

A MULTI-VARIATE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL BACKGROUND
CHARACTERISTICS AND AUTHORITARIAN ATTITUDINAL
INFLUENCES ON SOCIETAL REACTION TO TEN TYPES
OF DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

A THESIS
PRESENTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
MASTERS OF ARTS

BY
JAMES FRANCIS McDERMOTT

MAY , 1972

A MULTI-VARIATE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL BACKGROUND
CHARACTERISTICS AND AUTHORITARIAN ATTITUDINAL
INFLUENCES ON SOCIETAL REACTION TO TEN TYPES
OF DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Sociology
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

By
James Francis McDermott
May, 1972

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores several questions pertaining to the reactions of the university population sampled toward persons who participate or formerly participated in one of 10 types of deviant behaviors. The continuity of these reactions across four varying social relations are explored. It was hypothesized that the levels of social rejection for deviant behaviors are related to variations in the social background characteristics and attitudes of the persons who act as definers of deviance. The findings indicate that rejection or tolerance toward homosexuality, deviant consumption-selling (prostitution and drug addiction), atheism and radicalism is related to variations in the social background characteristics and attitudes of the sample tested. More specifically, reaction toward homosexuality is influenced predominately by authoritarian attitudes and the sex variable. Reactions toward behaviors grouped in the deviant consumption-selling variable are influenced predominately by the sex variable. Reactions toward atheism is influenced predominately by the authoritarian ethno-religious and social background variables. Lastly, reaction toward radicalism is influenced predominately by the authoritarian, social background and sex variables.

PREFACE

This thesis is written with two primary goals in mind. The first is to present a broad review of the literature concerned with explaining deviant behaviors. The second primary goal is to investigate the relationship social background characteristics and attitudes play in influencing reactions toward various types of deviant behaviors. In addition, answers to several questions about the type and continuity of reaction toward deviant behaviors across four varying social relations are explored.

In Chapter I four conceptual categories for explaining deviant behavior are developed. These categories are: the intrinsically deviant actor concept, the intrinsically deviant act concept, the intrinsically pathological socio-structural concept and the processual concept. The various theories and explanations given as examples in each category are presented as representative of that category of explanation. The review is not intended to be all inclusive and exhaustive. Rather it is to give the reader a general idea of the types of approaches for explaining deviant behavior used in the past. Further, the current trend toward processual conceptions of deviant behavior is introduced. Within each category several other theories might have been mentioned.

In Chapter II the research hypothesis and questions to be investigated are posed. The original independent and dependent variables are also presented. Lastly, the method of collecting the data and operationalizing of the variables is presented. The primary research goal is to explore to what extent authoritarian attitudes and background characteristics, such as age, sex, college

classification, race, political ideology, income, religion, marital status, geographic location and previous exposure to deviant behavior, play in influencing reactions exhibited toward 10 types of deviant behaviors in the varying social contexts. Such information concerning the nature of public reaction toward deviant behavior is a useful first step toward the understanding of how and why certain behaviors are defined as deviant.

In Chapter III the modes of analyzing the data is presented with the results of the analysis. The use of multi-variate statistical techniques are employed. A factor analysis was performed on the original independent and dependent variables. The 18 original independent variables were reduced to five independent factors. The original 50 dependent variables for the deviant and former deviant groups were likewise reduced to 11 and 13 independent factors respectively. A multiple regression analysis of the five independent factor variables on each of the dependent factor variables was performed. This factor analysis was performed to determine the influence the five independent variables had on each dependent variable.

The results are discussed in Chapter IV. Only partial support for the hypothesis is indicated. It was hypothesized that the levels of social rejection for deviant behaviors are related to variations in the social background characteristics and attitudes of the persons who act as definers of deviance. The findings indicate that rejection or tolerance toward homosexuality, deviant consumption-selling, atheism and radicalism is related to variations in the social background characteristics and attitudes of the sample tested.

This preface is presented to introduce the reader to the intentions of this thesis and the research undertaken. Hopefully, it will serve as a brief summary of the thesis and aid the reader in his review of the text.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	IV
PREFACE	V
CHAPTER 1. FOUR CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES FOR EXPLAINING DEVIANT BEHAVIOR	1
The Intrinsically Deviant Actor Conceptions.....	3
The Intrinsically Deviant Act Conceptions.....	9
The Intrinsically Pathological Socio-Structural Conceptions.....	11
The Processual Conceptions.....	19
Conclusions.....	28
CHAPTER 2. PROBLEMS, VARIABLES AND METHOD.....	30
Purpose of Research.....	30
Hypothesis.....	33
Types of Deviant Behaviors Used in Study.....	34
Independent Variables.....	37
Dependent Variables.....	40
Procedures for Collecting Data.....	40
CHAPTER 3. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	44
Modes of Analysis.....	44
The Independent Variables as Determined by The Factor Analysis.....	46
The Dependent Variables as Determined by The Factor Analysis for the Deviant Group.....	48
The Dependent Variables as Determined by the Factor Analysis for the Former Deviant Group....	49
Multiple Regression Analysis of the Independent Factor Variables on Each Dependent Factor Variable.....	50
Intercorrelations of Dependent and Independent Variable Sets Between Group Types.....	52
CHAPTER 4. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	55
Discussion of Results of Multiple Regression Analysis.....	55
Discussion of Results of Factor Analysis.....	60
Implications for Future Research.....	64
FOOTNOTES	65

APPENDICES.....	66
Appendix A	67
Appendix B	73
Appendix C	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	87

CHAPTER 1: FOUR CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES FOR EXPLAINING DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

A familiar problem which confronts writers and researchers concerned with social problems, and "deviant" behavior in particular, is agreement on meaning and use of terms and concepts. Any writer concerned with the sociology of deviant behavior must define his conception of deviant. Once the general definition is presented, the writer is free to explain the particular theoretical and/or pragmatic arguments for the causes and control of such behavior. However, the literature on deviant behavior now is brimming with almost as many different definitions and concepts of deviant as there are researchers studying the phenomenon. The purpose of this chapter is to suggest four conceptual categories in which the various concepts and theories developed to explain deviant behavior can be grouped.

There is an overlap among the various theories and concepts grouped in the four categories. However, each theoretical and conceptual stance grouped into a category shares a common element which defines that category. The categories are developed in order that the vast amount of theoretical and conceptual work done in the area of deviant behavior can be condensed into four summary categories for explaining deviant behavior. The theoretical explanations mentioned within each category are by no means intended to be all inclusive and exhaustive.

The four broad conceptual categories, suggested here for explaining deviant behavior, are:

1. Intrinsically deviant actor concept.
2. Intrinsically deviant act concept.
3. Intrinsically pathological socio-structural concept.

4. Processual concept.

An attempt was made by Gibbs (1966) to summarize concepts of deviant behaviors into three categories. The categories overlooked several important concepts and theoretical positions. The categories presented by Gibbs are: 1. the biological conception, which roughly corresponds to the intrinsically deviant actor conception, 2. the analytical conception, which roughly corresponds to the intrinsically deviant act conception, 3. the "new" perspective conception, which corresponds to the processual conception. A fourth category, neglected by Gibbs, has given a basis for traditional conceptual schemes of explaining deviant behavior. This category is called the intrinsically pathological socio-structural conception of deviant behavior.

Until recently, a major portion of the research done in the area of deviant behavior has been studies in crime and delinquency. The theories developed from these studies have been generalized widely to be made applicable to nearly all forms of deviant behavior. Such procedures have been challenged frequently by recent writers. The unfortunate residue of these practices, however, still leaves its mark on the vast majority of theoretical work based on the studies on crime and delinquency.

The processual conceptualizations of deviant behavior discussed in the last of this chapter are an exception by stressing the importance of viewing deviant behavior in terms of dynamic social interaction, rather than in terms of a static deviant quality inherent in a person, act or social structural situation. The advocates of the processual conceptions study each type of behavior not only for commonalities it may share with other deviant behavior, but in particular for their unique characteristics and social develop-

ment.

THE INTRINSICALLY DEVIANT ACTOR CONCEPTION

The intrinsically deviant actor conception of deviant behavior assumes there is some innate characteristic of the deviant actor which distinguishes him from the non-deviant. This deviant quality can be attributed to either some biological or psychological disposition of the actor.

Wide acceptance and support were given to the writings of Lombroso on crime, and in more recent years, to Hooten on crime and Shelton on mental illness, crime and alcoholism. All the proposals and theories espoused by these men tried to correlate deviant behavior with certain biological features or body types. Lombroso, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, demonstrated that certain physical characteristics were common to most criminals. Somewhat later Hooten, a physical anthropologist, showed, by comparing several thousand prisoners with a control group, that most criminals are atavistic with observable physical features. Hooten claimed that criminals are most likely to have long, thin necks and sloping shoulders, low and sloping foreheads, thinner beard and body hair, more red-brown hair, thin lips, compressed jaw angles and a small, extremely protruding ear. He went on to suggest that certain body types are connected with certain types of crime: tall, thin men tended to murder and rob; tall, heavy men to kill and commit forgery and fraud; undersized men to steal and to commit burglary; and short, heavy persons to assault, rape and commit other sex crimes (Clinard: 1960, 120).

The general thesis of Lombroso and Hooten has been elaborated and popularized into a more complex theory, written by William Sheldon (1940, 1942, 1949). There are few introductory texts on

abnormal psychology and deviant behavior which fail to allude to Sheldon's theory associating body types as an explanation for such varied behavior as mental illness, crime, delinquency and, indirectly, homosexuality.

Even though the biologically based theories which attempted to demonstrate a causal explanation between a person's bodily features and deviant behavior are no longer widely accepted, they still enjoy a large degree of popularity in both scholarly texts and in general readings available to the public. Very little in the way of critical evaluation accompanies these various writings. According to Clinard, the public has been quick to accept these ideas because a part of the folklore of our culture is a common belief in the direct relationship between physical appearance and personality (Clinard: 1960, 119). Deformed, robot-type men and crippled hunchbacks appear in literature, movies and on television as stereotypes of evil, or as court jesters. Fat persons, such as Friar Tuck, are shown as jolly and good-natured, while thin persons are seen as sad and melancholy, and the red-haired are fiery and hot-tempered. The effect upon the general public of these biological and body type theories as explanations of deviant behavior has been to help perpetuate stereotypes about causal associations between intrinsic biological properties of an individual and certain forms of behavior.

As mentioned earlier, most social scientists do not take seriously these theories, which posit the cause of deviant behavior in the intrinsic physical characteristics of the actor. Sutherland (1951) has pointed out that the body-type theorists such as Hooten and Sheldon, have not actually demonstrated the causal relation between physique and personality. They both tried to suggest that criminal types are the result of the selection of organically in-

ferior types by the environment. They judged inferiority by the presence of deviant behavior. Even if a strong statistically significant association were demonstrated between constitutional features and behavior, before the theory could be accepted, there would be need for an adequate general theory of human nature which would incorporate such findings. The jump from body-type to temperament is similarly assumed rather than explained.

A second criticism suggested by Clinard is that most of the argument involves jumping from certain anatomical characteristics to deviant behavior without any consideration of cultural factors (Clinard: 1960, 124). Hooten and Sheldon deal with undefined and relative terms such as crime and delinquency which involve value judgments, and attempt to relate them to a more stable factor such as physique.

A third problem with the biological and body-type theories is the contention that certain physical characteristics are intrinsically inferior. This is a mere assumption. Attributing goodness or badness to the physical appearance of the organism is simply not defensible. It is ironic that Hooten and Sheldon themselves reached opposite conclusions as to what is inferior. Hooten suggested that the criminal is an inadequately developed, runty physical type, while Sheldon contends the criminal and alcoholic inferior because they are husky, athletic types.

A methodological criticism of the studies, conducted by researchers espousing the intrinsically deviant actor conception, casts a shadow of doubt upon both the reliability and validity of the findings. None of these studies have used adequate control groups. They have been conducted largely on institutionalized populations or very

select groups which probably are not a representative sample of the population. Also, as various researchers attempted to duplicate the finding of these earlier studies, they discovered the results were seldom congruent.

Gibbs (1966) concluded his review of what he called 'the biological conception of deviant behavior' without mentioning what is frequently considered a biologically based explanation. This is the psychoanalytic theory of deviant behavior as traditionally presented by Freud. A discussion of this theoretical position in this writing is done within the intrinsically deviant action conception. This is done due to the heavy reliance of the theory on inherent instinctive drives, which play a major role in the traditional psychoanalytic scheme. There have been important revisions to the traditional psychoanalytic approach, however, the original Freudian scheme has influenced many popular writings widely read by the general public. It was Freud's claim that much of the adult's behavior, whether deviant or not, owes its form and intensity to these instinctive drives and to early reaction to parents and siblings. He suggested a combination of these two factors predisposes an individual to a particular psychological path for the rest of his life.

Every year several books and articles using this approach are written, which attempt to explain problems of crime, sex offenses, alcoholism, drug addiction, marital unrest, as well as racism and religious prejudices. Clinard stresses that, because of their emphasis on sex and symbolism, these works generally make fascinating reading for both professional men and for the general population (Clinard: 1960, 133). The result of this popularity is that no

approach to deviant behavior has a wider audience.

In the traditional psychoanalytic scheme the personality is composed of three parts: the id, ego and superego. The id is an instinctual animal tendency or drive which represents the unconscious or primitive in man. The ego is the conscious part of the mind which represents the civilized aspect of man. The superego is man's social self. It is partly conscious, partly unconscious, and it is the conscious part which corresponds to the conscience.

Various combinations of conflict and stresses arise among and between the id, ego and superego which psychoanalytic theorists claim, if not resolved, can directly or indirectly lead to various types of mental disorders and deviant behaviors.

An evaluation of the traditional psychoanalytic explanation outlined by Clinard points to several shortcomings of the approach (Clinard: 1960, 133-137). One common assumption of the psychoanalytic theories is early childhood experiences, to a large extent, develop the personality almost in total. Many challenge this position, suggesting it over-emphasizes the part childhood experiences play in personality development. It has been demonstrated by recent anthropological studies that "rigidity of character structure during the first year or two of life has been exaggerated by many authorities, and that the events of childhood and later years are of great importance in reinforcing or changing the character structure tentatively found during infancy" (Orlansky: 1949, 46). This suggests that the static predisposition of personality formation in early childhood seems implausible. Personality should be evaluated in terms of process and the continuous experiences of social interaction.

A second criticism of the traditional psychoanalytic explanation

of deviant behavior is that its findings have not been methodologically sound. The earlier psychoanalytic researcher generally failed to use experimental or verifiable situations to conduct his research. There has been very little use of reliable control techniques to test certain hypothesis. For evidence, there is reliance on verbal recall of childhood experiences which allows for the possible use of too much imagination and guesswork. In general, the studies have used small samples with no control groups, and generalized from these samples to the entire population. The sloppy, methodological practices of the psychoanalytic researcher make any conclusions about their results, at best, tentative.

The psychoanalytic overemphasis on sex is another criticism. There is no evidence to support the theory that sex represents such an all inclusive factor in influencing personality and causing mental conflicts and deviant behaviors. Here again, the importance of the social interaction processes are overlooked as key factors influencing personality development. Clinard points out that the entire psychoanalytic scheme is too "bodily conscious" rather than "socially conscious" (Clinard: 1960, 136).

Before concluding the evaluation of the body type and psychoanalytic theories of deviant behaviors, the underlying conceptual premise upon which both rely as a common denominator should be reiterated. This concept is that deviance is explained predominately, if not solely, by characteristics innate to the actors involved. Although the social sciences do not emphasize these stances as crucial explanatory theories, they are nevertheless widely popularized and accepted by the general public. The effect of this popularity is to perpetuate certain stereotypes of deviants. Those public images are unfounded, since the very positions upon which

they depend are both theoretically and methodologically unsound.

The evaluation presented above questions these positions and further challenges those who support these theoretical works grouped into the intrinsically deviant actor concept of deviant behavior for excluding social factors and the interaction process.

THE INTRINSICALLY DEVIANT ACT CONCEPTION

The intrinsically deviant act conception of deviant behavior is the second category under which various explanations of such behavior can be grouped. The category roughly corresponds to what Gibbs called the "analytical conception" of deviant behavior (Gibbs: 1966, 10). In this category, deviant acts are not viewed simply as acts contrary to normative rules, but are conceived as actions intrinsically detrimental to society. The shift in this conceptual scheme is from the inherent characteristics of the actors to the characteristics of their acts, the idea being that some acts are inherently deviant. The implication of this conception is that some acts per se are universally wrong, evil or deviant.

The various religious systems of knowledge are by far the most significant advocates of this position. Gibbs did not mention religious ideology as contributing to formation of moral structure in a society. However, to ignore religious influences is to ignore the single most important contributor to the intrinsically deviant act conception for explaining deviant behavior. Each of the various religious systems of knowledge and beliefs, such as Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Moslemism, etc., have doctrines which pronounce broad categories of action as inherently wrong or evil. These acts are viewed as universally wrong.

The determination of which acts are evil usually rests upon

a divine source, as interpreted by religious and spiritual leaders. These dogmas have a tremendous influence on the general population of the various societies they touch. Their interpretation significantly influences attitudes as to what is morally good and what is morally, and quite often, legally deviant. Certain acts are interpreted as morally and physically injurious to both the actor and society.

In recent years, many of the rules governing certain acts previously defined as wrong have been re-evaluated, in order to accommodate changes in societies. These have resulted in a challenge to the legitimacy of many of the religious claims. However, the basic theme is still predominate among all religious systems; namely, the theme that certain acts per se are intrinsically deviant.

This premise, however, seems untenable, in light of the cross cultural studies of various societies at a single point in history, and the study of a single society at various points in time. It has been found that no act is considered universally wrong or deviant by all societies, religions and cultures at one point in time. Also, it has been demonstrated that an act may be considered deviant at one point in time in the history of a society, but at another time is approved behavior. As Gibbs said, "the crucial point is that far from actually injuring society, or sharing some intrinsic feature in common, acts may be deviant because, and only because, they are proscribed legally and/or socially." (Gibbs: 1966, 10). An act may be labeled as deviant, and this proscription is real for both the deviant actor and the non-deviant population upon which the act depends for its deviant definition. But the act is not inherently deviant per se. It is crucial to realize that a

society made the act deviant at a particular time and may at another time alter this proscription. It is in this context that a deviant act may be observed and studied, not under the pretense that any action is universally deviant.

The task in understanding and studying deviant behavior is not to uncritically accept an act as deviant because of moral and cultural condemnation. Rather, the goal of the social researcher is to determine processes by which a variety of behavioral acts in certain contexts are given the unofficial and official deviant meaning. What is the reason for assigning certain acts a special status in society? That deviant status is assigned to an act and the actor can scarcely be denied, and will be discussed in detail when the processual conception is presented.

The object of the preceding discussion is to suggest that acts are not inherently right or wrong, but are so designated by a society. It is important for a researcher on deviant behavior to consider the intrinsically deviant act conception of deviant behavior and to realize its wide acceptance by a large portion of the general public. It is impossible to get a true picture of the processes which shape and determine deviant behavior without taking into account the influence exerted by the religious and moral systems in a society. Here, as with the intrinsically deviant actor conception, certain stereotypes are perpetuated about the inherent deviancy of certain acts and those participating in such acts.

THE INTRINSICALLY PATHOLOGICAL SOCIO-STRUCTURAL CONCEPTION

The intrinsically pathological socio-structural conception is the third category of theories and concepts formulated to explain deviant behavior. Gibbs (1966) did not develop a similar category,

nor did he discuss any of the major theoretical positions which can be placed in such a category.

This conceptual category, which is developed below, shares with the two preceding categories one common element. All three attribute the cause of deviant behavior to inherent characteristics. The first suggests the actor possesses innate characteristics which cause deviant behavior. The second claims that the act is intrinsically deviant. The third, that the causes of deviant behavior are found in certain pathological socio-cultural situations or socio-structural arrangements. The argument of those who support the various theories of deviant behavior, which can be grouped in this last category, is that because of these intrinsically pathological characteristics, persons who are a part of these types of environments are exposed to undue social pressures. This predisposes at least some of the inhabitants to become involved in deviant behavior.

The important question for the theorist is to locate and define these pathological arrangements, and to explain why they cause some people to choose the deviant behavior over conformity behavior. The theories which can be grouped under the intrinsically pathological socio-structural conception have been the dominant theoretical explanations of deviant behavior offered by sociologists for the last thirty years. The various theories differ greatly in their individual content, yet they all search for the cause of deviant behavior in pathological cultural or structural arrangements. Some of the leading writers representative of this general orientation are Robert Merton (Anomie), Albert Cohen (delinquent gang-status deprivation), Talcott Parson (Dysfunctional element of system), Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Olin (Differential opportunity) and to some degree Edwin H. Sutherland (differential association). Sutherland

however, was much more attentive to the importance of variables, such as societal reaction and social control.

Emile Durkheim (1947) used the term anomie in his first work, The Division of Labor in Society. For Durkheim anomie was a situation of normlessness; norms were in a state of flux. His 'anomie suicide' was attributed to the breakdown of controls over man's desires in a society, and of socially approved norms and standards, particularly when the change is abrupt. Although Durkheim used anomie to explain a particular type of suicide, it was not until Robert Merton's (1957) formulation of anomie, which was derived from Durkheim, that anomie was used in a full blown causal theory of various types of deviant behavior. Merton's theory of anomie and the social structure is probably the most widely researched and referred theory of deviant behavior.

The significance for sociology of this formulation has been great. Albert Cohen states, "Without any doubt, this body of ideas, which has come to be known as 'anomie theory', has been the most influential single formulation in the sociology of deviance in the last 25 years, and Merton's paper is possibly the most frequently quoted single paper in modern sociology" (Cohen: 1963, 3). For this reason, a review of Merton's theory is in order so the reader can better understand the general type of theory which can be grouped in the intrinsically pathological socio-structural conception and why.¹

For Merton, the understanding of the social order was important in explaining anomie and deviant behavior. He suggests a dichotomy between cultural goals and the institutional means to achieve them. He divides social reality into cultural structures and social structures, or culture and society respectively. The cultural structure is

"that organized set of normative values governing behavior which is common to members of a designated society or group" (Merton: 1957, 1932). The other element, the social structure, consists of institutional norms which define and regulate the acceptable mode of reaching these goals. This represents an "organized set of social relationships in which members of the society or social groups are variously implicated" (Merton: 1957, 162).

Anomie exists when there is a breakdown in the cultural structure due to a disjunction between cultural norms and goals, and the socially structured means to attain these norms and goals. Merton suggests that the disjunction between cultural norms and goals, and the socially acceptable means of attaining them, cause strains which lead to a breakdown of the norms, and the development of a situation of normlessness or anomie. Merton's explanation of deviant behavior rests on the validity of the assumption that the inability to achieve the goals of society by available means are differentially distributed through a social system, and that different modes of deviant adaptation will be located in varying social strata. Schematically, the relation of anomie to social structure can be summerized in this way:

1. Exposure to the cultural goal and norms regulating behavior oriented toward the goal.
2. Acceptance of the goal or norm as moral mandates and internalized values.
3. Relative accessibility to the goal: life chances in the opportunity structure.
4. The degree of discrepancy between the accepted goal and its accessibility.

5. The degree of anomie.

6. The rate of deviant behavior of the various types set out in the typology of modes of adaptation (Merton: 1957,175)

Merton contends that there are five types of individual adaptations used to cope with anomie. Theoretically, these five types of adaptations will allow the individual to achieve culturally prescribed goals of success open to those who occupy different positions in the social structure. The first type is conformity. The other four, innovation, ritualism, retreatism and rebellion, are adaptive modes of behavior which reduce anomie, but can, or do, lead to deviant behavior. Merton stresses that none of these modes of adaptation are deliberately selected by the individual or is utilitarian, but rather since all arise from strains in the social system they can be assumed to have a degree of spontaneity behind them. The paradigm for these five modes of adaption is as follows:

A Typology of Modes of Individual Adaptation

Modes of Adaption	Cultural Goals	Institutionalized Means
I. Conformity	+	+
II. Innovation	+	-
III. Ritualism	-	+
IV. Retreatism	-	-
V. Rebellion	±	±

+ = Acceptance: - = Rejection: ± = rejection of prevailing values and substitution of new values (Merton:1957,140).

Clinard summerizes Merton's formulation in this way: "deviant behavior arises where the social structure restricts access to certain common, culturally defined success goals. A clash between cultural goals and institutional means results in a strain toward anomie, in that the ability to achieve the goals of society by legitimate means is differentially distributed through the social system, and consequently, different modes of deviant adaptations

will be concentrated in various social strata." (Clinard: 1964, 54).

Conformity and ritualism have little direct relationship to deviation. Rebellion seeks a change in existing cultural and social structures, a rejection of prevailing values and a substitution of new ones. Until recently, rebellion has not been treated traditionally as a type of deviant behavior in texts. However, the "radicals" of the 1960's were a constant irritation to "established society" with the result that newer texts on deviant behavior devote chapters to the radicals (See Bell, 1971).

Innovation and retreatism are seen as the most germane to what has traditionally been thought of as deviant behavior. Innovation is the form of adaptation where the cultural goals are acceptable to the individual, but the institutionalized means of attaining these goals are either unavailable or rejected. Most of what is commonly thought of as crime, such as theft, burglary, vice, rackets and white collar offenses, are explained by the innovation mode of adaptation.

Retreatism is a rejection of both cultural goals and institutional means. It is significant, according to Merton, in understanding certain specific forms of deviant behavior. Retreatism constitutes some of the adaptive activities of "psychotics, autists, pariahs, outcasts, vagrants, tramps, chronic drunkards and drug addicts" (Merton: 1957, 1953). The retreatist form of adaptation is particularly condemned by conventional society, because it is nonproductive, nonstriving, attaches no value to the success-goal of a society, and does not use institutional means. Clinard paraphrases Merton by saying "the conformist keeps the wheels of society running; the innovator is at least 'smart' and actively striving; the ritualist at least conforms

to the norms, but the retreatist....." (Clinard: 1964, 21).

Retreatism, then, is the most rejected and private form of adaptation.

Apparently, for Merton, there is an etiological question which can best be answered by defining and studying the aspects of the social structure which are so arranged as to be pathological. Pathological in the sense that persons located in these strained situations are predisposed toward participation in some appropriate deviant behavior as a mode of adapting to the strained situation. It is for this stance that the theory of anomie and deviant behavior is placed in the intrinsically pathological socio-structure conception.

Although this brief summary does not do justice to Merton's theory, it suggests the general orientation of the theory and why it is placed in this category. Merton's theory is intriguing and well formulated. Due to its convincing exposition, unfortunately a vast number of sociologists seem to have accepted the theory in advance of adequate empirical support, or the incorporation of other relevant conceptual frameworks. Despite reformulations, there are a number of specific objections to the theory, which need to be outlined before continuing to the final category. A brief statement of these objectives are listed below:₂

1. It is claimed that the theory conceives of an atomistic and individualistic actor who selects adaptations to the social system. and in so doing fails to stress the importance of interactions with others who serve as reference groups for the actor.

2. The deviant act is seen as an abrupt change from the strain of anomie to deviance, rather than as an event which has been built up through the interactional process.

3. Many deviant acts can be explained as part of the role expectations, rather than disjunctions between goals and means.

4. The dichotomy of cultural goals and institutional means basic to anomie may be so artificial as to have little meaning, since both are so linked in reality.

5. It is difficult to identify a set of values or cultural goals which could be considered universal in most modern, complex, industrial societies. The ends sought grow out of multivalue claims made on individuals participating in diverse groups.

6. The concept of anomie best explains deviant behavior in societies where status is achieved. A different explanation may be needed where status is ascribed.

7. There is some doubt that deviant behavior is disproportionately more common in the lower class, as the theory of anomie maintains. More studies of the incidence and prevalence of deviant behavior are needed before that which is assumed by theory can be stated as fact.

8. Even if it is assumed that there is a higher rate of deviation in the lower class, there is the further question of why the bulk of the low class uses conformity to achieve prescribed goals.

9. The theory stresses the importance of position in the social structure and ability to reach cultural goals without taking into account factors such as subcultures, urbanization and especially the rate of group or collective adaptations.

10. At the level of social control, an important theoretical problem in explaining deviation is how deviant behavior originates, and how certain deviations lead to symbolic reorganization at the level of self-regarding attitudes and roles while others do not. The societal elements isolating and reacting to deviants are largely disregarded.

Before discussing the fourth conception, the processual orientation, it is important to clarify the position taken in this paper concerning Merton's theory and other traditional theoretical positions which have received considerable attention in the past. It is not the intention to disprove or discredit the theoretical gains made by these pioneering theorists, Merton, Parsons, Cohen and Sutherland. The intention is to point out that all of the theoretical stances suggested by them, to varying degrees, postulate the cause of deviant behavior to be located primarily in pathological situations inherent to certain socio-cultural and socio-structural arrangements. The exact social arrangement varies from theorist to theorist. Although the position in this paper is that socio-structural factors have been overemphasized in the past, it is not a claim that they are not involved in the deviant process. However, the challenge is made to the claims that these factors are the all-inclusive factors which determine deviant behavior. It is hoped that the critique presented above at least calls for a re-evaluation of the place theories grouped in the intrinsically pathological socio-structural conception has occupied in the study of deviant behavior.

THE PROCESSUAL CONCEPTION

The processual conception of deviant behavior is the fourth general category for the explanation of deviant behavior. The proponents of the positions grouped in this category, like those in the preceding categories, indicate that theirs is the germane explanation of deviant behavior. Unlike the previous three, however, the processual conception does not present a static model of explanation but rather a dynamic, process model. Deviant behavior is seen as developing in the process of social interaction. It is not seen as a static condition inherent in the actor, the act or pathological socio-

structural arrangements. Although process is central to the various positions grouped in the fourth category, few writers have yet to incorporate the effects of the socio-structural factors upon deviance into the framework of their positions.

Therefore, it is not the contention of this paper that the various positions grouped under the processual conception have exhibited the "answers" for understanding deviant behavior. For the processual conception to be a crucial explanation of deviant behavior, it must incorporate all factors in the interaction process which have an effect on social deviance. The effects that social control and societal reaction have on the development of deviant behavior have been the dominant interests of those representing the various processual positions.

The processual conception of deviant behavior as an explanation corresponds to what Gibbs called 'the new perspective conception'. (Gibbs: 1966, 10). Among the phrases used to describe this mode of analysis have been the social reaction approach, labeling theory and the interactionist orientation. These terms are used interchangeably throughout the remainder of this thesis. Writers most frequently cited as representative of the processual conception are Lemert, Becker, Kitsuse and Erikson, among others. In the latter part of the 1960's, there was a particular interest raised by these positions and it appears the enthusiasm is carrying over into the 1970's.

Again, the central concept of these writings is that of process. The conception is necessarily a dynamic one. The meaning of deviant behavior is viewed in terms of constantly fluxuating and changing states, which reflect complex social interaction processes. Lemert was one of the first to systematically elaborate processual analysis

as it relates to deviant behavior. Lemert stated: "the deviant person is one whose role, status, function and self-definition are importantly shaped by how much deviation he engages in, by the degree of its social visibility, by the particular exposure he has to the societal reaction, and by the nature and strength of the societal reaction." (Lemert: 1951, 23). Deviant behavior is not seen as a simple cause-effect relationship. Rather it is a network of complex social interaction processes involving not only the actor but also his life history, social position, risks, reactions of others, social controls, power, interest groups and normative defining processes, just to name a few factors influencing deviant behavior.

Building from Lemert's work, Becker emphasized the theme of the deviant label affixed through such processes as differentiation and definition. As he puts it: "social groups create deviance by making rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying these rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an offender. The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied: deviant behavior is behavior that people so label." (Becker: 1964, 9). This position is often cited as the central statement of the reaction orientation. Becker strongly proclaims that rather than viewing deviance as static, as a condition that either exists or does not exist, we should look to the processes affecting the development and elaboration of this fluid social phenomenon.

The works of Lemert and Becker have caused many writers in the recent past to reconsider the major focal points for research and

analysis in the area of deviance. As Schur states, "the important point emphasized in this approach is simply that identities are always in flux, that statuses may be conferred and withheld, that deviance is to a considerable extent an ascribed status. It reflects 'what other people do' as much as what the deviating actor himself does" (Schur: 1969, 312). Blumer's (1971), Matza's (1969) and Quinney's (1969) theoretical works are examples of the recent emphasis placed on studying the role played by other people to influence the content of normative and legal definitions of deviant behavior.

The real heart of the problem for the societal reaction position seems to be that too much attention has been placed on classification and analysis of deviant forms of behavior, with little attention being paid to the actual social process by which acts and actors come to be defined as deviants by others. For Becker and others, it is not the quality of the act the person commits which is of particular interest, but rather the consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an offender. The approach is primarily concerned with studying the importance of social definitions and the process by which acts and people are labeled as deviant.

This is the extreme opposite position of the first two conceptual categories described earlier, which stress the importance of deviant characteristics inherent to the actor or acts. This position also differs from the socio-structural approach, in that more traditional sociologists have directed their emphasis on the behavioral questions and accepted, as given, the established norms defining various kinds of behaviors as deviant. However, the traditional approach overlooks the fluidity of the normative process. In general, they neglect to realize that public definition of behavior as deviant is mutable. It

is open to reversals of political power, twists of public opinion and the development of social movements and moral crusaders, just to name a few sources of possible change. What is attacked as criminal today may be seen as sick next year, and fought over as as possible legitimate behavior by the next generation

Advocates of the processual conceptualization of deviant behavior have not only concerned themselves with societal reaction, labeling, normative definition processes and social control on the societal level of analysis, but also speak to the effect of reaction to deviance upon the individual, especially the effect of the public labeling process. When a person has been discovered and labeled a deviant, the stigma associated with the labeling is great. The labeling may end the secrecy of his behavior, thus his primary relations may be disrupted by it. It may also close conventional behavior alternatives for him. These effects, the cutting of primary ties with conventional society and the closing of legitimate alternatives, may produce severe psychological and sociological effects for the person. If the person cannot neutralize conventional norms and standards, he may label himself as a deviant. As a result, he will incur a negative self-evaluation. Even if the person is not discovered and formally labeled, he still realizes that his behavior is stigmatized by conventional society, and he must act with caution when in the midst of others to avoid such labeling.

The preceding remarks on the various positions which represent the processual conception of deviant behavior were not intended to be exhaustive; rather to give the reader a "feel" for the conceptual category. Gibbs (1966) and others have written critiques of the various approaches grouped in this category. Schur (1969) and Aker

(1968) have outlined these various criticisms and clarified certain confusions raised by the criticisms.

Gibbs noted that one of the major questions left unanswered by the new conceptions of deviant behavior is whether the ultimate goal is to explain deviant behavior or to explain reactions to deviations. (Gibbs: 1966, 9). However, it is Aker's opinion that a re-reading of the literature expounding this reaction orientation would show that the goal is not to account for either the behavior or the reaction, but both. Thus, in a sense, the writers defending the processual conceptualizations have illuminated the twofold problem of explanation in the broad study of deviance.

It is important to explore not only how and/or why some people engage in deviant acts (which has been the question asked by more traditional writers) but also how and/or why certain kinds of behavior and people become defined and labeled as deviant. Aker calls the two types of problems "structural" and "processual" questions (Aker: 1968, 456). The theoretical emphasis in the sociology of deviance has been on structural explanation. He states, "the structural theories contend that more people in certain groups, located in certain positions in, or encountering particular pressures created by the social structure, will engage in more deviance than those in other groups and locations"(Aker, 1968, 457).

He has reiterated a point made earlier in this thesis that most sociological perspectives are primarily structural in emphasis, or what has been referred to here as the pathological socio-structural conception of deviant behavior. The processual conception, in contrast to the socio-structural conception, postulates that the individual commits deviancy because he has encountered a particular life history. The processual approach recognizes that socio-structural

arrangements are not intrinsically or universally pathological. The approach also denies that actors are predisposed to encounter these pressures, which will enhance their possibilities of engaging in deviancy significantly more than those in other locations simply because they are located in these supposedly pathological structural situations.

The important problem, previously ignored by the socio-structural writers, is to learn how certain behavior came to be labeled as deviant. This involves two related processes: (a) establishing the rules, definitions, norms and laws, the infraction of which constitutes deviance, and (b) reacting to people who have, or have not, violated the norms by applying negative sanctions and labels to them. Sociology has attained little knowledge about the defining or norm making process as it relates to deviancy, or has it, until recently shown an interest in the labeling process.

In Gibbs' critique, he felt that a theory about reactions to deviance seems to be that which is sought by such analysts as Becker (Gibbs: 1966, 12). He contends that they have, in fact, provided no means of explaining why a given act is considered to be deviant and/or criminal in some, but not all, societies. Gibbs says "a certain kind of reaction may identify behavior as deviant, but it obviously does not explain why the behavior is deviant." (Gibbs: 1966, 12). Schur, however, asserts that Gibbs' criticism seems overstated. Schur states: "even if no sociologist has produced a full-fledged systematic theory explaining variations in societal definitions of behavior as deviant, at least there have been useful first steps toward that goal. Furthermore, it is significant that the societal reactions approach - almost alone among the current orientations to deviance - does clearly identify this issue as one of the

most important questions for empirical research in the field." (Schur: 1969, 314). Therefore, Gibbs' criticism may be premature, since the reaction orientation is just developing. Even so, it is the only orientation which stresses the importance of deviant defining by society.

That deviant behavior is defined by society is also pointed out by Erikson: "deviance is not a property inherent in certain forms of behavior; it is a property conferred upon these forms by the audiences which directly or indirectly witness them." "Sociologically, then," Erikson goes on to say, "the critical variable is the social audiencesince it is the audience which eventually decides whether or not any given action or actions will become a visible case of deviation." (Erikson: 1962, 308).

Another charge made against the reaction conception of deviance is that it is relativistic in the extreme, because it contends that the main characteristics of deviants and deviant acts are external to the actor and the acts. Thus, it appears that the reaction approach denies the reality of deviance. However, upon careful inspection of the literature, we find the authors of the reaction approach do not say deviating behavior does not actually occur. Rather, they view labeling forms of behavior as deviant per se as being problematic. Schur emphasizes that none of the reaction theorists would maintain that acts labeled homicide, stealing, homosexuality, mental disorders, radicalism and others would never occur if they were not defined as deviant. Rather, these theorists are insisting, since these behaviors inevitably are defined and reacted to in various specific ways in a given social order, it is meaningless to try to understand the behaviors without taking such definitions and reactions

into account (Schur: 1969, 315). "It is not so much the existence of the behavior", Schur states, "as it is the nature, distribution, social meaning and implications of the behavior that cannot be explained without consideration of reaction processes." (Schur:1969,315).

The review of the processual conception of deviant behavior is far from exhaustive. The basic contentions of this conceptual category were presented and some important differences between the processual vs. intrinsically pathological socio-structural conception were compared. The former stresses process and the dynamic complex social interaction which takes place in the defining and development of social deviance, while the latter emphasizes a more static model of deviant behavior. The basic differences in the approaches do not necessarily make them incompatible as explanations. What is needed in the study of deviant, as well as conforming, behavior is an integration of the cogent elements of the more traditional approach with the processual conceptions. In such a synthesis it will be necessary to view social reality in terms of process and as having a dynamic nature, but at the same time a recognition must be made that there are certain structural arrangements which remain relatively stable in society.

The processual approach should prove to be a challenging and potentially enlightening means to study deviant behavior. The findings of the more traditional sociological approaches to deviance should not be overlooked. However, the contention of many traditional approaches that deviance has an objective reality apart from the socially organized conceptions that define it must be re-evaluated. Further, more traditionally minded sociologists must stop judging the deficiency of the processual approach as not being a self-contained

theory, but rather in terms of the probable impact it will have on our overall understanding of deviance and social control. According to Schur, "its main contribution lies in its partial redirection of analysis to certain key objects of research, in the focus it places on understanding the dynamics of deviance, on studying specific reaction agencies and labelers, and on analyzing broad patterns of deviance defining." (Schur: 1969, 320).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed four conceptual categories in which various theories and conceptions for explaining deviant behavior can be grouped. The first two categories are the intrinsically deviant actor and the intrinsically deviant act conceptions of deviant behavior. The general theme of the first is that certain innate biological characteristics of the actor accounts for, or at least predisposes, the actor toward deviance. The second category suggests that the act per se is intrinsically wrong or deviant. Although these two conceptual categories are not widely supported by empirical data and the social sciences, they do contribute to the perpetuation of certain stereotype images about the nature and cause of social deviances.

The third conceptual category is the intrinsically pathological socio-structural conception of deviant behavior. It encompasses, to one degree or another, most traditional theoretical and conceptual schemes studied in sociology in the area of deviant behavior. The implications of the theories such as Anomie presented by Merton, and Parson's view of deviance as dysfunctional elements of the social system in particular represent this conceptual category. The basic theme which carries throughout these approaches is that certain cultural and structural arrangements in a society or a social system

are injurious and pathological to those located in them. Actors subjected to such environments find undue pressures and stresses which significantly enhance their chances of participating in deviant behaviors.

The processual conception of deviant behavior is the last category. This approach emphasizes the need to view deviance in terms of dynamic processes. The process of societal defining of norms, values and laws is an important aspect of this approach, as well as social reaction to deviance, social control and the labeling process.

It is hoped that the four conceptual categories will be useful in developing a broader understanding and search for all the major factors which contribute to what is called social deviance. Although the emphasis has been on viewing deviance in terms of process, the contributions of the more traditional approaches are not to be overlooked or neglected, but incorporated with the processual approaches. Finally, any theoretical position attempting to explain social deviance would be naive to neglect the stereotypical impressions engendered by conceptions of deviance which attribute inherent characteristics of the actor or the act to be deviant.

CHAPTER 2: PROBLEMS AND VARIABLES

A major problem surrounding the processual conceptions of explaining deviant behavior is that very little in the way of empirical research has been done which attempts to answer the questions posed by the writers of these orientations. This lack of empirical research can be attributed to the relatively recent interest generated in such problems as societal reaction and its part in the defining of deviant behaviors. Societal reaction and the deviant labeling process are relatively new areas of interest in the study of the sociology of deviant behavior. Social control viewed as contributing to the causes rather than being considered an effect of deviant behavior is a non-traditional approach to the study of social control which has attained some recognition. The defenders of these positions have been concerned predominantly with the formulation and defense of their arguments on theoretical grounds. They have left the task of empirical verification to others, or until a later time.

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the research undertaken in this thesis, and to demonstrate how it relates to some of the questions posed by processual conceptions of deviant behavior. The research attempts to produce data revelent to the deviant defining process. In addition, information concerning the effects of the deviant label are explored. A better understanding of the socio-cultural and attitudinal context, out of which various behaviors are defined as deviant, is a prime goal. At the same time, an attempt is made to determine to what extent a person carries the deviant label and the social sigma associated with the label after he has reformed.

Very little research has been attempted regarding these two areas, therefore, this research is essentially exploratory. Although the gross

outlines of public view regarding forms of deviant conduct are apparent, relatively specific evidence of public reaction is lacking. The studies by Rooney and Gibbons (1966), Simmons (1965) and Kitsuse (1962) are the most frequently cited which have attempted to understand the cultural and attitudinal context out of which various behaviors are defined as deviant. A study by Schwertz and Skolnick (1964) appears to be one of the few studies concerned with the effects of the deviant label on reformed deviators.

Rooney and Gibbons (1966) studied public reaction to three types of deviant behaviors: abortion, homosexuality and drug addiction. They found that for two of these behaviors, abortion and homosexuality, attitudes were more liberal than reflected in contemporary criminal laws. According to the results of their data, "women seeking an abortion or persons pursuing a sexual partner of the same sex receive some sympathy from the members of the sample. The same is not true for the drug addict. The respondents overwhelmingly favor the continuation of punitive law enforcement policies toward drug addicts" (Rooney and Gibbons: 1962, 406).

In the same study, three social background variables had an influencing effect on tolerance toward the three social deviances. There was a slight tendency for tolerance to decrease with advancing age. Education level had an effect, with the adults having less than a high school education being less tolerant than those who had completed high school and attended college. Finally, it was found that Protestants and Catholics shared similar views regarding homosexuality and drug addiction: there was a certain degree of tolerance toward homosexuality and intolerance toward drug addiction. However, the Catholic respondents were considerably less tolerant toward abortion

than the Protestants. The Jewish respondents were more tolerant toward all three behaviors than either the Catholics or Protestants.

Any conclusions drawn from this study must be considered tentative, since the authors' modes of analysis were relatively superficial considering the type of data they collected. Apparently, the only analysis to which their data was subjected was to obtain mean scores of the responses to each question asked on their questionnaire, then visually compare these means.³ They simply set up Tables showing that X% of the respondents agreed, Y% disagreed and Z% gave no response to the questions, and proceeded to make comparisons from these Tables. Since it appears they have interval data (possible responses: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree) for the most part, further and more sophisticated univariant and multivariant analysis may have produced more meaningful information without over-analysing the data. The study by Rooney and Gibbons is unique in its attempt to relate social background characteristics and attitudes to the type of reaction and attitudes exhibited toward certain types of deviant behaviors.

The other studies mentioned above were primarily interested in determining which behaviors were considered deviant and some of the stereotypes that exist about these behaviors (Simmons, 1965. Kitsuse, 1962). The objectives of the present research are more in the direction of understanding what effects social background characteristics and attitudes of a "non-deviant" population have, if any, on determining reaction to several types of deviant behavior across varying types of social relations. The research presented here attempts to explore possible answers to this and other questions, or at least indicate a possible direction for future research.

Another major goal of this research is to determine to what extent

the deviant label is applied to a person no longer participating in a particular deviant behavior.⁴ What little information collected in relation to this question indicates that for criminal offenses which carry the connotation of intent to harm (Ex. Assault), the social stigma is still strong, even if the person accused has been acquitted of the charges (Schwertz and Skolnick, 1964). However, it was also found that doctors accused of malpractice did not suffer social rejection, even though in some instances he was not cleared of the charges. This could indicate that social position and occupation may have an important influence on the degree of social stigma attached to the former deviant. Unfortunately, the data presented by Schwertz and Skolnick is very difficult to draw any conclusions from, since it was secondary data taken from two separate studies. Since there were differences of both method of collecting the data and intentions for conducting the research for these two studies, they cannot be used as formal controls for each other, as was recognized by the authors (Schwertz and Skolnick: 1964, 105). Therefore, the conclusions made from the comparisons of the two studies can only be interpreted as suggestive. Since so little is known as to the extent the deviant label is carried by the former deviant, the present research is so designed to explore the extent to which social stigma is attached to various types of former deviants.

HYPOTHESIS

Due to the lack of empirical research attempted and the methodological inadequacies which make any concrete conclusions of research done problematic, there is only one very general hypothesis tested in the research. However, it is designed in order to explore several specific questions which relate to deviant defining processes.

It is hypothesized that the levels of social rejection for deviant behaviors are related to variations in the social background

characteristics and attitudes of the persons who act as definers of deviance. This contention rests upon the argument that rejection or tolerance toward certain kinds of deviant activities are influenced by elements other than accurate information.

Besides testing this hypothesis, the research presented explores and provides information concerning several other questions. In summary, these questions are:

1. Does the reaction toward a social deviance remain constant across varying social relations?
2. Is the intensity of the reaction toward a social deviance the same for all types of deviant behaviors, or does each behavior generate reactions which are unique?
3. Can certain types of deviant behaviors be grouped together on the basis of similarity of the reaction directed toward them?
4. If some deviant behaviors can be grouped together on the basis of similar reaction, does this grouping remain constant across varying degrees of social relations?
5. If the social stigma or deviant label still carried by the former deviant?

TYPES OF DEVIANT BEHAVIORS USED IN STUDY

Before describing the independent and dependent variables used in this study, an explanation of the types of deviant behaviors selected is necessary. Any attempt to measure reaction toward the various behaviors labeled deviant necessitates the selection of a few types of deviant behaviors, which are representative of broad categories of deviance. Simmons found from a questionnaire in which he asked respondents to list those things or types of persons they regarded as deviant, that even with a certain amount of grouping and

collapsing, there were no less than 282 different acts and persons defined as deviant (Simmons: 1965, 244). The feasibility of asking respondents to give an accurate accounting of their feelings toward even 50 types of behaviors in a relatively long questionnaire seemed to be implausible. Therefore, 10 types of deviant behavior were selected, which are representative of five broad classifications. These 10 deviant behaviors were among the 20 most frequently mentioned types of behavior defined as deviant (Simmons: 1965, 255). They are: homosexuality, drug addiction, radicalism, alcoholism, prostitution, mental illness, theft, tax evasion, atheism and Klu-Klux-Klan membership, which was chosen to represent reactionary positions.

These behaviors are representative of five broad classifications of deviant behavior which are developed by Daniel Glaser (Glaser, 1971). According to Glaser, deviance can be classified into at least seven broad categories of behavior that differ markedly in the consistency with which they have been regarded as deviant. They are: predation, deviant consumption, deviant selling, deviant performance, deviant belief, deviant attributes and suicide. The last two are not considered in the present study. Deviant attributes are concerned with physical features of the individual over which he has no control rather than behavior; for example, blindness. Suicide is not considered since it would be problematic in analysis of the data to include a deviant behavior which cannot have a former deviant category.

Predations are acts in which someone definitely and intentionally takes or damages the person or property of another. These acts are what we most commonly consider as criminal. They clearly involve a predator and a victim.

Theft and tax evasion were chosen to represent this class, since

they both involve intent to take property of another. Theft is often seen as the more objectionable, possibly because of its more public exposure and its common association as being an offense of the lower classes. Tax evasion is frequently mentioned as a type of "white collar crime". White collar crimes, especially tax evasion, are typically associated with persons of middle, and more usually, upper economic status. A comparison of the reactions given by the respondents to these two types of deviant behaviors may yield tentative verification of the findings of Schwertz and Skolnick (1964).

Deviant consumption consists of "using certain goods and/or services deemed objectionable by those dominating a social system." (Glaser: 1971, 10). These acts have no clear victim. The people who consider this consumption objectionable may regard the deviant himself as the victim, however, the deviant does not necessarily share this view. Alcoholism and drug addiction were selected to represent this class of behavior.

Deviant selling is the counterpart of deviant consumption, which is the act of supplying consumers with goods or services regarded as objectionable. Prostitution is used in the present study as representative of this class of behavior.

Deviant performance encompasses a large range of behavior that, while not aimed at injuring anyone, nevertheless is found offensive enough to be defined frequently as deviant. Mental illness and homosexuality are examples of this class of behavior used in this study.

Deviant beliefs is the last class of behavior frequently labeled objectionable. These are usually objections to particular religious or political ideas not held by the majority of the people in a society. The atheist, student radical and Klu-Klux-Klan member were selected as representative of this class of behavior.

The selection of these 10 behaviors from among the five broad classifications of deviant behavior suggested by Glaser were made in order to have as wide a representation of the varying types as possible, without making the questionnaire too long. Certain other types of behavior could have been used to represent each class of deviant behavior, but selections were limited to these 10 since they were most frequently defined as deviant in the study done by Simmons (1965).

Glaser's classifications of deviant behaviors are based upon the assumption that the behaviors in each class exhibit similarities in either their content or intentions, and that each class of behavior markedly differs from the others. It can be inferred from his presentation that reaction to behaviors in each class are similar. There is little evidence to support this contention. It will be interesting to see from the present study if this classification of deviant behavior is an accurate and useful system for classifying reactions to deviant behavior.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

It has been hypothesized that certain social background and attitudinal characteristics of the persons who act as definers of deviant behavior are related to the level of social rejection exhibited toward that behavior. These social background and attitudinal characteristics are the independent variables in this study. The social background characteristics measured are: age, sex, college classification, race, political ideology, income, religion, marital status, geographic location and previous exposure to a social deviant.

In addition to these background characteristics and experiences, certain attitudinal dispositions are measured. These attitudes are believed to have an influencing effect on the rejection exhibited to-

ward deviant behavior. Reaction of an in-group to an out-group or groups seems to be related to the type information known about the "outsider" (Becker, 1963). Several studies have indicated that when information is inaccurate or sparse concerning an out-group, there is a tendency to attribute broad clusters of characteristics to the whole group by the in-group. These stereotypes are seldom accurate but frequently reacted to as if they were representative of the out-group (Couch, 1968: Dentler, 1959: Gove, 1970: Herzog, 1970: Reiss, 1970: Simmons, 1964). Racial and religious prejudice are examples frequently cited in which stereotypes are quickly acceptable to the in-group as part of the rationalization for their reactions toward those out-groups. Societal reaction, especially the nonpredatory types, can be seen as influenced by prejudices supported by stereotypes about the behavior.

The Authoritarian Personality Attitude Scale is frequently used to measure prejudice. The intended use for this scale is indicated by Adorno who developed the measurement instrument: "the attempt to construct a scale that would measure prejudice without appearing to have this aid and without mentioning the name of any minority group seems to have been fairly successful" (Adorno: 1950, 279). In the studies concerned with religious and racial prejudice, there has been a consistently high positive correlation between prejudice and high scores on the Authoritarian Scale. It is used in this study to determine what relationship exists, if any, between the Authoritarian Syndrome and reaction to deviant behavior.

The Authoritarian Scale consists of nine attitudinal subscales which measure antidemocratic trends. These nine subscales and the combined score of these scales (the F-Score) are used as independent variables in this study. The nine scales are:

1. Conventionalism: Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.
2. Authoritarian Submission: Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the in-group.
3. Authoritarian Agression: Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject and punish people who violate conventional values.
4. Anti-introjection: Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.
5. Superstition and Stereotypy: The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
6. Power and Toughness: Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension: identification with power figures: overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego: exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.
7. Destructiveness and Cynicism: Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
8. Projectivity: The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world: the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.
9. Sex: Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on". (Adorno: 1950, 255-257).

Perceptions of an act or actor as threatening have been found as an indicator of rejection or tolerance toward mentally ill patients (Gove, 1970). In the present study, perceived threat of the 10 types of deviants and former deviants is measured in order to explore the relationship perceived threat of the deviant behavior has to level of rejection. It is expected that the respondents who perceive a particu-

lar behavior as threatening will tend to indicate rejecting responses toward that behavior due to the perceived threat. In this instance, perceived threat is an independent variable, while the type of reaction is the dependent variable. Even though reaction to certain types of deviant behaviors may be influenced by perceived threat, at the same time the perception of a behavior as threatening may depend upon factors other than accurate information. Certain background influences such as education and previous exposure to the behavior or a combination of social background characteristics may determine a person's perception of a particular behavior as threatening. Therefore, the perception of threat as being dependent upon certain social background characteristics is also explored.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

The dependent variables in this study are the reactions of the respondents to questions concerning their willingness to associate with persons involved, or formerly involved, in one of the 10 types of deviant behaviors in four varying types of social relations. The four social relations are working relationship, neighborhood relationship, casual speaking acquaintence and a close friend relationship. By varying the types of social relations to which the respondents are to react, a broader picture of patterns of reactions to deviant behaviors is possible.

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA AND OPERATIONALIZING VARIABLES

The information was collected by means of survey questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed to 400 students enrolled in introductory American Government classes at the University of Houston during the Fall Semester of 1971. There were three types of questionnaires administered. The first was given to half of the students and contained questions intended to measure the respondent's reactions to-

ward persons involved in one of the 10 types of deviant behaviors (Deviant Group).⁶ The second questionnaire was given to the other half of the students and contained questions intended to measure the respondent's reactions toward the same 10 types of former deviant behaviors (Former Deviant Group).⁷ The questionnaires were randomly distributed among the 400 students. Both sets of questionnaires were identical in instructions and format except for the content of questions 11 through 60 which were different in the two questionnaires. One measured the deviant group reactions in questions 11 through 60, while the other measured former deviant group reaction in questions 11 through 60.

The third questionnaire was the authoritarian measure.⁸ The authoritarian variable and the nine attitudinal categories by which it is defined were operationalized by the use of F-scale cluster: forms 45 and 40 developed by Adorno (1950: 286). The complete test was administered to the whole sample population. The responses to the questions were converted into scores by a uniform scoring system. Since high scores were intended to express increasing authoritarianism, all responses were scored as follows:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Very Strongly Agree | -3 = 7 pts. |
| 2. Strongly Agree | -2 = 6 pts. |
| 3. Agree | -1 = 5 pts. |
| 4. No response | 0 = 4 pts. |
| 5. Disagree | +1 = 3 pts. |
| 6. Strongly Disagree | +2 = 2 pts. |
| 7. Very Strongly Disagree | +3 = 1 pt. |

A person's scale score is simply the sum of his scores on the single items. For the 28 items the scores can range between 28 to

196 points. When the scale score is divided by 28, we obtain the mean score per item, which is the F-score, or combined authoritarian score. The score for each of the nine sub-scales can be computed similarly. For example, the sub-scale conventionalism has four items in the questionnaire which are intended to measure this attitudinal disposition. By summing the scores of these four items, we obtain the scale score. When the scale score is divided by four, we obtain the mean score per item, which is the conventionalism score. The authoritarian questionnaires were administered in identical form to all 400 respondents and was indicated as Part D of all the questionnaires.

The social background variables of age, sex, college classification, race, political ideology, income, religion, marital status and geographic location were all operationalized by the first 10 questions, which was Part A of both questionnaires. These 10 questions for both questionnaire A (Deviant Group) and questionnaire B (Former Deviant Group) were administered in the same form and with the same content to all respondents in the sample.⁹ The questions pertaining to age, college classification, political ideology and income were designed so they may be interpreted as interval scales. Sex and marital status are obviously dichotomous. The race variable (White, Black, Mexican-American, Oriental, Other) and religion variable (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Other, None) were dichotomized for purpose of analysis into White, Non-White and Religious, Non-religious respectively. The previous exposure to deviant behavior variable was operationalized by questions 29 through 32 in Part D of the questionnaire.¹⁰ The perceived threat variable was operationalized by questions 51 through 60 of both questionnaires.¹¹ Questionnaire A contains questions 51 through 60 which are intended to measure perceived threat of the respondents

in the deviant group. Questionnaire B contains questions 51 through 60 which are intended to measure perceived threat of the respondents in the former deviant group.

The reactions to the questions concerning associations with the 10 types of deviants and former deviants in varying social relations by the respondents are the major dependent variables in this study. Part B in both the deviant group questionnaire and the former deviant group questionnaire contains questions 11 through 50 which operationalize the dependent variables.¹²

A pre-test was administered to a small class of Political Science students. Changes in the instructions were made so the respondents could more clearly understand what was being asked in each section of the questionnaire. Also, the "no response" category in questions 11 through 50 of both questionnaires was omitted in order to encourage the respondents to commit themselves to either a positive or negative response. The respondents in the pre-test indicated the "no response" answer was an easy way out for several of the questions.

This chapter has been a statement of the questions asked in this research, a specification of the original variables, and a discussion of the method used to collect the data and operationalize the variables. In the next chapter, the modes of analysis and the results are presented.

CHAPTER 3: METHOD AND RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the multi-variate statistical techniques used to analyse the data. The results of the analysis are reported.

MODES OF ANALYSIS

Before discussing the multivariate modes of analysis to which the data was subjected, a gross outline of the reactions toward the 10 types of deviant and former deviant behaviors in the four varying social relations are presented in Table I. In addition, the perceived threat exhibited by the respondents toward each of the types of behaviors is presented in Table 2. The percentages of those respondents giving rejecting responses are reported, along with the percentage of those respondents who perceived the deviant or former deviant as threatening. The Tables are presented in order to introduce the reader, in a superficial manner, to the reactions given by the respondents to the questions asked about the 10 types of deviant behaviors in the various social relations and situations. In order to meaningfully interpret the data, however, more sophisticated modes of analysis was necessary. These analysis are performed so that a more accurate understanding of the strength, direction and significance of the relationship between and among the variables involved in this study can be assessed.

The use of univariate techniques for analysis of data is widespread in studies of deviant behavior, and in sociology in general. Although analysis of this type is informative, rarely is social reality accurately depicted by a one to one causal relationship. In order to attain a broader and more meaningful understanding of the

TABLE 1: PERCENTAGES OF REJECTING RESPONSES TOWARD THE 10 TYPES OF DEVIANT AND FORMER DEVIANT BEHAVIORS IN FOUR SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS.

Behavior	Working Relation		Neighbor Relation		Casual Acquaintance		Close Friend	
	Deviant	Former Deviant	Deviant	Former Deviant	Deviant	Former Deviant	Deviant	Former Deviant
Homosexual	50%	23%	51%	21%	20%	13%	65%	36%
Drug Addict	66%	7%	70%	13%	17%	4%	49%	12%
Student Radical	29%	6%	28%	11%	9%	4%	25%	9%
Alcoholic	66%	5%	58%	7%	13%	2%	40%	5%
Prostitute	42%	9%	56%	15%	15%	6%	42%	13%
Mentally Ill	55%	8%	43%	14%	16%	3%	38%	10%
Thief	82%	15%	86%	27%	28%	8%	63%	16%
Tax Evader	41%	13%	30%	8%	8%	3%	21%	10%
Atheist	17%	6%	17%	7%	9%	5%	19%	10%
K.K.K. Member	67%	32%	73%	37%	37%	20%	69%	35%

TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE OF DEVIANT AND FORMER DEVIANT BEHAVIORS
PERCEIVED AS THREATENING

Behavior	Perceived Threat	
	Deviant	Former Deviant
Homosexual	47%	45%
Drug Addict	80%	37%
Student Radical	47%	35%
Alcoholic	66%	24%
Prostitute	46%	32%
Mentally Ill	52%	30%
Thief	95%	51%
Tax Evader	48%	30%
Atheist	23%	24%
K.K.K. Member	80%	56%

deviant defining process, the application of multivariate techniques is introduced as means of refining the variables included in this study. Factor analysis and regression analysis are two multivariate modes of analysis used in this study.

The factor analysis is performed in order to determine the inter-correlations of the raw variables. The task is to assess the minimum number of independent dimensions needed to account for most of the variance in the original set of variables.

The first step in this analysis is to achieve a reduction of the intercorrelated raw variables presented in this paper to a smaller set of linearly independent descriptors. Through the application of factor analytic techniques, we can establish the independent dimensions of the raw independent and dependent variables measured in this study. Inspection of the content of these dimensions will give a clearer understanding of which groups of variables should be regarded as mutually interactive, as well as demonstrating which syndromes may be regarded as independent in their influence.

The second mode of analysis involved use of multiple regression to determine sources of variation in the dependent variables. The multiple regression analysis is performed so that we can assess the direct individual impact each independent variable contributes to reaction toward the various types of deviant and former deviant behaviors. However, we must give attention to Goldberger's warning that with multicollinear independent variables the "contribution of an individual regressor remains inherently ambiguous", and predictors must be found which are as uncorrelated as possible (Hunt and Pendley: 1971, 13).

A solution to this problem is achieved by using the independent

and uncorrelated dimensions generated from the factor analysis of the raw independent and dependent variables respectively. The individual factor scores may then be entered as measures of the independent and dependent variables in a multiple regression analysis. The resulting regression coefficients can then be interpreted as measures of the relative importance of each independent variable dimension in influencing each dependent variable dimension, since the typical difficulty in interpreting regression coefficients, when using intercorrelated predictors, has been eliminated.

The first task of the analysis was to reduce the 18 original background variables into a smaller number of independent factors. The 50 original dependent variables likewise were factored. The method employed was a principal components factor analysis, followed by a rotation of an orthogonal solution, using Kaiser's Varimax criterion as the computational algorithm. The results of the analysis are presented in Tables 3 through 6.

As indicated by Tables 3 and 4, five principal components were extracted and rotated, and found meaningfully interpretable from the original 18 background variables for both the deviant and the former deviant groups respectively. As indicated in Table 5, 11 principal components were extracted and rotated and found interpretable from the 50 dependent variables for the deviant group, while, as indicated in Table 6, 13 principal components were extracted and rotated and found interpretable from the 50 original dependent variables for the former deviant group.

THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AS DETERMINED BY THE FACTOR ANALYSIS

The five factors to be used as independent variables appear to be similar for both the deviant and former deviant groups, except

TABLE 3: BACKGROUND FACTORS OF DEVIANT GROUP

Variables	ROTATED FACTORS *				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Age		.881			
Sex					.913
College Classification		.771			
Race			-.532	.479	
Political Ideology					
Parent's Income			.865		
Religion				.857	
Marital Status		.705			
Geographic Location					
Previous Exposure					
Combined F-Score	.988				
Conventionalism	.728				
Authoritarian Submission	.816				
Authoritarian Agression	.874				
Anti-Intracception	.754				
Superstition and Stereotypy	.823				
Power and Toughness	.852				
Destructiveness and Cynicism	.605				
Projectivity	.797				
Over Concern with Sexual Goings-On	.748				
Eigenvalues	6.8	2.0	1.3	1.0	1.0

*Loadings less than .4 are omitted from this table.

TABLE 4: BACKGROUND FACTORS OF FORMER DEVIANT GROUP

Variables	ROTATED FACTORS*				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Age		.851			
Sex					.910
College Classification		.728			
Race			.717		
Political Ideology				.744	
Parent's Income			-.663		
Religion				-.554	
Marital Status		.791			
Geographic Location					
Previous Exposure					
Combined F-Score	.847				
Conventionalism	.817				
Authoritarian Submission	.520				
Authoritarian Aggression	.860				
Anti-Intraception	.819				
Superstition and Stereotypy	.539				
Power & Toughness	.636				
Destructiveness and Cynicism					
Projectivity	.690				
Over-Concern with Sexual Goings-on	.798				
Eigenvalues	6.2	2.1	1.4	1.3	1.0

*Loadings less than .4 are omitted from this table.

for the fourth factor. In the deviant group, the fourth factor grouped ethnic background with religious background into an Ethno-religious variable. In the former deviant group, the fourth factor developed into Ideology dimension. This factor reflects the possible interacting influences which political ideology, religious background and attitudes concerning superstition and power might have on general ideology formation. The Ethno-religious variable indicates that for the population sampled, whites tend to be more closely affiliated to the more traditional American Religions than non-whites. The Ideology variable grouped conservative, religious, superstitious and power impressed traits together, as opposed to the more liberal, non-religious, non-superstitious, unimpressed by power disposition.

The remaining four factors representing the independent variables are nearly identical for both deviant and former deviant groups. These factors are: Authoritarianism (Factor I), Social Background (Factor II), Ethno-Economic Status (Factor III) and Sex (Factor V). The Authoritarianism variable consists of the combined scores of the nine scales of the standard authoritarian test discussed earlier. The Social Background variable consists of a correlation among age, marital status and college classification. The variable indicates that the older, married upperclassmen group together, and the younger, single lowerclassmen group together. The Ethno-Economic Status variable reflects the association between ethnic background and income. The variable indicates an inverse relationship exists between the two: the non-whites having a lower income while the whites have a higher income. The last factor, Sex, was not grouped with other variables by the factor analysis.

THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES AS DETERMINED BY THE FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR
THE DEVIANT GROUP

There are 11 factors to be used as dependent variables for the deviant group. These factors are: Casual Acquaintance (Factor I), Homosexuality (Factor II), Closeness (Factor III), Deviant Consumption-Selling in Secondary Relations (Factor IV), Reaction (Factor V), Atheism (Factor VI), Mental Illness (Factor VII), White Collar Criminality (Factor VIII), Radicalism (Factor IX), Thief Acquaintance (Factor X), Thief Threat (Factor XI).

The Casual Acquaintance variable indicated that for all 10 types of deviant behaviors there is a tendency toward a low degree of rejection in a casual acquaintance or speaking relationship. There is a similarly low degree of rejection for six of the deviant behaviors in a close friendship relation, as indicated by the Closeness variable. The homosexual, thief, atheist and K.K.K. member did not exhibit the low degree of rejection in a close friendship relation that was indicated for the drug addict, alcoholic, student radical, prostitute, tax evader and the mentally ill.

The Homosexuality, Reaction, Atheism, Mental Illness, White Collar Criminality, Radicalism and Thief Relationship variables all generated into separate factors. The indication is that these seven forms of behavior across the four social situations (Work, Neighbor, Casual Acquaintance, Close Friend) exhibit a low degree of rejection.

The Deviant Consumption-Selling variable groups two types of deviant behaviors, prostitution and drug addiction, into a single factor. The Deviant Consumption-Selling variable indicates a low degree of rejection for prostitutes and drug addiction in secondary social relations. That is, only in the work and neighbor social situation was a tolerance for these two behaviors indicated, while in

TABLE 5: DEPENDENT FACTORS OF DEVIANT GROUP

Variables	ROTATED FACTORS *										
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
Homosexual - W**		.782									
Drug Addict				.507							
Student Radical - W									.670		
Alcoholic - W											
Prostitute - W				.752							
Mentally Ill-W							.718				
Thief-W										.694	
Tax Evader-W								.822			
Atheist-W						.617					
K.K.K. Member-W					.876						
Homosexual-N		.703									
Durg Addict-N				.439							
Student Radical-N									.722		
Alcoholic-N											
Prostitute-N				.751							
Mentally Ill-N							.787				
Thief-N										.721	
Tax Evader-N								.827			
Atheist-N						.693					
K.K.K. Member-N					.892						
Homosexual-S	.711										
Drug Addict-S	.781										
Student Radical-S	.728										
Alcoholic-S	.780										
Prostitute-S	.766										
Mentally Ill-S	.694										
Thief-S	.763										
Tax Evader-S	.702										
Atheist-S	.564					.611					
K.K.K.Member-S	.563				.606						

TABLE 5: DEPENDENT FACTORS OF DEVIANT GROUP (con't)

Variables	ROTATED FACTORS *										
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
Homosexual-C		.721									
Drug Addict-C			.666								
Student Radical-C			.576						.569		
Alcoholic-C			.675								
Prostitute-C			.631								
Mentally Ill-C			.615								
Thief-C										.513	
Tax Evader-C			.538					.530			
Atheist-C						.762					
K.K.K. Member-C					.791						
Homosexual-T		.596									
Drug Addict-T											
Student Radical-T									.538		
Alcoholic-T											
Prostitute-T											
Mentally Ill-T							.584				
Thief-T											-.629
Tax Evader-T								.652			
Atheist-T						.657					
K.K.K. Member-T					.637						
Eigenvalues	13.6	4.4	3.4	2.7	2.3	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.3

*Loadings less than .4 are omitted from the table

**W = Working relationship

N= Neighborhood Relationship

S = Casual Speaking Acquaintances

C = Close Friend Relationship

T = Threatening Relationship

the more primary types of social relations, there was no indication of a low rejection level for the Deviant Consumption-Selling variable.

Finally, the Thief Threat variable indicates a high degree of perceived threat toward the thief. These 11 factors accounted for 72% of the total variance. The total variance accounted for was 50%.

THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES AS DETERMINED BY THE FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR THE FORMER DEVIANT GROUP

There are 13 factors used as dependent variables for the former deviant group. These factors are: Threat (Factor I), Closeness (Factor II), Casual Acquaintance (Factor III), Reaction (Factor IV), Deviant Consumption-Selling (Factor V), Homosexuality (Factor VI), Mental Illness (Factor VII), White Collar Criminality in Secondary Relations (Factor VIII), Atheism in Secondary Relations (Factor IX), Prostitution in Primary Relations (Factor X), Radicalism in Secondary Relations (Factor XI), Drug Addiction in Secondary Relations (Factor XII), Thief Factor in Working Relations (Factor XIII).

The Threat variable indicates that across eight of the 10 types of behavior in the former deviant group, there was a low degree of perceived threat. Only the homosexual and the K.K.K. member did not cluster with this variable in the factor analysis. The Threat variable is unique to the former deviant group, for this low degree of perceived threat did not generate into an independent factor for the deviant group.

The Closeness and Casual Acquaintance variables were indicated by two separate factors for the former deviant group, as they did for the deviant group. The Closeness variable indicates that for seven of the ten types of deviant behaviors there is a tendency toward a low degree of rejection in a close friend relation. The three types

TABLE 6: DEPENDENT FACTORS OF FORMER DEVIANT GROUP

[illegible]

TABLE 6: DEPENDENT FACTORS OF FORMER DEVIANT GROUP (Con't)

Variables	ROTATED FACTORS *												
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII
Homosexual-C						.619							
Drug Addict-C		.608											
Student Radical-C		.685											
Alcoholic-C		.667											
Prostitute-C										.721			
Mentally Ill-C		.640					.509						
Thief-C		.662											
Tax Evader-C		.712											
Atheist-C		.691											
K.K.K. Member-C				.789									
Homosexual-T	.593												
Drug Addict-T	.616											.538	
Student Radical-T	.651												
Alcoholic-T	.672												
Prostitute-T	.679												
Mentally Ill-T	.637												
Thief-T	.668												
Tax Evader-T	.710												
Atheist-T	.626												
K.K.K. Member-T	.552			.566									
Eigenvalues	14.3	4.3	3.0	2.5	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0

*Loadings less than .4 are omitted from the table

**W = Working Relationship

N = Neighborhood Relationship

S = Casual Speaking Acquaintance

C = Close Friend Relationship

T = Threatening Relationship

which are not included are homosexuals, prostitutes and KKK members. The Casual Acquaintance variable indicates that for eight of the ten types of former deviant behaviors, there is a tendency toward a low degree of rejection in a casual acquaintance or speaking relation. The two types which are not included are homosexuals and KKK members.

Reaction, Deviant Consumption-Selling, Homosexuality and Mental Illness all generate into separate factors. The indication is that these four forms of former deviant behavior across the four social situations exhibit a low degree of rejection. White Collar Criminality, Atheism, Radicalism and Drug Addiction also generated into separate factors. However, the indication is that for these four forms of former deviant behavior, the tolerance is exhibited only in the more secondary types of social situations (Work, Neighbor). Prostitution generated into a separate factor which indicates that the rejection exhibited toward a former prostitute was low only in the more primary social situations (Casual Acquaintance - Close Friendship). This is interesting in light of the fact that in the deviant group the low level of rejection for the prostitute is exhibited only in secondary social relations. Finally, the Thief variable in a working relation indicates that a low level of rejection is shown toward the former thief in a working relationship.

These 13 factors accounted for 70% of the total variance. The total variance accounted for was 50%.

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE INDEPENDENT FACTOR VARIABLES ON EACH DEPENDENT FACTOR VARIABLE

In order to determine whether the social background characteristics and attitudinal dispositions presented in this study are related to social reactions toward the 10 types of deviant and former deviant behaviors, multiple regression analysis are performed. The factor

scores obtained from the original independent variables are utilized as independent variables in this analysis. The factor score obtained from the original dependent variables are utilized as dependent variables.

The factor procedure which was employed generated for both the independent and dependent variables a completely uncorrelated matrix of factor scores. The five independent factor variables were entered jointly into a regression analysis with each dependent factor variable. The correlations between the five independent variables and each of the 11 dependent variable measures for the deviant group are presented in Table 7. The correlations between the five independent variables and each of the 13 dependent variable measures for the former deviant group are presented in Table 8. With few exceptions, the correlations are slight. From an examination of the results of the regression analysis performed on each dependent variable, only in four of the regression equations did the independent variables predict a sizable percentage of the variance in the dependent variables. All four of these were in the deviant group. None of the regression equations for the former deviant group yielded results which could predict a substantial percentage of the variance in the dependent variables. The four regression equations from the deviant group are presented in Tables 9 through 12.

Table 9 shows the regression of the five independent variables on homosexuality. A regression equation results which predicts 11% of the variance. The authoritarian and sex variables accounted for over 9% of that variance. Table 10 shows the regression of the five independent variables on deviant consumption-selling. A regression equation results which predicts 13% of that variance. The sex variable accounted for over 9% of the variance. Table 11 shows the regression

TABLE 7: CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND 11 DEPENDENT VARIABLES FOR THE DEVIANT GROUP

[illegible]

TABLE 8: CORRELATION BETWEEN FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND 13 DEPENDENT VARIABLES FOR THE FORMER DEVIANT GROUP

[illegible]

TABLE 9: REPRESSON OF FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
ON THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE, HOMOSEXUALITY

	Coefficient	Variables
Homosexuality =	-.233	Authoritarianism
	.193	Sex
	.097	Ethno-Economic
	.091	Ethno-Religious
	.046	Social Background

Multiple R = .333

Multiple R^2 = .111

F = 4.70 with (5,188) df; significant beyond the .001 level.

TABLE 10: REGRESSION OF FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
ON THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE, DEVIANT
CONSUMPTION-SELLING

	Coefficient	Variables
Deviant Consumption-Selling =	-.306	Sex
	-.112	Social Background
	-.105	Authoritarianism
	.088	Ethno-Economic
	.065	Ethno-Religious

Multiple R = .355

Multiple R^2 = .126

F = 5.43 with (5,188) df; significant beyond the .0001 level.

TABLE 11: REGRESSION OF FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
ON THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE, ATHEISM

	Coefficient	Variables
Atheism =		
	-.378	Authoritarianism
	.217	Ethno-Religious
	.139	Social Background
	-.073	Sex
	.031	Ethno-Economic
Multiple R = .4641		
Multiple R ² = .2154		
F = 10.32 with (5,188) df; significant beyond the .000 level		

TABLE 12: REGRESSION OF FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
ON THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE, RADICALISM

	Coefficient	Variables
Radicalism =		
	-.221	Authoritarianism
	-.216	Social Background
	.159	Sex
	.037	Ethno-Religious
	-.026	Ethno-Economic
Multiple R = .3506		
Multiple R ² = .1229		
F = 5.27 with (5,188) df; significant beyond the .0001 level		

of the five independent variables on atheism. A regression equation results which predicts 22% of the variance. The authoritarian, ethno-religious and social background variables accounted for 21% of that variance. Table 12 shows the regression of the five independent variables on radicalism. A regression equation results which predicts 12% of the variance. The authoritarianism, social background and sex variables accounted for over 11% of that variance.

The discussion of these results is delayed until the next chapter, in which the implications of all the analysis performed on this data are considered. The results of one final type of analysis is presented before continuing to the last chapter.

INTERCORRELATIONS OF DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SETS BETWEEN GROUP TYPES.

The rotated factor scores for the independent variables in the deviant and former deviant group, as well as the rotated factor scores for the dependent variables, are compared by means of a relate analysis developed by Veldman (1967, Chapter 9). Veldman provides a computer program which (a) accepts as input two rotated factor loading matrices derived from the same set of variables, but which represent the factor structures of two specific samples: (b) arbitrarily equates the origins and factor vector orientations of the two factor structures: (c) and then determines the degree of rotation of the factor axes of one of the structures necessary to provide a maximum overlap between corresponding test vectors (Hunt: 1972, 5). The degree of rotation which achieves this criteria is then expressed "as a matrix of cosine of the angles between all pairs of factor axes in the two structures" (Veldman: 1967, 237). These cosines are interpretable as correlations between the factors derived from the two original factor analysis.

The results of this factor comparison analysis performed on the rotated factor structures of the independent and dependent variables for the deviant and former deviant groups are presented in Tables 13 and 14 respectively. From this analysis, it was possible to determine how similar the sets of independent variables were between the deviant and the former deviant groups (Table 13). In this analysis, we are also able to compare the reaction toward the 10 types of deviant behavior with the reaction exhibited toward the 10 types of former deviant behaviors. To rephrase the problem, it can be asked "Will clusters of intercorrelation among the social reaction variables (as represented in the factor loading matrices) be the same for observations made on the sample in the deviant group as they are on observations of the former deviant group sample?" (Table 14)

Reviewing the results of the factor structure comparison analysis present in Table 13, we observe that strong statistical relationships are found between each individual factor in the former deviant group exclusively, with its corresponding factor in the deviant group. For example, authorititarianism in the former deviant group is highly correlated with authorititarianism in the deviant group (.91) and is not strongly correlated with any of the other factors represented among the independent variables. This would indicate that for both deviant and former deviant groups each independent variable was measuring approximately the same phenomenon. It also indicates that each factor is independent or uncorrelated with any of the other four factors. This is important since these factors are used as independent variables in the regression analysis, which requires the predictors or regressor variables to be independent. As indicated in Table 14, there is a high correlation between each individual dependent variable factor

TABLE 13: RELATE ANALYSIS OF FORMER DEVIANT GROUP (A) WITH DEVIANT GROUP (B)
ON ROTATED INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FACTORS

Former Deviant Group	Deviant Group				
	I	II	III	IV	V
	Authori- tarianism	Social Background	Ethno- Economic	Ideology	Sex
Authoritarianism	(.9140)	-.0899	.3717	.1079	.0826
Social Background	.0226	(.9750)	.1197	.1748	.0451
Ethno-Economic Background	.2815	.0171	(.8489)	.3965	.2068
Ethno-Religious Background	.2536	.1923	-.3230	(.8910)	.0204
Sex	-.1436	-.0453	.1500	-.0828	(.9736)

TABLE 14: RELATE ANALYSIS OF FORMER DEVIANT GROUP (A) WITH DEVIANT GROUP (B)
ON ROTATED DEPENDENT VARIABLE FACTORS

Former Deviant Group	Deviant Group										
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
	Casual Acquain- tance	Homo- sexual	Close- ness	Deviant Consump- tion- Selling	React- ionism	Atheism	Mental- ly Ill	White Collar Crimi- nality	Radi- calism	Theft	Threat Theft
Threat	.0172	.0232	.0476	.0966	.0044	.2583	.0990	.0882	.0390	.0317	.9422
Closeness	.0107	.0542	(.8942)	-.0883	-.0240	.3023	-.0027	.1183	.0885	.1131	-.1352
Casual Ac- quaintance	(.9484)	-.1146	-.0771	-.0242	-.1015	.0011	-.0456	-.0170	.1856	.1514	.0052
Reaction- arism	.0915	-.0144	-.0007	.0214	(.8835)	.0282	.0263	.0137	.0177	.0333	-.0110
Deviat Consumption- Selling	-.0515	.0897	-.0517	(.7559)	-.0723	.0196	.2467	-.0725	.0014	.3065	-.1345
Homosexuality	.1423	(.8931)	-.0238	-.1761	-.0002	.0244	-.0275	.0471	-.0706	.0607	-.0293
Mental Illness	.0622	.0302	.0837	-.1623	.0185	-.1525	(.9130)	-.1191	.0530	.0549	-.0330
White Collar Criminality	.0414	-.0783	-.0805	.0678	.0029	-.1120	.1013	(.9563)	-.0308	-.0713	-.0916
Atheism	-.0185	.0929	-.2877	.0866	-.0405	(.8152)	.1739	.0805	.130	-.1777	-.1832
Prostitution	.1896	.0273	.2766	.5640	.0635	-.0868	-.1599	-.0643	-.1143	-.303	-.0213
Radicalism	-.1574	.0396	.0069	.0462	.0187	-.1257	-.0922	.0132	(.9473)	-.0091	.0653
Drug Addition	-.0303	.3637	.0095	.1865	-.0173	-.3723	-.0222	.1103	.0738	.0662	.1335
Theft	-.0775	.0426	-.0850	-.0366	.0304	.0967	-.1751	.0816	-.0380	.8552	-.0350

in the former deviant group with its corresponding dependent variable factor in the deviant group. The interpretations of these high levels of association are discussed in the last chapter.

The mode of analysis and the results of the data analysis have been presented in this chapter. A discussion and possible interpretation of the results presented is the task of the next and final chapter. It will also outline what conclusions can be made from this study.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter is concerned with a discussion of the results which were obtained from the analysis of the data collected for this research. The emphasis is placed on the interpretation of the results as they pertain to the questions posed in Chapter 2. Due to the nature of the population from which the sample was drawn, any conclusions made must be considered as tentative. So there is no attempt to generalize these results beyond the specific university population sampled. However, the findings of this study are of value in that they indicate there are definite patterns of reactions toward the various types of deviant behaviors, as well as reactions which are unique to a particular type of deviant behavior. Furthermore, there is the indication that the reactions toward four of the deviant behaviors were significantly influenced in differing degrees by certain social background characteristics and attitudinal structures of the respondents.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

It was hypothesized that the levels of social rejection for deviant behaviors are related to variations in the social background characteristics and attitudes of the persons who act as definers of deviance. The definers of deviance in this instance are the respondents to the questionnaires.

The results from the regression analysis indicates that rejection or tolerance of homosexuality, deviant consumption-selling, atheism and radicalism is related to variations in the social background characteristics and attitudes of the sample tested. Examination of Table 9 reveals that reaction toward homosexuality is influenced predominately by the authoritarian and sex variables

For instance, those respondents with high authoritarian attitudinal dispositions tend to give more rejecting responses toward the homosexual in all the varying social contexts. In addition, females tend to be more tolerant toward the homosexual than the male. The results concerning the authoritarians are not surprising, since high authoritarianism is frequently associated with intolerance toward members of an out-group, assuming that those high in authoritarianism consider homosexuals as an out-group. The female's more tolerant reactions toward the homosexual can be understood in light of the finding that stereotypes typically associated with homosexual activities include behaviors which are considered sexually abnormal, perverted and maladjusted (Simmons: 1965, 277). In addition, the homosexual act is usually perceived as sexual behavior, or behaviors, between or among men. A possible interpretation of the female's tolerance is that the female can be less concerned with behavior of the homosexual in the various social relationships, since the assumed "deviant" behavior is usually not directed toward females. Males, however, are more likely to be concerned with the behavior of the homosexual in varying social contexts. This concern could be to the point of rejection, especially for those high in authoritarianism who tend to accept readily the popular stereotypes attributed to an out-group.

Examination of Table 10 reveals that reactions toward behaviors grouped in the deviant consumption-selling variable are influenced predominately by the sex variable. Drug addiction and prostitution are the two types of deviant behaviors which make up the deviant consumption-selling variable. These two types of behavior were grouped together on the basis of similarity of reaction exhibited toward them only in the more secondary types of social

relationships (work-neighbor). As indicated by the data, the female respondents tend to reject the behaviors in the deviant consumption-selling group in the secondary type of social relations. This difference in the male-female reaction to the prostitute might be attributable to the traditionally differing norms regarding sexual behavior in American society. There seems to exist a double standard regarding sexual activities. The woman is generally expected to live by one set of sexual norms, which include control of the sexual appetite and a sexual faithfulness to the man she loves and/or to whom she is married. Any deviation from this norm is usually severely condemned by society. The traditional ideal is that a woman gives herself sexually only to the one she loves. The selling of sex has always been viewed as an abuse of the sexual act, and the women involved in prostitution traditionally have been highly ostracized from conventional society, especially by other women.

Men, on the other hand, even though ideally should remain faithful, traditionally are not severely condemned for deviating. Since men are the primary supporters of the institution of prostitution, it is not surprising that they seem more tolerant of the prostitute in a working and neighbor relationship.

Although in recent years, as exemplified by such movements as "Women's Liberation" and the "Sexual Revolution", there appears to be a trend toward the liberalization of sexual norms and a removal of the double standard. The results presented here seem to indicate that a double standard does still exist, however. The very existence of the profession of prostitution is attributable to this double standard. Prostitution is an institution which, in addition to other functions, serves as a means of sexual gratification for men. Similarly, structured occupation intended for the

gratification of the female's sexual interests are extremely rare. Given the existence of this double standard, it is not surprising to find that females tend to reject prostitution more than males.

Examination of Table 11 reveals that reaction toward atheism is influenced predominately by the authoritarian, ethno-religious and social background variables. For instance, those with high authoritarian tendencies reject the atheist. Also those respondents who tend to be more religious reject the atheist. Neither of these findings is surprising. Upon further examination, we find that the older, married upperclassmen tend to reject the atheist. This may be understood by taking into consideration the important role religion has traditionally played in the American family. Religious training has been an integral part of most American families, and religious doctrines are used frequently as guidelines for the teaching of morality in the family.

Many single college students seem to let their concern for religion taper during the early part of their college experience. However, it appears that for this sample as the student is married, the possibilities of beginning a family seems to influence a renewed or continued commitment to the more traditional religious interests. Since atheism stands in opposition to the traditionally religious systems, it is not surprising that the married have a tendency to reject the atheist. Even though there seems to be more and more young people, both married and single, who are not aligning or re-aligning themselves with the traditional American religions, it appears, that at least for this sample, the above explanation for the reactions of the older, married upperclassmen toward the atheist could be applicable.

Examination of Table 12 reveals that reaction toward radicalism is influenced predominately by the authoritarian, social background and sex variables. For instance, those high in authoritarianism tend to reject the student radical. In addition, the older, married upperclassmen tend to reject the student radical. Finally, the female appears to be more tolerant of the student radical than the male.

The authoritarian's rejection of the student radical is understandable since the syndrome is by definition conservative. The reaction of the older, married upperclassmen could also be interpreted as a tendency to become more conservative with age and marriage. There is more of a commitment to the political and economic system upon which the college graduate must depend for work and support of the family.

The preceding was a discussion of the findings of the multiple regression analysis of the reactions toward four types of deviant behaviors as they were influenced by social background characteristics and authoritarian attitudinal structures. The results yielded partial verification for the hypothesis that levels of social rejection for deviant behaviors are related to variations in the social background characteristics and attitudes of the persons who act as definers of the deviance.

It was found that for homosexuality, deviant consumption-selling (Prostitution-Drug Addiction), atheism and radicalism rejection or tolerance was significantly related to the varying influences of authoritarianism, sex, ethno-religious status and the social background factor (age, marital status, college classification). The authoritarian variable was significantly influential in the reactions toward three types of deviant behaviors. The indication is that persons who are highly conventional and think in rigid categories, in

addition to the other characteristics of the authoritarian syndrome, will tend to reject homosexuality, atheism and radicalism.

The social background factors of age, marital status, college classification significantly influenced reactions toward two types of deviant behaviors. The indication is that older, married upper-classmen tend to reject atheism and radicalism. These reactions might possibly be attributable to certain commitments made to both religious and economic systems after an individual is married.

The sex variable significantly influenced reactions toward three types of deviant behaviors. The indication is that the female tends to reject the behaviors in the deviant consumption-selling variable more than the male. However, the female tends to be more tolerant of homosexuality and radicalism than the male.

Finally, the ethno-religious variable significantly influenced reaction toward atheism. The indication is that the more religious person tends to reject atheism.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS OF FACTOR ANALYSIS

The factor analysis performed on the original raw dependent variables yielded information which is helpful in providing partial answers to some of the questions asked earlier. From inspection of Tables 5 and 6, certain specific comments are justifiable concerning the follow questions:

1. Does the reaction toward a social deviance remain constant across varying social relations?
2. Is the reaction toward a social deviance the same for all types of deviant behaviors, or does each behavior generate reactions which are unique?
3. Can certain types of deviant behaviors be grouped together

on the basis of similarity of the reaction directed toward them, and if so, does this grouping remain constant across varying degrees of social relations?

In answer to the first question, it appears that reactions toward at least seven types of deviant behaviors remain relatively constant across the varying social relations of work, neighbor, casual acquaintance and close friendship. These seven behaviors are homosexuality, reactionarism, atheism, mental illness, white collar criminality and radicalism. The indication is that reaction toward these behaviors for the sample tested are in the direction of tolerance rather than rejection across all four social relations. In addition, the rejection of the homosexual by those high in authoritarianism, and by males, which was discussed earlier, also appears to remain constant across the varying social relations. The influences of authoritarianism and social background characteristics upon reaction to homosexuality, atheism and radicalism remains constant across the four varying social relations. Therefore, it appears that at least for the seven types of deviant behaviors, reaction in the form of tolerance or rejection seems to remain relatively constant across the four varying social relations.

In answer to the second question, the indication is that each type of deviant behavior does generate reactions, which are unique to that behavior. It appears that reactions to deviant behaviors are not the same for all types. Furthermore, the grouping of several types of behaviors into categories based on similarity of reaction exhibited toward them would be to underestimate the unique reaction generated by each type of deviant behavior. From Table 5, it is clear that each type of deviant behavior generates reaction which is unique to that behavior. The only exception to this was the

deviant consumption-selling variable.

That each deviant behavior generates a unique reaction is also indicated by the results of the multiple regression analysis. That is, reactions were not influenced by the same combinations of authoritarianism and social background characteristics for each behavior. Each reaction was influenced by its own unique combination of these variables. Therefore, any simple classification or grouping of deviant behaviors into neat categories based on assumed similarity of these behaviors needs a careful re-evaluation, taking into account not only that each deviant behavior is a unique social phenomenon in itself, but also societal reactions to deviant behaviors exhibits unique patterns. As mentioned earlier, only prostitution and drug addiction grouped together in the factor analysis on the basis of similarity of reactions exhibited toward them.

However, reactions toward all types of deviant behaviors did group together as being similar in the casual acquaintance relation. This reaction was in the direction of tolerance toward all 10 types of deviant behaviors. This tolerance was very strong in the casual acquaintance relations, when compared to the mild, almost borderline tolerance exhibited for each of the various types of deviant behaviors across the varying social relations. This is visually apparent by inspection of Table 1. This tolerance exhibited toward the 10 types of deviant behaviors in a casual acquaintance relation is not surprising. It could be that the respondents do not perceive the possibility as being great for encountering the behavior, which has been labeled deviant, in a relationship which involves only a minimal degree of commitment and contact.

A final question posed in this research is whether social stigma or the deviant label is still carried by the former deviant. The

relate analysis discussed earlier was performed in order to compare the rotated factor scores of the dependent variables for the deviant group with the rotated factor scores of the dependent variables for the former deviant group. Reviewing the results of the factor structure comparison analysis presented in Table 14, strong statistical relationships are found between reactions of the deviant and former deviant groups. This would seem to support the contention that reactions toward deviant behaviors across varying social relations are similar. These results do not, however, indicate that social stigma is still carried by the former deviant. The indication is that the patterns of reaction in the direction of tolerance which were exhibited in the deviant group were similarly exhibited in the former deviant group.

Since there is a tendency in a college population to be more liberal than that of the general public, the more tolerant reactions toward the 10 types of deviant behaviors found in this study might be significantly influenced by the population sampled. Even though the direction of the reaction appears to be tolerant, it is important to note that there are indications, even in this college sample, that for homosexuality, drug addiction, alcoholism, theft and reactionarism there is only a very borderline tolerance indicated.¹³ Atheism is the only type of behavior across all four social relations which generated an obvious high degree of tolerance.

These cautions are mentioned primarily to reiterate the exploratory nature of this research, and the admitted inadequacies of the sample tested for the purpose of generalizations. Any conclusions about the results of this research must be viewed as tentative. The intentions of the research have been to explore the composition of societal reactions, as well as to explore the possible relations

which authoritarian attitudinal structures and social background characteristics have on influencing societal reactions to deviant behavior. Hopefully, the research has yielded information which will be useful in giving direction to finding the answers to some of the questions asked about societal reaction to deviant behavior, the eventual goal being a better understanding of the role played by societal reaction in the deviant defining process.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The information presented in this research is a useful first step toward a better understanding of reactions toward deviant behaviors. Future research which has the goal of further understanding the nature of public reaction toward deviant behavior might lead to answers to such questions as the influence public reaction toward deviant behavior exerts upon the possessors of power and interest groups. Interest groups have been mentioned frequently by writers such as Quinney as playing an important role in the norm defining and law making processes. The question of whether powerful interest groups are influenced by public reaction to deviant behavior or if public reaction toward deviant behavior is largely influenced by the powerful interest groups or a combination of both is one direction for future study. Hopefully, more studies in the future will be concerned with societal reaction to deviant behavior and the deviant defining process. This research, along with the research of Simmons, Kitsuse, Rooney and Gibbons and others, are substantial beginnings. In addition, the research implication derived from the theoretical suggestions of Blumer (1971), Matza (1969) and Quinney (1969) should lay a substantial foundation for informative research into the deviant defining process.

FOOTNOTES

1. Marshall B. Clinard's edited book, Anomie and Deviant Behavior, is the most extensive work done to date explaining Merton's theory, in addition to presenting extensions and criticisms of the theory. This is followed in the final section with a defense written by Merton. The major portion of what follows is simply a condensation and comment of Clinard's book.
2. A detailed explanation of each criticism is covered by several authors in Clinard's Anomie and Deviant Behavior, pp. 57. Edwin Lemert, James F. Short, Jr., Warren Dunham, Alfred Lindesmith, John Gagnon and Charles Snyder were the contributing authors.
3. It is entirely possible more sophisticated statistical techniques were used, but if so, they were not reported in their article.
4. For the remainder of the thesis, the term "former deviant" will be used when discussing a person no longer participating in a deviant behavior.
5. See Appendix A
6. See Appendix B
7. See Appendix C
9. See Part A of Appendices A and B
10. See Part D of Appendix C
11. See Part C of Appendices A and B
12. See Part B of Appendices A and B
13. See Deviant Columns in Table 1

APPENDICES A, B, C.

APPENDIX A

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer all the following questions (1-60) on the answer sheet provided. Answer questions (1-32) of Part D directly on the question sheet. You will notice Part D is separate from the rest of the questionnaire. Make sure not to answer any of the questions from Part D on the answer sheet. Make sure when answering Parts A-C that you mark on the answer sheet the number which corresponds on the question sheet. There are no right or wrong answers, we are only interested in your honest response. Do not write your name or student number on the questionnaire or the answer sheet. If there are any questions, please ask them now.

PART A: Please answer the following questions which pertain to you:

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1. Age | 1
17-18 | 2
19-20 | 3
21-22 | 4
23-24 | 5
25 & over |
| 2. Sex | Male | Female | | | |
| 3. Classification | Freshman | Sophomore | Junior | Senior | Graduate |
| 4. Race | White | Black | Mexican-American | Oriental | Other |
| 5. Political Ideology | Radical | Liberal | Moderate | Conservative | Reactionary |
| 6. Parents Income | \$5,000-7,499 | \$7,500-9,999 | \$10,000-12,499 | \$12,500-14,999 | \$15,000. & above |
| 7. Religion | Protestant | Catholic | Jewish | Other | None |
| 8. Martial Status | Single | Married | | | |

Please answer either Question #9 or #10, as it pertains to you.

- | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| 9. If Texas resident, which region? | 1
North | 2
East | 3
South | 4
West | 5
Central |
| 10. If out of state resident, which region? | North | East | South | West | Central |

PART B: In this section there are four questions about 10 different types of people. Read the questions and give your response pertaining to each type of person. Give only one answer to each question and please answer every question, leaving no blanks.

1. In a working situation, how would you feel about working closely with this type person?

	1	2	3	4
11. Homosexual	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
12. Drug Addict	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
13. Student Radical	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
14. Alcoholic	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
15. Prostitute	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
16. Mentally Ill Person	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
17. Thief	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
18. Person Guilty of Income Tax Evasion	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
19. Atheist	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
20. Klu-Klux-Klan Member	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve

II. How would you feel about having this person as your next door neighbor?

	1	2	3	5
21. Homosexual	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
22. Drug Addict	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
23. Student Radical	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve

24.	Alcoholic	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
25.	Prostitute	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
26.	Mentally Ill Person	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
27.	Thief	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
28.	Person Guilty of Income Tax Evasion	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
29.	Atheist	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve
30.	Klu-Klux-Klan Member	Strongly Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	Strongly Approve

III. If the occasion arose, do you think you could accept this person as a casual speaking acquaintance?

	1	2	3	4
31. Homosexual	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
32. Drug Addict	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
33. Student Radical	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
34. Alcoholic	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
35. Prostitute	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
36. Mentally Ill Person	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
37. Thief	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
38. Person Guilty of Income Tax Evasion	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
39. Atheist	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
40. Klu-Klux-Klan Member	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

IV. If the occasion arose, do you think you could develop a close friendship with this person?

	1	2	3	4
41. Homosexual	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
42. Drug Addict	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

43.	Student Radical	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
44.	Alcoholic	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
45.	Prostitute	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
46.	Mentally Ill Person	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
47.	Thief	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
48.	Person Guilty of Income Tax Evasion	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
49.	Atheist	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes
50.	Klu-Klux-Klan Member	No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

PART C: Please answer the following questions. Give only one response to each question. Answer all questions, leaving no blanks.

51. What do you feel is most threatening about a homosexual?
 1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
52. What do you feel is most threatening about a drug addict?
 1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
53. What do you feel is most threatening about a student radical?
 1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
54. What do you feel is most threatening about an alcoholic?
 1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.

55. What do you feel is most threatening about a prostitute?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
56. What do you feel most threatening about a person who is mentally ill?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
57. What do you feel is most threatening about a thief?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
58. What do you feel is most threatening about a person guilty of income tax evasion?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
59. What do you feel is most threatening about an atheist?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
60. What do you feel is most threatening about a Klu-Klux-Klan member?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral and religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.

APPENDIX B

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer all the following questions (1-60) on the answer sheet provided. Answer questions 1-32 of Part D directly on the question sheet. You will notice Part D is separate from the rest of the questionnaire. Make sure not to answer any of the questions from Part D on the answer sheet. Make sure when answering Parts A-C that you mark on the answer sheet the number which corresponds on the question sheet. There are no right or wrong answers, as we are only interested in your honest response. Do not write your name or student number on the questionnaire or the answer sheet. If there are any questions, please ask them now.

PART A: Please answer the following questions which pertain to you:

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. Age | 17-18 | 19-20 | 21-22 | 23-24 | 25 & over |
| 2. Sex | Male | Female | | | |
| 3. Classification | Freshman | Sophomore | Junior | Senior | Graduate |
| 4. Race | White | Black | Mexican-American | Oriental | Other |
| 5. Political Ideology | Radical | Liberal | Moderate | Conservative | Reactionary |
| 6. Parents' Income | \$5,000.-
7,499. | \$7,500.-
9,999. | \$10,000.-
12,499. | \$12,500.-
14,999. | \$15,000.
& above |
| 7. Religion | Protestant | Catholic | Jewish | Other | None |
| 8. Marital Status | Single | Married | | | |

Please answer either Question 9 or 10 as it pertains to you.

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|---------|
| 9. If Texas resident, which region | North | East | South | West | Central |
| 10. If out of state, which region | North | East | South | West | Central |

PART B: In this section there are four questions about 10 different types of persons. Read the questions and give your response pertaining to each type of person. Give only one answer to each question and please answer every question, leaving no blanks.

1. In working situation, how would you feel about working closely with this type person?

11. A person who was at one time a homosexual, however, is no longer.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

12. A person who was at one time addicted to drugs, however, is now cured of the addiction.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

13. A person who was at one time a student radical, however, is no longer involved in radicalism.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

14. A person who at one time was an alcoholic, however, no longer drinks at all.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

15. A person who was at one time a prostitute, however, has rejected prostitution and no longer is involved with it in any way.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

16. A person who was at one time mentally ill but who has been cured and is now psychologically stable.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

17. A person who was at one time a thief but who now feels theft is wrong and would not be involved in any way in such acts in the future.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

18. A person who at one time was guilty of income tax evasion but is now honest with the government and feels he would not commit such acts again.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

19. A person who was at one time an atheist, however, now does not hold that conviction.

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Strongly disapprove | 3) Approve |
| 2) Disapprove | 4) Strongly approve |

20. A person who was at one time a member of the Klu-Klux-Klan but no longer is a member or adheres to the Klan philosophy.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

II. How would you feel about having this person as your next door neighbor?

21. A person who was at one time a homosexual, however, is no longer.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

22. A person who was at one time addicted to drugs, however, is now cured of the addiction.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

23. A person who was at one time a student radical, however, is no longer involved in radicalism.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

24. A person who was at one time an alcoholic, however, no longer drinks at all.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

25. A person who was at one time a prostitute, however, has rejected prostitution and no longer is involved with it in any way.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

26. A person who was at one time mentally ill but who has been cured and is now psychologically stable.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

27. A person who was at one time a thief but who now feels theft is wrong and would not be involved in any such acts in the future.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

28. A person who at one time was guilty of income tax evasion but is now honest with the government and feels he would not commit such acts again.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

29. A person who was at one time an atheist, however, now does not hold that conviction.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

30. A person who was at one time a member of the Klu-Klux-Klan but no longer is a member or adheres to the Klan philosophy.

- 1) Strongly disapprove 3) Approve
- 2) Disapprove 4) Strongly approve

III. If the occasion arose, do you think you could accept this person as a speaking acquaintance?

31. A person who was at one time a homosexual, however, is no longer.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

32. A person who at one time was addicted to drugs, however, is now cured of the addiction.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

33. A person who at one time was a student radical, however, is no longer involved in radicalism.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

34. A person who was at one time an alcoholic, however, no longer drinks at all.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

35. A person who at one time was a prostitute, however, has rejected prostitution and no longer is involved with it in any way.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

36. A person who was at one time mentally ill but who has been cured and is now psychologically stable.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

37. A person who was at one time a thief but who now feels that theft is wrong and would not be involved in any such acts in the future.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

38. A person who was at one time guilty of income tax evasion but is now honest with the government and feels he would not commit such acts again.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

39. A person who was at one time an atheist, however, now does not hold that conviction.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

40. A person who was at one time a member of the Klu-Klux-Klan but no longer is a member or adheres to the Klan philosophy.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

IV. If the occasion arose, do you think you could develop a close friendship with this person?

41. A person who was at one time a homosexual, however, is now cured.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

42. A person who was at one time addicted to drugs, however, is now cured of the addiction.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

43. A person who was at one time a student radical, however, is no longer involved in student radicalism.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

44. A person who was at one time an alcoholic, however, no longer drinks at all.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

45. A person who was at one time a prostitute, however, has rejected prostitution and is no longer involved with it in any way.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

46. A person who was at one time mentally ill but who has been cured and is now psychologically stable.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

47. A person who was at one time a thief but who now feels theft is wrong and would not be involved in any such acts in the future.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

48. A person who at one time was guilty of income tax evasion but is now honest with the government and feels he would not commit such acts again.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

49. A person who was at one time an atheist, however, now does not hold that conviction.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

50. A person who was at one time a member of the Klu-Klux-Klan but no longer is a member or adheres to the Klan philosophy.

1	2	3	4
No	Doubtful	Possibly	Yes

PART C: Please answer the following questions. Give only one response to each question. Please answer every question, leaving no blanks.

51. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once a homosexual?

1. A possibly physical threat to myself or others.
2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.

3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
52. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once a drug addict but is now cured of the addiction?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
53. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once a student radical, however, is no longer involved in radicalism?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
54. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once an alcoholic, however, no longer drinks at all?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
55. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once a prostitute, however, has rejected it and no longer is involved with it in any way?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.
56. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once mentally ill but has been cured and is now psychologically stable?
1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
 2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
 3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
 4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
 5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.

57. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once a thief but now feels theft is wrong and would not be involved with any such acts in the future?

1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.

58. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once guilty of income tax evasion but is now honest with the government and feels he would not commit such an act again?

1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.

59. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was once an atheist, however, now does not hold that conviction?

1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.

60. What do you feel is most threatening about a person who was at one time a member of the Klu-Klux-Klan but no longer is a member or adheres to the Klan philosophy?

1. A possible physical threat to myself or others.
2. A possible threat to the property of myself or others.
3. A possible threat to the moral or religious values of myself or others.
4. A possible threat to basic American ideals as I perceive them.
5. I do not perceive this person as a threat.

APPENDIX C

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE: PART D

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please answer the following questions by circling your choice on the question sheet, making sure to give only one response to each question. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions, so give your honest response to each question.

1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

2. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will-power.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

3. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

4. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

5. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

6. When a person has a problem of worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

7. A person who has bad manners, habits and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Very
Strongly	Agree			Disagree	Strongly
Agree					Disagree

8. What youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination and the will to work and fight for family and country.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Very
Strongly	Agree			Disagree	Strongly
Agree					Disagree

9. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Very
Strongly	Agree			Disagree	Strongly
Agree					Disagree

10. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself, especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from others.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Very
Strongly	Agree			Disagree	Strongly
Agree					Disagree

11. An insult to our honor should always be punished.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Very
Strongly	Agree			Disagree	Strongly
Agree					Disagree

12. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Very
Strongly	Agree			Disagree	Strongly
Agree					Disagree

13. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Very
Strongly	Agree			Disagree	Strongly
Agree					Disagree

14. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publically whipped or worse.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Very
Strongly	Agree			Disagree	Strongly
Agree					Disagree

15. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

16. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude and respect for his parents.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

17. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

18. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

19. Wars and social problems may some day be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

20. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked and feebleminded people.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

21. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

22. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

23. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

24. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

25. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

26. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

27. Familiarity breeds contempt.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

28. Nobody every learned anything really important except through suffering.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree

Please answer the following questions. These answers are strictly confidential and will only be used in analysis of the questionnaire.

29. Do you have any close relatives or friends who are any of the below listed types of persons?

1	2	If yes, circle the type which is applicable.	
Yes	No	A. Homosexual	F. Thief
		B. Drug Addict	G. Income Tax Evader
		C. Student Radical	H. Mentally Ill
		D. Alcoholic	I. Atheist
		E. Prostitute	J. Klu-Klux-Klan Member

30. Do have any close relatives or friends who were at one time one of the types of persons listed below?

1	2	If yes, circle the type which is applicable.	
Yes	No	A. Homosexual	F. Thief
		B. Drug Addict	G. Income Tax Evader
		C. Student Radical	H. Mentally Ill
		D. Alcoholic	I. Atheist
		E. Prostitute	J. Klu-Klux-Klan Member

31. Do you consider yourself to presently be one of the types of persons listed below?

1	2	If yes, circle the type which is applicable.	
Yes	No	A. Homosexual	F. Thief
		B. Drug Addict	G. Income Tax Evader
		C. Student Radical	H. Mentally Ill
		D. Alcoholic	I. Atheist
		E. Prostitute	J. Klu-Klux-Klan Member

32. Do you consider yourself ever to have been one of the types of persons listed below?

1	2	If yes, circle the type which is applicable.	
Yes	No	A. Homosexual	F. Thief
		B. Drug Addict	G. Income Tax Evader
		C. Student Radical	H. Mentally Ill
		D. Alcoholic	I. Atheist
		E. Prostitute	J. Klu-Klux-Klan Member

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aberle, David
1950. "Shared Values in Complex Societies".
American Sociological Review, 15, 495-502.
2. Adorno, T. W.
1950. "F-Scale Clusters, Forms 45 and 40".
The Authoritarian Personality. New York:
Harper and Row.
3. Aker, R. L.
1968. "Problems in the Sociology of Deviance:
Social Definitions and Behavior". Social Forces
46, 455-465.
4. Barnett, Larry D.
1970. "Achievement Values and Anomie Among
Women in a Low-Income Housing Project". Social
Forces, 49, 127-133.
5. Becker, Howard
1964. The Other Side. London: The Free Press
of Glencoe, Collier-McMillan, Limited.

1963. Outsider. London: The Free Press of
Glencoe, Collier-McMillan, Limited.
6. Bell, Daniel.
1971. Social Deviance. New York: Dorsey Press.
7. Blalock, Herbert M.
1960. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill
Book Co., Inc.
8. Blumer, Herbert
1971. "Social Problems as Collective Behavior".
Social Problems, Winter (Vol. 18, No. 3),
298-306
9. Bord, Richard J.
1971. "Rejection of the Mentally Ill:
Continuities and Further Development".
Social Problems, Spring (Vol. 18), 496-509.
10. Carr, Leslie G.
1971. "The Srole Items and Acquiescence".
American Sociological Review, April (Vol.
36), 287-292.
11. Clinard, Marshall B.
1964. Anomie and Deviant Behavior. New York:
The Free Press.

1960. Sociology of Deviant Behavior. New York:
Rinehart and Co., Inc.

12. Cohen, Albert K.
1966. *Deviance and Control*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1963. "Towards a Theory of Deviant Behavior: Continuities Continued", paper presented to session on deviant behavior, American Sociological Association meeting. Aug. 28.
13. Couch, C. J.
1968. "Collective Behavior: An Examination of Some Stereotypes". *Social Problems*, Winter (Vol. 15) 310-322.
14. DeLamater, John
1968. "On the Nature of Deviance". *Social Forces*, 46, 445-455.
15. Dentler, Robert A., and Erikson, Kai T.
1959. "The Functions of Deviance in Groups" *Social Problems*, Fall (Vol. 7) 98-107.
16. Dubin, Robert
1959. "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure: Continuities in Social Theory". *American Sociological Review*, 24, 163-174.
17. Durkheim, Emile
1947. *The Division of Labor in Society.*, trans. George Simpson. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
18. Erikson, Kai T.
1966. *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Wiley Press.

1962. "Notes on the Sociology of Deviance". *Social Problems* 9, 307-314.
19. Finestone, Harold
1964. "Cats, Kicks and Color", *The Other Side* by Howard Becker, pp. 281-297. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-McMillan, Limited.
20. Firth, Raymond
1961. "Suicide and Risk Taking in Tokopia Society". *Psychiatry*, 24, 2-17.
21. Garfinkel, Harold
1956. "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies". *American Journal of Sociology* 6, 420-424.
22. Gibbs, Jack P.
1966. "Conceptions of Deviant Behavior: The Old and the New". *Pacific Sociological Review*, Spring (Vol. 9) 9-14.

23. Glaser, Daniel
1971. Social Deviance. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., Inc.
24. Goffman, Erving
1963. Stigma. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Printice-Hall, Inc.
25. Goldberger, Arthur
1964. Econometric Theory. New York: John Wiley, Inc.
26. Gove, W. R.
1970. "Societal Reaction as an Explanation of Mental Illness: An Evaluation". American Sociological Review, 35, 873-884.
27. Gusfield, J. R.
1967. "Moral Passage: The Symbolic Process in Public Designation of Deviance". Social Problems, Fall (Vol. 15) 175-188.
28. Haber, Lawrence D. and Smith, Richard T.
1971. "Disability and Deviance: Normative Adaptions of Role Behavior". American Sociological Review, 36, 87-97.
29. Hagedorn, R. B., Miller, J. R. and Labovitz, S.
1971. "Industrialization, Urbanization and Deviant Behavior": Pacific Sociological Review 14, 177-191.
30. Hartung, Frank E.
1953. "Common and Discrete Values". Journal of Social Psychology, 38, 394-399.
31. Herzog, E.
1970. "Society Stereotypes and Social Research". Journal of Social Issues, 26, 109-125.
32. Hunt, A. Lee
1972. "The Recruiter-Candidate Matrix: A Multivariate Examination of the Similarity Hypothesis" : Unpublished Article.
33. Hunt, A. Lee and Pendley, Robert E.
1971. "Community Gatekeepers: An Examination of Political Recruiters". Unpublished Article.
34. Jessor, Richard
1968. Society, Personality and Deviant Behavior, A Study of a Tri-Ethnic Community. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.

35. Kitsuse, John I.
1962. "Societal Reaction to Deviant Behavior: Problems of Theory and Method". Social Problems, Winter (Vol. 9) 247-254.
36. Lanphier, C. M., and Faulkner, J. E.
1970. "Deviance in a Middle-Class Community". International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 11, 63-74.
37. Lefton, M., Skipper, J., and McCaghy, C.
1968. Approaches to Deviance: Theories, Concepts and Research Findings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
38. Lemert, Edwin M.
1969. Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1951. Social Pathology. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
39. Lorch, B. D.
1966. "Perception of Deviancy by Self and Others". Society and Social Research 50, 223-229.
40. Matza, David
1969. Becoming Deviant. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1964. Delinquent and Drift. New York: Wiley Press.
41. Merton, Robert K.
1957. Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
42. Miller, Walter B.
1958. "Lower Class Culture as a Generator of Gang Delinquency". Journal of Social Issues, 14, 5-10.
43. Miller, Delbert C.
1968. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.
44. Nett, Roger, and Sioberg, G.
1968. A Methodology for Social Research. New York: Harper and Row.

1954. "Conformity-Deviation and the Social Concept". Ethics, LXIV, 38-45.
45. Orlansky, Harold
1949. "Infant Care and Personality". Psychological Bulletin, 46, 1-48.

46. Quinney, Richard
1969. Crime and Justice in Society.
Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown and Co.
47. Ray, Marsh B.
1964. "The Cycle of Abstinence and Relapse
Among Heroin Addicts". The Other Side by H.
Becker, pp. 163-177. London: The Free Press
of Glencoe.
48. Reiss, Albert J.
1964. "The Social Integration of Queers
and Peers". The Other Side by H. Becker,
pp. 181-210. London: The Free Press of
Glencoe.
49. Reiss, I. L.
1970. "Premarital Sex as Deviant Behavior:
An Application of Current Approaches to
Deviance". American Sociological Review,
35, 78-87.
50. Rettig, Salomon, and Pasamunich, B.
1959. "Changes in Moral Values as a
Function of Adult Socialization". Social
Problems, 7, 117-125.
51. Rodman, Hyman
1950. "The Lower Class Value Stretch".
Social Forces, 42, 205-215.
52. Rodney, E. A., and Gibbons, D. C.
1966. "Social Reactions to Crimes Without
Victims". Social Problems 13, 400-410.
53. Rubington, E., and Weinberg, M. S.
1968. Deviance. Toronto, Ontario:
The McMillan Co.
54. Rummel, R. J.
1970. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston:
Northwestern University Press.
55. Rushing, William A.
1969. Deviant Behavior and Social Process.
Chicago, Illinois: Rand-McNally & Co.
56. Schur, Edwin M.
1969. "Reactions to Deviance: A Critical
Assessment". American Journal of Sociology,
75, 309-322.

1965. Crimes Without Victims. Englewood
Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1964. "Drug Addiction Under British Policy".
Other Side by H. Becker, pp. 57-83. London:
The Free Press of Glencoe.

57. Sheldon, William H.
1949. Varieties of Delinquent Youth.
New York: Harper and Row.

1942. The Varieties of Temperament.
New York: Harper and Row.

1940. The Varieties of Human Physique.
New York: Harper and Brothers.
58. Simmons, J. L.
1965. "Public Stereotypes of Deviants".
Social Problems, 13, 223-232.
59. Schwertz, R. D., and Skolnick, J.
1964. "Two Studies of Legal Stigma".
Other Side by H. Becker, pp. 103-118.
London: The Free Press of Glencoe.
60. Srole, Leo
1956. "Social Intergration and Certain
Correlations: An Exploratory Study".
American Sociological Review, 30, 709-716.
61. Sutherland, Edwin H., and Cressey, Donald R.
1960. Principles of Criminology.
Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
62. Sutherland, Edwin H.
1951. "A Critique of Sheldon's Varieties
of Delinquent Youth". American Sociological
Review, February (Vol. 16), 10-13.

1940. "White Collar Criminality". American
Sociological Review, 5, 1-12.
63. Sykes, Gresham and Matza.
1957. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory
of Delinquency". American Sociological Review,
22, 664-670.
64. Taylor, I., and Walton, P.
1970. "Values in Deviancy Theory and Society".
British Journal of Sociology, 21, 362-374.
65. Veldman, Donald J.
1967. Fortran Programming for the Behavioral
Sciences. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
66. Warner, Lyle G., and DeFleur, Melvin L.
1969. "Attitudes as an Interactional Concept:
Social Constraint and Social Distance as
Intervening Variables Between Attitude and
Action". American Sociological Review, April
(Vol. 34), 153-169.

67. Wilkins, Leslie
1964. Social Deviance. Englewood Cliffs,
New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
68. Winick, Charles
1964. "Physician Narcotic Addicts". In
H. Becker's The Other Side, pp. 261-280.
London: The Free Press of Glencoe.