level.

When institutionalized females (N=29) are considered, for delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) and the three components of outer containment (internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement) all correlations are negative. With an N of 29, an r of .36 is significant at the .05 level. Two of the relationships are statistically significant (self-reported delinquency and internalization of rules equals .51 and official involvement with the law and internalization of rules equals -.36). The relationships between internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement and self-reported delinquency for institutionalized females are: -.39, -.06, -.11 (see Table XVI).

P₄: The components of outer containment (conformity to or internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

Concerning the total sample (N=728) with outer containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains .264 of the variation. The other two variables (availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) do not add to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for the total sample is internalization of rules and is weighted by a -.51 B value. All three variables added together explain .267 of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: -.54, .04, .03 for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. All three variables together, however, hardly account for more variation (.267) than internalization of rules (.264) by itself.

In relation to non-institutionalized males (N=282) with outer

containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains .176 of the variation (see Table XVII). The other variables (availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized males is internalization of rules, and is weighted by a $-.42$ B value. All three variables added together explain .178 of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $-.43$, $.06$, $.04$ for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. All three variables together, however, hardly account for more variation (.78) than internalization of rules (.176) by itself.

Concerning non-institutionalized females ($N=29$), with outer containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains .226 of the variation (see Table XVII). The other two variables (availability of rules and group reinforcement) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized females is internalization of rules and is weighted by a $-.51$ B value. All three variables added together explain .233 of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $-.50$, $.03$, $.10$ for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. All three variables together, however, hardly account for more variation (.233) than internalization of rules (.226) by itself.

Considering institutionalized males ($N=39$), with outer containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains .242 of the variation. The other two variables (availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) do not add significantly to the

TABLE XVII

RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS AMONG OUTER CONTAINMENT AND SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

<u>Significant outer containment variables with R².</u>				
Non-Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
Males (N=282)	Females (N=374)	Males (N=39)	Females (N=29)	(N=728)
INTRULE (.176)	INTRULE (.226)	INTRULE (.242)	INTRULE (.302)	INTRULE (.264)
INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPE (.178)	INTRULE, GROUPE (.232)	INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPE (.249)	INTRULE, GROUPE (.342)	INTRULE, AVAILMR (.266)
	INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPE (.233)		INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPE (.350)	INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPE (.267)
<u>Best prediction of self-reported delinquency and outer containment variable with standardized B value.</u>				
INTRULE (-.42)	INTRULE (-.51)	INTRULE (-.50)	INTRULE (-.55)	INTRULE (-.51)
<u>Total prediction of self-reported delinquency with the three components of outer containment with standardized B values.</u>				
INTRULE (-.43)	(-.50)	(-.51)	(-.55)	(-.54)
AVAILMR (.06)	(.03)	(.10)	(.13)	(.04)
GROUPE (.04)	(.10)	(.08)	(-.28)	(.03)

explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for institutionalized males is internalization of rules and is weighted by a $-.50$ B value. All three variables added together explain $.249$ of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted: $-.51$, $.10$, $.08$ for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. All three variables together, however, hardly account for more variation ($.249$) than internalization of rules ($.242$) by itself.

Regarding institutionalized females ($N=29$), with outer containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains $.302$ of the variation (see Table XVII). The other two variables (availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for institutionalized females is internalization of rules and is weighted by a $-.55$ B value. All three variables added together explain $.350$ of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $-.55$, $.13$, $-.28$ for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency. All three variables together, however, hardly account for more variation ($.350$) than internalization of rules ($.302$) by itself.

Concerning the total sample ($N=728$) with outer containment and official involvement with the law, internalization of rules explains $.127$ of the variation. The other two variables (availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) do not add to the explanation. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for the total sample is internalization of rules and is weighted by a $-.36$ B value. All three variables added together explain $.131$ of the variation. Internalization

of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted: $-.36$, $.07$, $-.06$ for a total prediction of official involvement with the law. All three variables together, however, hardly account for more variation ($.131$) than internalization of rules ($.127$) by itself.

In relation to non-institutionalized males ($N=282$) with outer containment and official involvement with the law (see Table XVIII) internalization of rules explains $.081$ of the variation. The other two variables (availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for non-institutionalized males is internalization of rules, and is weighted by a $-.23$ B value. All three variables added together explain $.093$ of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $-.23$, $-.12$, $.00$ for a total prediction of official involvement with the law. All three variables added together, however, hardly account for more variation ($.093$) than internalization of rules ($.081$) by itself.

Concerning non-institutionalized females ($N=29$), with outer containment and official involvement with the law, internalization of rules explains $.073$ of the variation (see Table XVIII). The other two variables (availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for non-institutionalized females is internalization of rules, and is weighted by a $-.27$ B value. All three variables added together explain $.085$ of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement are weighted by: $-.25$, $-.14$, $.11$ for a total prediction of official involvement with the law.

TABLE XVIII

RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS AMONG OUTER CONTAINMENT AND OFFICIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW

Significant outer containment variables with R^2 .

Non-Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
Males (N=282)	Females (N=374)	Males (N=39)	Females (N=29)	(N=728)
INTRULE (.081)	INTRULE (.073)	No variables were significant	INTRULE (.150)	INTRULE (.127)
INTRULE, AVAILMR (.092)	INTRULE, AVAILMR (.078)		INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPRE (.163)	INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPRE (.131)
INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPRE (.093)	INTRULE, AVAILMR, GROUPRE (.085)			

Best prediction of official involvement with the law and outer containment variable with standardized B value.

INTRULE (-.23)	INTRULE (-.27)	No variables were significant	INTRULE (-.39)	INTRULE (-.36)
----------------	----------------	-------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Total prediction of official involvement with the law with the three components of outer containment with standardized B values.

INTRULE (-.23)	(-.25)	(.04)	(-.39)	(-.36)
AVAILMR (-.12)	(-.14)	(-.04)	(.12)	(.07)
GROUPRE (.00)	(.11)	(.02)	(.15)	(-.06)

All three variables together, however, hardly account for more variation (.085) than internalization of rules (.073) by itself.

Considering institutionalized males (N=39), with outer containment and official involvement with the law (see Table XVIII), no variable is found to be significant to explain the variation. Therefore, there is no one best predictor of official involvement with the law and institutionalized males in relation to outer containment. All three variables added together explain .002 of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: .04, -.04, and .02 for a total prediction of official involvement with the law.

In relation to institutionalized females (N=29), with outer containment and official involvement with the law (see Table XVIII), internalization of rules explains .150 of the variation. The other two variables (availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) do not add significantly to the explanation. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for institutionalized females is internalization of rules, and is weighted by -.39 B value. All three variables added together explain .163 of the variation. Internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: -.39, .12 and .15 for a total prediction of official involvement with the law. All three variables added together, however, hardly account for more variation (.163) than internalization of rules (.150) by itself.

P₅: The components of both inner containment and outer containment (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and

group reinforcement) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

Concerning the total sample (N=728) with both inner containment and outer containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains .265 of the variation (see Table XIX). When retention of norms is added to internalization of rules, .272 of the variation is explained and when availability of meaningful roles is added to the first two variables, .277 of the variation is explained. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for the total sample when all seven containers are considered is a three variable predictor: internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement which are weighted by $-.47$, $-.13$, $.09$ B values. All seven variables added together explain .281 of the variation for a total prediction of self-reported delinquency, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $.26$, $.05$, $.02$, $-.16$, $-.50$, $.05$, $.02$. The seven variables of containment theory however hardly account for more variation (.281) than the three variables of internalization of rules, retention of norms, availability of meaningful roles (.277).

Regarding non-institutionalized males (N=282), with both inner containment and outer containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains .176 of the variation (see Table XIX). When retention of norms is added to internalization of rules, .184 of the variation is explained. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized males when all seven containers are considered is a two variable predictor: internalization of rules and retention of

TABLE XIX

RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS AMONG BOTH INNER CONTAINMENT AND OUTER CONTAINMENT
AND SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

Significant inner and outer containment variables with R^2 .				
Non-Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
Males (N=282)	Females (N=374)	Males (N=39)	Females (N=29)	(N=728)
INTRULE (.176)	INTRULE (.227)	INTRULE (.243)	INTRULE (.302)	INTRULE (.265)
RETNORM, INTRULE (.184)	RETNORM, INTRULE (.242)	FRUSTOL, INTRULE (.285)	FRUSTOL, INTRULE (.370)	RETNORM, INTRULE (.272)
RETNORM, INTRULE, AVAILMR (.188)	GOALOR, RETNORM, INTRULE (.258)	ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.363)	ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.427)	RETNORM, INTRULE, AVAILMR (.277)
ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.195)	ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.269)			ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.281)
Best prediction of self-reported delinquency and inner and outer containment variables with standardized B values.				
INTRULE (-.34)	INTRULE (-.45)	INTRULE (-.49)	INTRULE (-.45)	INTRULE (-.47)
RETNORM (-.12)	RETNORM (-.28)		FRUSTOL (-.28)	RETNORM (-.13)
	GOALOR (.15)			AVAILMR (-.09)
Total prediction of self-reported delinquency with the seven components of containment theory with standardized B values.				
SELFPER (-.08)	(.00)	(.29)	(.08)	(.26)
GOALOR (-.06)	(.16)	(.03)	(-.05)	(.05)
FRUSTOL (.00)	(.03)	(-.27)	(-.33)	(.02)
RETNORM (-.11)	(-.28)	(-.17)	(-.10)	(-.16)
INTRULE (-.35)	(-.45)	(-.41)	(-.39)	(-.50)
AVAILMR (.10)	(.00)	(.04)	(.29)	(.05)
GROUPRE (.04)	(.10)	(-.11)	(-.33)	(.02)

norms which are weighted by $-.34$ and $-.12$ B values. All seven containers added together explain $.195$ of the variation. For a total prediction of self-reported delinquency, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $-.08$, $-.06$, $.00$, $-.11$, $-.35$, $.10$, $.04$. The seven variables of containment theory, however, hardly account for more variation ($.195$) than the variables of internalization of rules and retention of norms ($.184$).

In relation to non-institutionalized females ($N=374$), with both inner containment and outer containment and self-reported delinquency internalization of rules explains $.227$ of the variation (see Table XIX). When retention of norms is added to internalization of rules, $.242$ of the variation is explained and when goal orientation is added to the first two, $.258$ of the variation is explained. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for non-institutionalized females when the seven containers are considered is a three variable predictor: internalization of rules, retention of norms, and goal orientation which are weighted by $-.45$, $-.28$, $.15$ B values. All seven containers added together explain $.269$ of the variation. For a total prediction of self-reported delinquency, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement are weighted by: $.00$, $.16$, $.03$, $-.28$, $-.45$, $.00$ and $.10$. The seven variables of containment theory however, hardly account for more variation ($.269$) than the three variables internalization of rules, retention of norms and goal orientation ($.258$).

In relation to institutionalized males ($N=39$), with both inner

containment and outer containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains .243 of the variation (see Table XIX). When frustration tolerance is added to internalization of rules, .285 of the variation is explained. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for institutionalized males when the seven containers are considered is a two variable predictor: internalization of rules and frustration tolerance which are weighted by $-.49$ and $-.28$ B values. All seven containers added together explain .363 of the variation. For a total prediction of self-reported delinquency, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, and group reinforcement are weighted by: $.29$, $.03$, $-.27$, $-.17$, $-.41$, $.04$, $-.11$. The seven variables of containment theory however, hardly account for more variation (.363) than the two internalization of rules and frustration tolerance (.285).

In relation to institutionalized females ($N=29$), with both inner and outer containment and self-reported delinquency, internalization of rules explains .302 of the variation (see Table XIX). When frustration tolerance is added to internalization of rules, .370 of the variation is explained. The best predictor of self-reported delinquency for institutionalized females when the seven containers are considered is a two variable predictor: internalization of rules and frustration tolerance which are weighted by $-.45$ and $-.28$ B values. All seven containers added together explain .427 of the variation. For a total prediction of self-reported delinquency, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $.08$, $-.05$, $-.33$, $-.10$, $-.39$, $.29$, $-.33$. The seven variables of containment theory,

however, hardly account for more variation (.427) than the two variables internalization of rules and frustration tolerance (.370).

Concerning the total sample (N=728), with both inner containment and outer containment and official involvement with the law, internalization of rules explains .128 of the variation (see Table XX). When frustration tolerance is added to internalization of rules, .142 of the variation is explained. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for the total sample when all seven containers are considered is a two variable predictor: internalization of rules and frustration tolerance which are weighted by: $-.41$ and $.13$ B values. All seven variables added together explain .152 of the variation. For a total prediction of official involvement with the law, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $.00$, $.10$, $.13$, $-.09$, $-.39$, $-.09$, $.04$. The seven variables of containment theory, however, hardly account for more variation (.152) than internalization of rules and frustration tolerance (.142).

Regarding non-institutionalized males (N=282), with both inner and outer containment and official involvement with the law, internalization of rules explains .082 of the variation (see Table XX). When retention of norms is added to internalization of rules, .097 of the variation is explained and when frustration tolerance is added to the first two variables, .107 of the variation is explained. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for non-institutionalized males is a three variable predictor: internalization of rules, retention of norms, and frustration tolerance, which are weighted by $-.20$, $-.15$ and $.14$ B values. All seven containers added together explain .121 of the variation. For

TABLE XX

RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS AMONG BOTH INNER CONTAINMENT AND OUTER CONTAINMENT
AND OFFICIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAWSignificant inner and outer containment variables with R^2 .

Non-Institutionalized		Institutionalized		Total
Males (N=282)	Females (N=374)	Males (N=39)	Females (N=29)	(N=728)
INTRULE (.082)	INTRULE (.073)	FRUSTOL (.027)	INTRULE (.151)	INTRULE (.128)
RETNORM, INTRULE (.097)	FRUSTOL, INTRULE (.094)	ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.063)	FRUSTOL, INTRULE (.222)	FRUSTOL, INTRULE (.142)
FRUSTOL, RETNORM, INTRULE (.107)	FRUSTOL, INTRULE, AVAILMR (.109)		ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.278)	ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.152)
ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.121)	ALL SEVEN VARIABLES (.120)			

Best predictor of official involvement with the law and inner and outer containment variables with
standardized B values.

INTRULE (-.20)	INTRULE (-.29)	FRUSTOL (-.17)	INTRULE (-.39)	INTRULE (-.41)
RETNORM (-.15)	FRUSTOL (.21)			FRUSTOL (.13)
FRUSTOL (.14)	AVAILMR (-.15)			

Total prediction of official involvement with the law with the seven components of containment theory with
standardized B values.

SELFPER (.02)	(-.10)	(.11)	(.08)	(.00)
GOALOR (.08)	(.06)	(.17)	(.42)	(.10)
FRUSTOL (.13)	(.21)	(-.25)	(.31)	(.13)
RETNORM (-.18)	(-.07)	(-.10)	(-.18)	(-.09)
INTRULE (-.21)	(-.29)	(.04)	(-.41)	(-.39)
AVAILMR (-.15)	(-.17)	(-.05)	(.04)	(-.09)
GROUPRE (.00)	(.11)	(.03)	(-.25)	(.04)

a total prediction of official involvement with the law, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: .02, .08, .13, -.18, -.21, -.15, .00. The seven variables of containment theory, however, hardly account for more variation (.121) than the three variables of internalization of rules, retention of norms and frustration tolerance (.107).

In relation to non-institutionalized females (N=29), with both inner and outer containment and official involvement with the law, internalization of rules explains .073 of the variation (see Table XX). When frustration tolerance is added to internalization of rules, .094 of the variation is explained and when availability of meaningful roles is added to the first two, .109 of the variation is explained. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for non-institutionalized females when the seven containers are considered is a three variable predictor: internalization of rules, frustration tolerance, and availability of meaningful roles which are weighted by: -.29, .21, -.15 B values. All seven containers added together explain .120 of the variation. For a total prediction of official involvement with the law, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: -.10, .06, .21, -.07, -.29, -.17, .11. The seven variables of containment theory, however, hardly account for more variation (.120) than the three variables internalization of rules, frustration tolerance, and availability of meaningful roles (.109).

In relation to institutionalized males (N=39), with both inner and outer containment and official involvement with the law, frustration

tolerance explains .027 of the variation. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for institutionalized males when the seven containers are considered is frustration tolerance which is weighted by $-.17$ B value. All seven containers added together explain .063 of the variation. For a total prediction of official involvement with the law, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement are weighted by: $.11$, $.17$, $-.25$, $-.10$, $.04$, $-.05$, $.03$. The seven variables of containment theory, however, hardly account for more variation (.063) than frustration tolerance (.027).

In relation to institutionalized females ($N=29$), with both inner and outer containment and official involvement with the law, internalization of rules explains .151 of the variation. When frustration tolerance is added to internalization of rules, .222 of the variation is explained. The best predictor of official involvement with the law for institutionalized females when the seven containers are considered is a two variable predictor: internalization of rules and frustration tolerance which are weighted by a $-.39$ B value. All seven containers added together explain .278 of the variation. For a total prediction of official involvement with the law, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles, group reinforcement are weighted by: $.08$, $.42$, $.31$, $-.18$, $-.41$, $.04$, $-.25$. The seven variables of containment theory, however, hardly account for more variation (.278) than internalization of rules and frustration tolerance (.222).

CHAPTER V

FURTHER EXPLORATIONS

Introduction

The majority of research and literature in the area of delinquency has concentrated on the area of self concept or self perception. This study has been an attempt to broaden the research emphasis to include measurement of dependent variables such as frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement and independent variables of sex and self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law. The propositions in this study, however, have limited analysis of data to specific independent-dependent variable relationships. Other data was also collected by the questionnaire concerning demographic characteristics of the respondent. In addition to the items employed specifically for testing the propositions in this study (sex of the respondent and official involvement with the law), the demographic data gathered includes: the respondent's sex, year in school, race, church attendance, number of close friends recently picked up by the police, and occupation of father. The following sections of this chapter will, therefore, elaborate the relationships of these six independent variables with the seven containers (self perception, frustration tolerance, goal orientation, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcements) and self-reported

delinquency (see Table XXI).

Sex of the Respondent

The relation between sex of the subject and the elements of inner containment is a weak one: self perception ($-.06$), frustration tolerance ($-.05$), goal orientation ($.13$), retention of norms ($.17$). Sex also appears to have little relation to outer containment: internalization of rules ($.17$), availability of meaningful roles ($.04$), group reinforcement ($.07$). The relation between sex of the respondent and delinquency, however, is somewhat stronger: self-reported delinquency ($-.32$) and official involvement with the law ($-.21$). Concerning the number of companions present when committing delinquent acts, this is also a weak negative relationship ($-.18$).

Year in School

As seen in Table XXI, the class of the respondent, or the year in school (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) is not related to any of the seven containment variables or to the two measures of delinquency. There is a negative relation between retention of norms ($-.02$) and year in school and between official involvement with the law ($-.07$) and year in school. There is a positive relation between year in school and the other three elements of inner containment: self perception ($.15$), frustration tolerance ($.08$), and goal orientation ($.01$). All of these relationships, however, are not statistically significant. Concerning year in school and the elements of outer containment, all are positive, but all are statistically insignificant: internalization of rules ($.02$), availability of meaningful roles ($.00$) and group reinforcement ($.06$).

TABLE XXI

A CORRELATION MATRIX OF CONTAINMENT COMPONENTS AND DELINQUENCY (SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY AND OFFICIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LAW) AND DEMOGRAPHIC ITEMS

Demographic Items	Self Perception	Frustration Tolerance	Goal Orientation	Retention of Norms	Internalization of Rules	Availability of Meaningful Roles	Group Reinforcement	Self-reported Delinquency	Official involvement with law	Number of Companions
Sex	-.06	-.05	.13	.17	.17	.04	.07	-.32	-.21	-.18
Year in School	.15	.08	.01	-.02	.02	.00	.06	.02	-.07	.02
Church Attendance	.08	.18	.18	.27	.24	.20	.14	-.27	-.15	-.13
Number of Delinquent Friends	-.15	-.14	-.17	-.31	-.46	-.19	-.19	.56	.49	.34
Father's Occupation	.03	.04	.04	.04	.06	.20	.08	.04	.00	.02

A person's year in school also has no relationship to self-reported delinquency (.02) or to official involvement with the law (-.07) or to the number of companions present when the delinquency occurred (.02). The highest correlation (.15) is in relation to self perception, or as one moves from being a freshman to a senior, self perception increases. This relationship, however, is a weak one. One's year in school, therefore, is not significant in relation to any of the ten variables.

Church Attendance

The frequency of the subjects church attendance shows a slight increase in relation to the containment variables and delinquency over the two previously mentioned demographic items: year in school and race. Church attendance (Table XXI) relates positively to the four elements of inner containment: self perception (.08), frustration tolerance (.18), goal orientation (.18) and retention of norms (.27). The elements of outer containment are also positively related to one's church attendance: internalization of rules (.24), availability of meaningful roles (.20), and group reinforcement (.14). Self-reported delinquency (-.27), official involvement with the law (-.15) and the number of companions present during the commission of the delinquent act (-.13) are all negatively related to church attendance. This third demographic variable also seems to have little effect on the seven containers, delinquency or number of companions present.

Number of Delinquent Friends

From Table XXI, the number of delinquent friends recently (within the last year) picked up by the police results in a negative relation-

ship with all seven containment elements: self perception (-.15), frustration tolerance (-.14), goal orientation (-.17), retention of norms (-.31), internalization of rules (-.46), availability of meaningful roles (-.19) and group reinforcement (-.19). The strongest relationship is seen between the number of friends recently picked up by the police and retention of norms (-.31) and internalization of rules (-.46). As delinquent friends increase rules are internalized less and norms are retained less. There is a significant positive relationship between the respondents delinquent friends and delinquency: self-reported delinquency (.56) and official involvement with the law (.49). There is also a positive relationship between ones delinquent friends and the number of companions present when committing a delinquent act (.34).

Father's Occupation

The occupation of the subjects' father (see Table XXI) has the least to do with the seven containers and delinquency than the other four demographic variables previously mentioned. The relationship between father's occupation and all of the variables is very weak: self perception (.03), frustration tolerance (.04), goal orientation (.04), retention of norms (.04), internalization of rules (.06), availability of meaningful roles (.20), group reinforcement (.08), self-reported delinquency (.04), official involvement with the law (.00) and number of companions present when committing a delinquent act (.02). The relation between father's occupation and the variables previously mentioned approaches zero significance.

Summary

Although the propositions of this study have limited the areas of discussion to specific variables, these six demographic items have provided additional information and insight. Self perception has been emphasized in related literature, but in relation to this data, has a weak relation in explaining any variation. The most significant demographic item is the number of delinquent friends recently picked up by the police in relation to internalization of rules, self-reported delinquency, and official involvement with the law. These results suggest the need for further research in the area of delinquency, particularly considering the legal involvement of one's friends. From the previous discussion, however, many areas of research are suggested.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The objective of this study was to operationalize the seven variables of containment theory (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) and attempted to determine whether or not each variable predicts delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well for this particular group of subjects. Another goal of this study was to determine whether or not there is a negative correlation between each of the seven containers and delinquency, or the higher the score on a containment variable, the lower the score on delinquency.

The results of this study presented in Chapter IV, confirm as well as reject the separate propositions. This chapter is divided into three major sections. First, the summary will re-state the propositions and summarize the findings relevant to each. The section of interpretation is an attempt to emphasize the major findings as well as speculating on their significance. The third section entitled "Conclusions" will synthesize the past studies and related literature to the findings of this study.

Summary

P₁: There will be a negative correlation between the components of inner containment (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms) and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law).

Proposition one is confirmed by the findings in this particular study. When the total sample (N=728) is considered, all correlations are negative (see Table XIII). All correlations are also statistically significant except one (official involvement with the law and frustration tolerance). Regarding non-institutionalized males (N=282), and non-institutionalized females all correlations are negative and all are statistically significant except for the subjects official involvement with the law and frustration tolerance. Concerning institutionalized males (N=39), all correlations are negative. However, only two of the relationships are statistically significant (self-reported delinquency and frustration tolerance and self-reported delinquency and retention of norms). All correlations are negative concerning institutionalized females (N=29), with one relationship being statistically significant (self-reported delinquency and frustration tolerance). Proposition one, therefore, is confirmed with all correlations between the components of inner containment (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms) and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) being negative.

P₂: The components of inner containment (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

Proposition two is not confirmed by the findings in this particular study; the four variables of inner containment do not predict delinquency equally well. Concerning the total sample (N=728), and the four inner containers, the results indicate that the best predictor of self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law is the respondents retention of norms, which accounts for the majority of variation. The other three variables were found to have a minor role in predicting delinquency. The findings also indicate that retention of norms is the best predictor of delinquency (both self-reported and official involvement with the law) for non-institutionalized males and females. However, when institutionalized males are considered, frustration tolerance seems to be the best predictor of delinquency; the other three variables having a small effect on the prediction. Considering institutionalized females, frustration tolerance is the best predictor in relation to self-reported delinquency and retention of norms is the best predictor in relation to official involvement with the law. Therefore, the most significant predictor in all categories, except three (institutionalized males and females in relation to self-reported delinquency and institutionalized males in relation to official involvement with the law) is the respondents retention of norms. Proposition two, therefore, cannot be confirmed.

P₃: There will be a negative correlation between the components of outer containment (internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law).

Proposition three is confirmed by the findings in this particular study. When the total sample is considered (N=728), all correlations

are negative (see Table XV), and all correlations are statistically significant. Regarding non-institutionalized males (N=282), all are negative and all correlations are statistically significant. Concerning non-institutionalized females (N=374), all correlations are negative. All correlations are statistically significant except two (self-reported delinquency and group reinforcement and official involvement with the law and group reinforcement). When institutionalized males are considered (N=39), all correlations are negative. Only one of the relationships, however, is statistically significant (self-reported delinquency and internalization of rules). Regarding institutionalized females (N=29), all correlations are negative with two of the relationships being statistically significant (self-reported delinquency and internalization of rules and official involvement with the law and internalization of rules). Proposition three, therefore, is confirmed with all correlations between the components of outer containment (internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) and delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) being negative.

P₄: The components of outer containment (internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

Proposition four is not confirmed by the findings in this particular study; the components of outer containment do not predict delinquency equally well. Concerning the total sample (N=728), and the three containers, the results indicate that the best predictor of self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law is the respondent's

internalization of rules, which accounts for the majority of the variation. The other two variables were found to have a minor role in predicting delinquency. The findings also indicate that internalization of rules is the best predictor of self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law in all categories of respondents except one: institutionalized males and official involvement with the law. Concerning this particular category, none of the three outer containers is found to be significant. Therefore, the most significant predictor in all categories except one is the respondent's internalization of rules. Proposition four, therefore, cannot be confirmed.

P₅: The components of both inner containment and outer containment (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) will predict delinquency (self-reported and official involvement with the law) equally well.

Proposition five is not confirmed by the findings in this particular study; the components of inner containment and outer containment do not predict delinquency equally well. Concerning the total sample (N=728), and the seven containers, the results indicate that the best predictor of self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law is the respondent's internalization of rules, which accounts for the majority of the variation. Although internalization of rules is the strongest predictor of self-reported delinquency, the regression analysis indicates that a combination of three variables is the best predictor: internalization of rules, retention of norms and availability of meaningful roles. Analysis also indicates that in relation to the respondent's official involvement with the law a combination of two

variables is a best predictor: internalization of rules and frustration tolerance.

Concerning non-institutionalized males and the seven containers, internalization of rules is the strongest predictor of self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law, accounting for the majority of the variation. However, in this study, regression analysis indicates that in relation to self-reported delinquency a combination of two variables is the best predictor (internalization of rules and retention of norms) and in relation to official involvement with the law, a combination of three variables is the best predictor (internalization of rules, retention of norms and frustration tolerance).

In relation to non-institutionalized females and the seven variables, internalization of rules is the strongest predictor of self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law, accounting for the majority of the variation. However, in this study, regression analysis again indicates that in relation to self-reported delinquency a combination of three variables is the best predictor: internalization of rules, retention of norms and goal orientation. Analysis also indicates that in relation to the respondents official involvement with the law, a combination of three variables is the best predictor: internalization of rules, frustration tolerance and availability of meaningful roles.

Concerning institutionalized males and the seven variables, internalization of rules is the strongest predictor of self-reported delinquency and frustration tolerance is the strongest predictor of official involvement with the law, which account for the majority of the variation. And when institutionalized females are considered, internalization

of rules is the strongest predictor of self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law, accounting for the majority of the variation. Regression analysis indicates that a combination of two variables is the best predictor of self-reported delinquency: internalization of rules and frustration tolerance. Therefore, the most significant predictor in all categories, when the seven variables are considered, except one (institutionalized males and official involvement with the law), is the respondents internalization. Proposition five, therefore, cannot be confirmed.

Interpretations

It is assumed that each of the seven variables of containment theory (self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, retention of norms, internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement) are related to delinquency. And it is assumed that each of the variables is positively related to each other. The results of this study indicate that the seven containers are in fact positively related to each other and their relationships are significant beyond the .01 level (see Table XIII).

This study finds that when both inner containment and outer containment are considered in regard to predicting delinquency, outer containment is a better predictor of delinquency than inner containment. Self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms explain less of the variation than does internalization of rules, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement for both self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law. Past research has often emphasized the roles of the individuals self

perception as the significant variable related to delinquency. The present study indicates that self perception and the three other variables of inner containment play a smaller role in one's delinquency than was anticipated for this sample. It may be possible to have a poor self concept and still follow the rules given by one's parents or the school. Pressure to conform or the ability of a group to maintain its rules may be a stronger force to restrict delinquency than one's self perception, etc. Having and following rigid rules in a particular school or at home, therefore, appears to have a stronger influence on prediction of delinquency than the individual's inner emotions or beliefs. Therefore, although self concept is the most researched in the past, in this study it is the least significant variable of predicting delinquency.

When inner containment and/or outer containment seem to have some success in prediction of the respondent's self-reported delinquency, this study finds that none of the seven containers explain much of the variation in relation to one's official involvement with the law. This is consistent with the correlations between the containers and self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law. The correlations are much lower when official involvement with the law is considered. For future research, other variables might be explored in relation to official involvement with the law. Perhaps the environmental setting of the delinquent would have some effect on the resultant involvement with the law.

Considering the element of inner containment and delinquency, the respondents retention of norms is the most significant predictor of delinquency for the non-institutionalized group. However, among the institutionalized group of respondents, frustration tolerance is most

significant in predicting delinquency accounting for the largest amount of delinquency among institutionalized subjects. While juvenile programs may have been concentrating on the delinquents self concept or goals in life, it appears that perhaps some time should be spent helping the institutionalized juveniles cope with frustration. Perhaps the label that comes with institutionalization is difficult to handle without some form of counseling directed at frustration tolerance.

In relation to outer containment, internalization of rules for both males and females is the most significant predictor of delinquency. Past studies have suggested that a high school age individual has few if any meaningful roles to follow. This study finds that availability of meaningful roles is the least significant predictor of delinquency. Internalization of rules accounts for almost all of the prediction.

When the seven variables of containment theory are considered together (both inner and outer containment), the most significant predictor of delinquency again is the respondents internalization of rules, in every category except one. For institutionalized males, the most significant predictor is the respondents frustration tolerance. This study also finds that the seven variables considered together predict better for certain groups. More variation is explained for the institutionalized versus the non-institutionalized and for the girls versus the boys. The largest amount of explained variation is among institutionalized females.

Because males have been a focus of past studies of delinquency, this researcher is interested in a comparison of males and females in relation to delinquency. Results of this study indicate that males report more delinquency than females for the total sample in both the

institutionalized and non-institutionalized categories. Males are also more officially involved with the law in both categories. However, institutionalized individuals (both male and female) have more similarity in scores on the average than males versus females. The fact that one has been institutionalized is more important than one's sex in relation to both self-reported delinquency and official involvement with the law (see Table XII). Therefore, because these results indicate that males and females are similar in relation to delinquency, it is not as significant as this researcher had anticipated that females have previously been somewhat neglected in research. Although the differences are slight, females on the average tend to score higher than males in relation to the seven containers (see Table XII). Females are therefore somewhat less involved in delinquency.

Conclusions

Although it is not implied that findings of this study can always be generalized to other samples, much support for containment theory has been found. Internalization of rules is found to be the most significant of the seven variables in the prediction of delinquency. Self perception, however, is found to be among the least significant variable in the prediction of delinquency.

Two of the central concepts of containment theory are inner containment and outer containment. Outer containment [Reckless, 1967:470] is the ability of society, the state, the family or other nuclear groups to hold the individual within the bounds of accepted norms and expectations. It assumes that these groups can contain and limit the behavior of their members. Containment theory assumes that individuals are

presented with a set of norms, and from these norms and expectations one is presented with a "correct" model of behavior. Internalization of rules [Reckless, 1967:470] refers to whether or not a group can get its members to comply to established rules. In this study, internalization of rules explains the majority of delinquency when outer containment is considered by itself as well as when all seven variables are considered together. There is, therefore, some overlap with reference group theory especially in relation to the effects of sex and peer group socialization.

Reckless, et al. [1956] studied "good" boys who were sixth graders nominated by their teachers to be the least likely to come in contact with the police or juvenile court. Those boys nominated saw themselves as law abiding and obedient individuals who conformed to the expectations of those in authority. They tried to conform to the expectations of their teachers and parents. They indicated that they would keep out of trouble at all costs. In relation to this particular study, this may imply that these "good" boys had a strong conformity to and internalization of rules from both parents and the school. This study, therefore, lends some support to containment theory and the "good" boys lack of delinquency. They have internalized, or at least followed the rules established by those in authority and have strong outer containment.

Inner containment [Reckless, 1967:475] is the ability of the person to follow expected norms and, therefore, to direct himself. It involves the individual personality needs to live up to expectations of others. Inner containment consists of four components: self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance and retention of norms. Of the four components, this study finds that retention of norms tends to be the

most significant predictor of delinquency. Retention of norms [Reckless, 1967:475] involves adhering to accepting and identifying with values, norms, laws, etc. When the "good" boys stated that they would keep out of trouble at all costs, this also may imply a strong retention of norms.

This research, therefore, lends strong support to two specific areas of containment theory: internalization of rules and retention of norms. When outer containment is considered, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement added to internalization of rules hardly explains more variation than internalization of rules by itself. When inner containment is considered, self perception, goal orientation and frustration tolerance added to retention of norms hardly explains more variation than retention of norms by itself. And when all seven containers are considered, self perception, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, availability of meaningful roles and group reinforcement added to internalization of rules hardly explains more variation than internalization of rules by itself.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bardwick, Judith
1971 "Infant Sex Differences." Psychology of Women. New York: Harper and Row.
- Barr, Anthony James and James Howard Goodnight
1972 A Users Guide to the Statistical Analysis System. Raleigh, North Carolina: Student Supply Stores.
- Briar, Scott and Irving Piliavin
1965 "Delinquency, Situational Inducements and Commitment to Conformity," Social Problems 13 (Summer) 35-45.
- Cohen, Albert
1956 The Sutherland Papers. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Cressey, Donald R.
1953 Other People's Money. New York: The Free Press.
- Draper, N. R. and H. Smith
1967 Applied Regression Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Dinitz, Simon, Frank Scarpitti and Walter C. Reckless
1962 "Delinquency Vulnerability: A Cross Group and Longitudinal Analysis." American Sociological Review 27 (August) 515-517.
- Hirschi, Travis
1969 Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jensen, Gary F.
1970 "Containment and Delinquency: Analysis of a Theory." University of Washington Journal of Sociology 2 (November) 1-14.
- Matza, David
1964 Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley and Son.
- Mujamoto, Frank and Stanford M. Dornbusch
1956 "A Test of Interactionist Hypotheses of Self Conception." American Journal of Sociology 61 (March) 403.
- Nye, F. Ivan
1958 Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: Wiley Publishers.

- Quarantelli, E. L. and Joseph Cooper
 1966 "Self Conception and Others: A Further Test of Median Hypothesis." *Sociological Quarterly* (Summer) 296.
- Reckless, Walter C., Simon Dinitz and Ellen Murray
 1956 "Self Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 21 (December) 744-746.
- Reckless, Walter C., Simon Dinitz and Barbara Kay
 1957 "The Self Component in Potential Delinquency and Potential Non-Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 22 (August) 566-570.
- Reckless, Walter C.
 1967 *The Crime Problem*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Reiss, Albert J.
 1951 "Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls." *American Sociological Review* 16 (April) 196-207.
- Scarpitti, Frank R., Ellen Murray, Simon Dinitz, and Walter C. Reckless
 1960 "The Good Boy in a High Delinquency Area: Four Years Later." *American Sociological Review* 25 (August) 555-558.
- Sykes, Gresham M. and David Matza
 1957 "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 22, 664-670.
- Tangri, Sandra S. and Michael Schwartz
 1965 "A Note on Self Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 30, 923.
- Tangri, Sandra S. and Michael Schwartz
 1967 "Delinquency Research and the Self Concept Variable." *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 58 (June) 182-190.
- Videbeck, Richard
 1960 "Self Conception and the Reaction of Others." *Sociometry* (December) 359.
- Warrior, Betsy
 1970 "Sex Roles and Their Consequences." *Voices from Women's Liberation*. (ed. Leslie B. Tanner). New York: The New American Library.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

ATTITUDE SURVEY IN HIGH SCHOOL

The purpose of this research is to become acquainted with how young people behave and feel about themselves. Your responses to all items in this questionnaire will be kept ANONYMOUS. In order to guarantee that your responses will remain ANONYMOUS, please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME OR PUT ANY KIND OF IDENTIFYING MARKS ANYWHERE ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

PART I

Instructions: Please check only one response for each of the following items.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Sex: | 2. Year in school: |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Male | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> freshman |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Female | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> sophomore |
| | 3. <input type="checkbox"/> junior |
| | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> senior |
| | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> other |
| 3. Race: | |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Black | |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Chicano | |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Indian | |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> White | |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |
| 5. How many of your close friends have been recently (within the last year) picked up by the police? | 4. I attend church service: |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> none | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> never |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> one or two | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> a few times a year |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> three or four | 3. <input type="checkbox"/> about once a month |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> five or more | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> several times/month |
| | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> every week |
| | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> several times/week |
| 6. Which one of the following categories comes closest to your father's occupation? If your father is retired, deceased, or unemployed, indicate his former or usual occupation. (Mark one only.) | |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> unskilled worker, laborer, farm worker | |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> semiskilled worker (machine operator) | |

3. _____ service worker (policeman, fireman, barber, etc.)
 4. _____ skilled worker or craftsman (carpenter, electrician, plumber, etc.)
 5. _____ salesman, bookkeeper, secretary, office worker, etc.
 6. _____ owner, manager, partner of a small business, lower level governmental official, military commissioned officer
 7. _____ professional -- requiring a bachelor's degree (engineer, elementary or secondary school teacher, etc.)
 8. _____ owner, high level executive -- large business or high level governmental agency
 9. _____ professional requiring an advanced college degree (doctor, lawyer, college professor, etc.)
7. Please check the item which describes your closest relations with formal law authorities. (Do not consider traffic violations.)
1. _____ I have never been involved with law enforcement authorities
 2. _____ I have been questioned by the police, but never taken into custody.
 3. _____ I have been taken into custody by the police.
 4. _____ Although I have never had a hearing in juvenile court, I have been placed under supervision of a guardian or probation.
 5. _____ I have had a hearing in juvenile court.
 6. _____ The juvenile court has placed me under supervision of a guardian or other authority.
 7. _____ I have been committed to an institution.

PART II

The following items are concerned with how you feel about yourself. Please indicate your degree of acceptance or rejection of the items in this section by CIRCLING ONLY ONE of the numbers of the scale.

- | | Strongly
Disagree | Strongly
Agree |
|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| 8. I certainly feel useless at times. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 9. There are many people who call me their friend. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 10. My parents praise me when I deserve it. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 11. All people, regardless of race or religion, are entitled to and should receive equal social privileges. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 12. I am not depressed by temporary setbacks or disappointments. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 13. The school has meaningful activities available to me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |

	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
14. It is important to have a creative hobby in which you try to do well.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
15. At times I think I am no good at all.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
16. Most of the time I like myself.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
17. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
18. If I am performing publicly (in the arts or sports) my parents attend the activity.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
19. We should respect the achievement of our forefathers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
20. I finish tasks I start, even when they are not very important.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
21. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
22. I keep my room clean because my parents want me to.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
23. I am not depressed when I fail.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
24. I keep trying when things don't work out.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
25. There's no such thing as a problem that can't be solved.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
26. I meet the requirements if I want to go to college.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
27. I usually follow the rules set up by the school.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
28. I cope well with failure.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
29. I have a close relationship with my father.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
30. I persevere under adversity and pressure from others.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
31. The really worthwhile things in life require sacrifice.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
32. I am glad to be the person I am.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
33. Often my parents are too busy to listen to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
34. I usually follow rules established by my parents.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
35. I often save my allowance for something I've always wanted.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
36. It is important to help in trying to improve things.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
37. It is important to save for the future.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
38. Part-time jobs are too demanding.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
39. A formal education is an important part of life.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
40. It's okay to get around the law if you don't get caught.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
41. My friends consult me when making decisions.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
42. I would rather decide things as they come up rather than always try to plan ahead.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
43. I am often the last one to give up trying something.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
44. I am proud of the qualities I have.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
45. I complete assignments given to me by my teacher.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
46. Activities offered by the school require more abilities than I have.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
47. In order to be successful in life you should obtain as much schooling as possible.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
48. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
49. The hassles of life really get to me.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
50. I am often absent from school.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
51. I return from a date at a time my parents have agreed on.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
52. I keep a rosy outlook even when life seems to be a series of disappointments.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
53. My friends appreciate my accomplishments.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
54. You are asking for trouble if you try to help everyone who asks for aid.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
55. I am an irresponsible person.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
56. My parents care about my grades.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
57. My friends are often too busy to listen to me.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
58. To get ahead, you must sometimes do things that are not right.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
59. For the most part, justice is done by the police.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
60. Education is not necessary; the way to get ahead is through "connections."	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
61. If I wanted to find a part-time job, I could.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
62. I have the skills necessary for school sports or to be a cheerleader.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
63. It is desirable to show concern for those people less fortunate, or those who need assistance.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7

	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
64. I sometimes smoke within the school building.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
65. My friends accept me for myself.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
66. I usually feel accepted by my teachers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
67. In their actions, people should consider whether or not their behavior will be acceptable to others.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
68. My friends offer meaningful roles to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
69. You should work hard for success and recognition of achievements.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
70. I know my parents have expectations of me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
71. I usually do what my friends expect me to do.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
72. It's best to do things according to the rules.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
73. I meet requirements for a class office.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
74. My family offers meaningful roles to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
75. I know what I want to do with my life.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
76. I tend to let others persuade me to do things I think are wrong.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
77. I accept myself the way I am.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
78. To identify with a cause is an important part of life.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
79. I keep studying the subjects in which I have not done well.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
80. A nation deserves its citizens loyalty at all times.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
81. I sometimes eat candy or drink pop in class.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
82. I follow some rules even when I do not believe in them.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
83. I often feel left out.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
84. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
85. It is important to excel in your job in order to improve or gain promotions.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
86. People seem to like me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
87. One should be actively engaged in some kind of disciplined, productive activity.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
88. I have a voice in school policies.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
89. In general, I am supported by the school for my efforts.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

- | | Strongly
Disagree | Strongly
Agree |
|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| 90. I have a close relationship with my mother. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 91. I have a high opinion of myself. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 92. I turn my homework in on time. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 93. I am consulted in family decisions. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |

PART III

Recent research has found that everyone breaks some rules and regulations during their lifetime. Some break them regularly, others less often. Below are some frequently broken rules. HAVE YOU:

94. EVER DRIVEN A CAR WITHOUT A DRIVER'S LICENSE OR PERMIT (do not include driver's training)?
- (1) Never _____ (3) Three or four times _____
(2) Once or twice _____ (4) Five or more times _____
95. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:
- (1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____
96. EVER DRANK BEER, WINE, OR LIQUOR?
- (1) Never _____ (3) Three or four times _____
(2) Once or twice _____ (4) 5 or more times _____
97. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:
- (1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____
98. EVER PURCHASED BEER, WINE, OR LIQUOR?
- (1) Never _____ (3) Three or four times _____
(2) Once or twice _____ (4) Five or more times _____
99. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:
- (1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____
100. EVER DEFIED PARENTS AUTHORITY (FOR EXAMPLE: RUNNING AWAY FROM HOME OR HITTING THEM?)
- (1) Never _____ (3) Three of four times _____
(2) Once or twice _____ (4) Five or more times _____
101. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:
- (1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____
102. EVER FORGED A CHECK.
- (1) Never _____ (3) Three or four times _____
(2) Once or twice _____ (4) Five or more times _____
103. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:
- (1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

104. EVER SEVERELY "BEAT UP" OR ASSAULTED SOMEONE?

(1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

105. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:

(1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

106. EVER BEEN PLACED ON SCHOOL PROBATION?

(1) Never ____ (3) Three or four times ____
(2) Once or twice ____ (4) Five or more times ____

107. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:

(1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

108. EVER VANDALIZED (SERIOUSLY DAMAGED) PROPERTY THAT DID NOT BELONG TO YOU?

(1) Never ____ (3) Three or four times ____
(2) Once or twice ____ (4) Five or more times ____

109. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:

(1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

110. EVER TAKEN THINGS (WORTH LESS THAN \$20) THAT DID NOT BELONG TO YOU?

(1) Never ____ (3) Three of four times ____
(2) Once or twice ____ (4) Five or more times ____

111. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:

(1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

112. EVER TAKEN A CAR WITHOUT THE OWNER'S PERMISSION (OTHER THAN YOUR PARENTS OR PARENTS OF FRIENDS?)

(1) Never ____ (3) Three or four times ____
(2) Once or twice ____ (4) Five or more times ____

113. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:

(1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

114. EVER TAKEN THINGS (WORTH \$20 OR MORE) THAT DID NOT BELONG TO YOU (DO NOT INCLUDE AUTOMOBILES)?

(1) Never ____ (3) Three of four times ____
(2) Once or twice ____ (4) Five or more times ____

115. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:

(1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

116. EVER BURGLARIZED (BROKEN INTO) A HOUSE OR A CAR TO TAKE THINGS THAT DID NOT BELONG TO YOU?

(1) Never ____ (3) Three of four times ____
(2) Once or twice ____ (4) Five or more times ____

117. THE NUMBER OF COMPANIONS WITH ME AT THE TIME WERE:

(1) None ____ (2) 1 or 2 ____ (3) 3 or 4 ____ (4) 5 or more ____

VITA

Janet Ruth Long

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: AN EMPIRICAL EXPLICATION OF ISSUES IN CONTAINMENT THEORY

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Wichita Falls, Texas, October 26, 1950, the daughter of Mrs. Bill Baldwin and Mr. Vernon S. Roberts.

Education: Graduated from Thomas Alva Edison High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, in May, 1968; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology from Oral Roberts University in 1972; received Master of Science degree in Sociology from the University of Tulsa in 1973; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1976.

Professional Experience: Adjunct instructor of Sociology in the Department of Behavioral Sciences, Oral Roberts University, 1973-1975; Instructor of Sociology, Oral Roberts University, 1975-1976.