

1-1-1974

Social Class and attitudes towards deviants

Michael D. Mendenhall
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Mendenhall, Michael D., "Social Class and attitudes towards deviants" (1974). *Student Work*. 1689.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/1689>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



SOCIAL CLASS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS DEVIANTS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Sociology

and the

Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies

University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Michael D. Mendenhall

10152-33

UMI Number: EP73529

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73529

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the College of Graduate Studies of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

Robert Simpson Sociology
Chairman Department

Graduate Committee:

Mark O. Rousseau Sociology
Name Department

Hugh R. Cowdin Journalism

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE:	THE PROBLEM	1
	INTRODUCTION	1
	THE PROBLEM	5
CHAPTER TWO:	THE THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE	15
	METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	28
	SUMMARY	30
CHAPTER THREE:	HYPOTHESES AND VARIABLES	32
	VARIABLES	32
	OPERATIONALIZATION	37
	SUMMARY	54
CHAPTER FOUR:	SAMPLING AND RESEARCH METHODS	56
	THE SAMPLE	56
	RESEARCH METHODS	61
CHAPTER FIVE:	RESULTS	67
	INTRODUCTION	67
	Ho1: SOCIAL CLASS AND IDENTIFICATION OF DEVIANTS	68
	Ho2: SOCIAL CLASS AND ACCEPTANCE- REJECTION OF DEVIANTS	72
	Ho3: SOCIAL CLASS AND ACCEPTANCE- REJECTION OF DEVIANTS, BY LIBERALISM-CONSERVATISM	80
	SUMMARY	81
CHAPTER SIX:	ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	84

ANALYSIS	84
EVALUATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	101
CONCLUSIONS	104
APPENDIX A - LETTER SENT TO SAMPLE MEMBERS INTERVIEWED BY VISIT	107
APPENDIX B - LETTER SENT TO SAMPLE MEMBERS INTERVIEWED BY PHONE	108
APPENDIX C - QUESTIONNAIRE	109
APPENDIX D - GROUPS IDENTIFIED BY SAMPLE AS DEVIANT	112
REFERENCES	115

TABLES

Table I.	Guttman Scale Coefficients	49
Table II.	Sample Participation in Study by Census Tract	58
Table III.	Social Class Characteristics of Sample	59
Table IV.	Family Income for Sample and for City of Omaha	60
Table V.	Social Characteristics of Sample	62
Table VI.	Identification of Deviants for this Study and for Simmons	67
Table VII.	Identification of Deviants, by Social Class	69
Table VIII.	Social Distance to Individual Types of Deviants	73
Table IX.	Social Distance to Aggregate Types of Deviants	74
Table X.	Social Distance to Individual Types of Deviants, by Social Class	75
Table XI.	Social Distance to Aggregate Types of Deviants and to Deviants in General, by Social Class	77
Table XII.	Acceptance-Rejection of Criminal Deviants, by Social Class	79
Table XIII.	Acceptance-Rejection of Criminal Deviants, by Social Class and Liberalism-Conservatism	81

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to several persons who contributed to the various stages of this research. Dr. Robert Simpson offered constructive ideas and criticisms during every step of this project, from the initial idea to the final draft of the thesis. I am grateful for the large amount of time which he devoted to this project, and the interest he maintained in it. Dr. Mark Rousseau also provided helpful suggestions, particularly in regard to the statistical analyses which were possible with my data. My sister Cathy provided assistance in the critical stage of collecting interviews. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the assistance of my wife, Mary. She contributed long hours to this project, including making phone calls, proof-reading, making suggestions, and typing both the first and final drafts of this thesis.

The assistance of each of these persons made my job easier and much more enjoyable.

CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

As a new member of any group is taught the proper ways of behaving, he is also taught what the improper ways of acting are, and what the consequences and penalties are for violations of these rules. The concept of group norm refers to these standardized ways of behaving that are characteristic of all social groups. The discipline of sociology deals with both notions of adherence to group norms, conformity, and with violations of those norms, deviance.

Sociologists and others have defined and explained deviance in several ways. Some have used a statistical definition, in which conformity constitutes majority behavior and deviance constitutes variations from the average. Most people engage in heterosexual activity, the definition implies, therefore homosexuality is deviant. The problem with this definition is that not only is homosexuality deviant, but also being left-handed, being a murderer, and having red hair. The concept of deviance using this definition says very little about the individual's behavior or the reactions of others to his behavior.

A second explanation refers to deviance as a pathological or unhealthy variation from the normal, which is a sign of

illness in all who engage in this behavior. Thus, mental illness, homosexuality, criminality, and drug addiction are all signs of sickness because they vary from some universal set of norms. There are at least two problems with this definition. First, there are very likely no universal norms, applying to all cultures and all time periods. Second, many writers (including Durkheim, 1958; Cohen, 1966; Erikson, 1966) have noted the functions which deviance performs for maintaining and strengthening the group.

A third explanation holds that deviance is a result of anomie. According to Merton (1957), whenever there is conflict between cultural norms and goals and the means by which these goals can be achieved, then anomie occurs. There is a breakdown in the social structure, and the individual has to "adapt" in some way. Deviant behavior is often the result of that adaptation. If, for example, a lower class individual wishes to achieve the culturally approved goal of financial success but finds culturally approved methods (education, inheritance) denied to him, he may respond by engaging in some form of deviant behavior such as stealing to achieve his goal.

Many researchers have used this perspective to explain some form of deviant behavior. Homans (1969) and Bensman and Gerver (1963) use this perspective in defining deviance in industrial settings.

There are other problems with each of these definitions. Erikson (1964) objects to the "anomie" explanation of deviance

because it cannot explain why some individuals are more likely to be caught and punished for their deviant activity than others. Many researchers have noted that a large number of people commit acts which are generally considered to be deviant but for which they are never caught. In a study by Wallerstein and Wyle (1947), 91 per cent of their sample committed one or more crimes after they were sixteen. 64 per cent of the men and 29 per cent of the women could have been convicted of felonies. Other studies (Porterfield, 1946; Kinsey et al., 1948) have indicated a similar high rate of deviant activity by members of the population. Therefore, only a small percentage of activity that violates some rule ever receives any punishment or reaction.

These considerations have led many writers to define deviance as a violation of a social norm which is followed by the act of conferring a deviant label on the individual. A deviant is someone whose rule violation was noticed and reacted to by a group of people. The difference, therefore, between convicted felons and the sample members who also committed felonies is that the former group was caught and labelled for their activities; the latter group was not.

The implications of the "labelling" definition of deviance is that there is nothing inherent in an act which results in that act being called deviant. The act becomes deviant only after some group has conferred a deviant label

on it. Homosexuality, for example, is considered deviant by many in our society. Historically, however, many societies have not disapproved of it. Prostitution is illegal in most parts of the United States; in some parts of Nevada, however, it is not. The critical factor, therefore, in determining whether an act which violates some rule is given a deviant label, is the existence of some kind of group or societal reaction to that act.

The study of the Trobriand Islanders by Malinowski X (1926) provides an interesting example of this process. An Island youth had violated ancient customs by marrying the daughter of his mother's sister. Although the other islanders were aware of this violation, they were willing to overlook it under the pretense that they were not aware of it. When, however, the young bride's discarded lover made a public accusation of the crime in front of the whole town, the townspeople could no longer ignore the violation. Because the violation was now made public, the townspeople were obligated to ostracize and punish the young couple, until finally the young man committed suicide.

Vincent (1961) provides another interesting example in his study of unwed mothers. He notes that sexual relations between unmarried persons generally results in little or no censure. If, however, these sexual relations result in a pregnancy, there is likely to be severe social reaction to the offenders, particularly to the unwed mother. The same act (illicit sexual relations) may result in social reaction and censure ranging from no reaction to very strong disapproval,

depending on the consequences of that act and the sex of the offenders.

The concept of societal reaction is critical to the X "labelling" definition of deviance and to the body of theory which those who subscribe to this definition have developed. These individuals include Becker (1963), Erikson (1964), Kitsuse (1962), and Simmons (1965). This theoretical perspective will be elaborated on in the next chapter. The problem which this report attempts to deal X with concerns this concept of societal reaction. We have very little research investigating the societal reaction to deviance. If this concept is as important as these theorists maintain, then we ought to know more than we presently do about the nature and complexities of societal reaction to deviant acts and actors.

THE PROBLEM

Becker (1963, 1967) has noted that a researcher interested in studying deviance can generally conduct his study from one of two perspectives. He can examine the perspective of the deviant actor himself, for example by interviewing a sample of drug addicts. Or he can study the viewpoints of the rule enforcers, such as police, judges, or social agencies that deal with drug addicts. Whichever group of persons he chooses to study, whether the rule breakers or the rule enforcers, he will be accused of bias for ignoring

the viewpoints of the group that he is not studying, and for presenting the viewpoints of his sample in a "sympathetic" light. Becker feels that this is an unfair accusation, for in fact the researcher is simply trying to understand the thought processes, the ways of interpreting and reacting to reality that is characteristic of the group that is the subject of his study.

In addition to the two perspectives that Becker mentions, it seems that there is also a third perspective that the sociologist might study, the viewpoint of the general public. The public may or may not agree with the rule enforcers in their interpretations of what is deviant. The widespread violations of the Prohibition laws in the twenties, and violations of marijuana laws in our own time, provide examples of such disagreement. The present paper reports the results of an investigation of the attitudes of a sample selected from the general population towards various types of deviants.

It is hoped that this research will serve both theoretical and research functions. As we will see in greater detail in the next chapter, the theoretical implications of this study pertain to that school of thought in the sociology of deviance known as the "labelling" or "societal reaction" school. We have already dealt with the definition of deviance which this school proposes. Hopefully, the results of this study will shed some light on a major concept within this school, that of

societal reaction.

There are two research functions of this study. First of all, we have very few studies of the attitudes of people towards various kinds of deviants. The present study will help fill that research gap. Secondly, the design of this study will provide a means for studying the attitudes and the reactions of a sample towards various kinds of deviants.

One of the few studies that we do have in this area was conducted by J. L. Simmons (1965) in the first of four pilot studies. In this study he asked a sample of 180 respondents (selected by means of a quota formula) to list those acts or groups of persons that they regarded as being deviant. Simmons discovered a number of interesting results. 252 different acts or groups were defined as deviant, suggesting that almost everyone is deviant from the perspective of at least a few persons. No group or act was defined as deviant by as many as half of the respondents. Homosexuals headed the list, with 49% of the sample identifying them as being deviant. A few of the responses that followed were: drug addicts (47%), prostitutes (27%), murderers (22%), criminals (18%). Subdividing his sample by age, sex, and education, Simmons found very few variations along the lines of these categories. Those few that he did find were mentioned in his article as follows (Simmons, 1965:224):

Thirty-six percent of the females, as opposed to 18% of the males, mentioned prostitute; 54%

of those with some college, as opposed to 34% of those who had finished high school or less, mentioned drug addicts; 19% of those over 40 years old, as opposed to 7% of those under 40, said beatniks were deviant. But all other subgroup variations were too slight to be reliable.

The data which Simmons has gathered gives us considerable insight into the sociology of deviance. Particularly, it introduces the notion that there may exist a hierarchy of acts which may be considered deviant by a considerable portion of a society. Homosexuality and drug addiction were given the greatest amount of attention by his sample; prostitution, murder, and criminality were also frequently mentioned. These behaviors, then, represent violations of norms which must be considered important by members of this sample.

The Simmons' study also suggests that subgroups within a society will react differently to the various kinds of deviant behavior which occurs in that society. The implications of this statement for social research are profound: which subgroups disapprove of which kinds of behavior, and why? What social, cultural, or environmental conditions lead this group to react in this way to this kind of deviant behavior? As we will see, these questions served as a catalyst for the development of the present research problem.

Yet the methodological limitations of Simmons' study are too important to be ignored. The major question derives from the design of the experiment itself: it does not really tell us very much about the proportion of people that defines various acts as

deviant. That is, 49% of his sample named homosexuals, but it does not follow that the other 51% do not consider homosexuals to be deviant. Also, even if someone names homosexuals as deviant, that in itself says nothing about the likelihood that that respondent would completely or partially limit his interaction with homosexuals. In other words, naming homosexuals as deviant tells us nothing about the individual respondent's attitudes of acceptance or rejection of homosexuals.

One reason for these problems is the fact that several assumptions are being made in the Simmons study that remain unsupported. Simmons is assuming that those groups which are identified by his sample as deviant are the ones disapproved of the most. Those groups, therefore, that are identified most frequently as being deviant are the ones disapproved of most strongly by his sample. These assumptions may or may not be valid. Testing these assumptions would clarify Simmons' concept of identification of deviants, and thus make it more useful for future theory and research.

The general area of investigation for the present research † is the study of attitudes towards deviants. The Simmons' report has served as the foundation upon which this study has been developed. The research will, first of all, replicate the Simmons' study by asking members of a sample to name those groups or acts which they regard as deviant. In addition, they will also indicate the extent to which they are willing to interact with members of certain deviant subgroups.

This additional variable, the degree of acceptance or rejection of deviants, will provide a much more complete indication of attitudes towards deviants. It will also permit the testing of the assumptions made by Simmons regarding the correlation between identification of deviants and disapproval of deviants. Two indications of attitudes towards deviants are therefore provided: identification of deviants, and degree of acceptance or rejection of deviants. These concepts will serve as the dependent variables for this study.

Two additional variables will be introduced in this study. I have selected social class as the primary independent variable. This refers to the relative rankings of individuals or families in a community in terms the differential amounts of wealth, power, or prestige that they have. Also, I have selected liberalism-conservatism as a control variable. This concept refers to the degree to which a person is willing to accept political or economic changes.

I will therefore be interested in answering the following questions:

1. Do members of different social classes identify different groups as being deviant?
2. Do members of different social classes differ in their attitudes of acceptance or rejection of various kinds of deviants?
3. If the concept of liberalism-conservatism were introduced as a control variable, would the above relationship

between social class and attitudes of acceptance-rejection be changed at all?

There were two reasons for selecting social class as the independent variable for this study. First of all, a number of studies have indicated that social classes are characterized by differing value orientations. For example, Miller (1958) has described the lower class as concerned with demonstrating toughness, avoiding "trouble" from officials, believing in the consequences of fate and luck, and desiring the excitement of thrills, risk, and danger. On the other hand, Cohen (1955) characterizes the middle class as respecting the property of others, controlling aggression, desiring wholesome recreation, and cultivating manners and courtesy. Q

The implications of these and other studies (Kahl, 1957; Hollingshead, 1949) which demonstrate different values for different social classes is that these values may lead to different attitudes and reactions to deviants. The middle class might prove to be less tolerant of criminal kinds of deviants because of the respect for property which the middle class values.

The second reason for selecting social class as the independent variable is because of the differences among social classes in the incidence of deviant activity that has been reported by many studies. Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) discovered a large variation in the incidence of mental illness in the lower classes as opposed to the upper classes. Sutherland

(1960) reported that upper and middle class individuals are less likely to engage in crimes such as burglary, but may engage in white collar crime, such as price fixing or income tax evasion. Other studies (Reiss and Rhodes, 1961; Robins et al., 1962) have also discovered a relationship between social class and incidence of deviant activity.

Assuming that there are differences among the social classes in terms of the deviant behavior that takes place, it is possible that these differences would lead to differences in attitudes towards deviants. A lower class individual may be more tolerant of the kinds of deviant activity which he is more likely to see. The reverse may also be true; he may be less tolerant of this activity.

Liberalism-Conservatism was selected as a control variable because many researchers have discovered a relationship between social class and various kinds of political and social attitudes.

+ Selvin and Hagstrom (1960) found that students whose fathers were blue-collar workers were more libertarian than students from any other social class background. They also found that these differences diminished as the students got older; junior and senior students were more libertarian than their freshman and sophomore counterparts.

Lipset (1960) discovered that lower class individuals were more liberal than the upper classes on economic issues, and more conservative on non-economic issues, such as civil rights, international relations, and civil liberties. MacKinnon and

Centers (1956) found that lower class individuals scored over twice as high on an authoritarianism scale as the upper class.

Political and social attitudes, therefore, are related to social class in very complex ways. It would seem that there is something about the life styles and conditions of the various social classes that would lead to differences in social attitudes. If this is so, liberalism-conservatism might prove to be a significant intervening variable for the present study. We might find, for example, that among liberals the upper classes are more tolerant of marijuana smoking than the lower classes, but among conservatives there might be no social class differences. All conservatives, regardless of social class, might disapprove of marijuana smokers. Similar results might be found for other kinds of deviant activity.

This study, therefore, will investigate the interrelationships among four variables. Social class is the independent variable. The two dependent variables are identification of deviants and acceptance-rejection of deviants. The control variable is liberalism-conservatism. Three specific null hypotheses will be tested by this research:

- Ho1: There is no relationship between social class and the identification of deviants.
- Ho2: There is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of various types of deviants.
- Ho3: There is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of deviants when liberalism-conservatism has been introduced as a control variable.

I am interested, therefore, in investigating the differences among the social classes in terms of their attitudes and reactions to deviants. Because I do not know whether those differences exist, and if so in what direction they exist, I have chosen to state the hypotheses relating to this problem in a null form. If differences are then found for specific kinds of deviants, the null hypotheses can be rejected for those kinds of deviants.

It is important that each of the four variables in this study be defined, both conceptually and operationally. Before proceeding to this step, however, I have included in Chapter Two a discussion of the theory and research which relates to this research. X

An underlying assumption of this project is that attitudes are not uniform throughout the population but rather they vary along subcultural, and particularly social class, lines. Hopefully, then, we can get a good deal of insight into the complexities of "societal reaction" to deviance as a result of this research.

CHAPTER TWO: THE THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The present research is related most closely to that school of thought known as the "labelling" or "societal reaction" school of deviance. As we saw in the previous chapter, this school maintains that an act is deviant only when it becomes labelled as deviant by society. That is, there is nothing inherent in any act which dictates that it will be considered deviant; rather, the social audience confers that label on the act. The most important stage in the process by which an act becomes labelled as deviant involves the societal reaction to the deviant act. Thus, the act of stealing is not deviant per se, but only becomes so after some type of societal reaction has taken place and the offender has been given a deviant label.

One of the first expressions of this point of view came from Edwin M. Lemert in Social Pathology (1951). He noted that deviant acts and actors differ in terms of the frequency of the acts' occurrence, the amount of reaction which these acts call forth from others, the likelihood that deviant actors will be caught and punished, and the extent to which these actors have accepted the deviant label. Lemert therefore developed an eight-stage continuum of a deviant career moving from primary to secondary deviation. At first an individual may commit an isolated deviant act (primary deviation, step one), for which he may receive some punishment by someone in authority (step two). He may then

commit further acts of primary deviation (three), for which he receives stronger penalties and rejection (four). Fifth, the process of further deviation may continue, with the deviant actor feeling hostility and resentment towards his accusers whenever he is punished. Sixth, the community takes formal action against the deviant, stigmatizing him for his aberrant behavior. Eventually, the deviant behavior is strengthened by these acts of stigmatization by the community (step seven). The individual may find that he is often blocked from acting in non-deviant ways. An ex-convict often has considerable difficulty getting a job after his release. Other processes may be intervening here as well. The deviant may decide that he prefers his deviant ways, that these ways have their rewards as well as their penalties. Thus the eighth and final stage is characterized by the subsequent acceptance by the individual of the deviant role, as well as his efforts to adjust his life on the basis of that role. He may dress or speak differently; he may limit his interaction to those persons who share similar activities and life styles. When deviation reaches this last stage, Lemert refers to it as secondary deviation. According to Lemert (1951: 76): "When a person begins to employ his deviant behavior or a role based upon it as a means of defense, attack, or adjustment to the overt and covert problems created by the consequent societal reaction to him, his deviation is secondary."

Other sociologists in the labelling school have also used the sequential or multiple-stage model to explain deviant behavior. Becker (1963) notes, for example, four stages in the deviant career. The first is the commission of an act which breaks someone's rules. The second is the act of being caught and publicly labelled as deviant. Several things may follow such an experience. The person may be treated as if he were somehow "different" from everyone else; he may be regarded by others with constant suspicion, as if they were waiting for him to deviate again. Thus the third stage may follow, that of the self-fulfilling prophecy. He may be forced to pursue a deviant career simply because he has little opportunity to pursue more "normal" activities. Being severely limited in his interaction with non-deviants, he may find that he can receive psychological support by joining an organized deviant group. This is Becker's fourth and final stage of the deviant career.

These and other theorists in the "labelling" school tradition have made some important contributions to the sociologist's understanding of deviance. They have emphasized the role of society or the social group in determining deviance; that is, groups determine deviance by deciding which acts will be labelled as deviant. As Erikson (1962: 308) has noted:

When a community acts to control the behavior of one of its members, it is engaged in a very intricate process of

selection. After all, even the worst miscreant in society conforms most of the time....and if the community elects to bring sanctions against him for the occasions when he does misbehave, it is responding to a few deviant details set within a vast array of entirely acceptable conduct.

The career or sequential model is particularly useful for studying many aspects of deviant behavior. Using this model, we can investigate the progression of deviant acts from isolated rule breaking, to the subsequent societal label and its effects, to the deviant's accepting the role of deviant, and to his entering a deviant subculture. We can compare the activities and life styles of deviants who have reached different stages of this continuum. This model can also lead the researcher who is studying deviant activity to ask important questions about the individuals he is studying: What step on this continuum have my subjects reached? What led them to progress to this step rather than stay at the last step? Why have they not yet reached the next step? How did their lives change after progressing from the past step to the present one?

It is interesting to read many of the studies of deviant behavior from the perspective of the career model of deviance. Thus, the crimes that were reported by Wallerstein and Wyle (1947), mentioned in the previous chapter, were examples of primary deviation. The subjects who admitted committing these crimes never reached Becker's second stage

of being caught and labelled.

The homosexual activity described by Reiss (1961) is also an example of primary deviation. Reiss examines the activities of a group of young male prostitutes who engage in sexual relations with adult male homosexuals. These young men did this for economic reasons; this was a way of making "easy money" with a minimum of risk. A strict set of norms govern the relationships which the boys may have with the homosexuals, forbidding certain kinds of sexual activities and permitting none but an economic relationship between the participants. Adherence to these norms made it possible for the boys to maintain their "straight" identities, and thus not proceed to subsequent stages. The policies of the police and authorities also prevented the boys from moving beyond the early stages of homosexual behavior: if these boys were ever caught, they would be treated as exploited children because they are minors. The law says that the adults are the exploiters and therefore are guilty.

Homosexual behavior which has reached the stage of secondary deviation is described by Leznoff and Westley (1956). When a homosexual reaches the point where he identifies himself as a homosexual, the authors believe, then he will very often enter a homosexual community. This community serves a number of functions for its members. The primary function is psychological in nature. Within the group the individual members are able to move freely, to be themselves without fear

of the severe reprisals which the "straight" world imposes on them. Thus the homosexual community provides a means for acceptance and psychological support for its members.

Sociologists have conducted a number of studies to determine why individuals commit deviant acts initially. Greenwald (1958), ⁺ for example, interviewed a group of 20 call girls concerning their early childhood experiences. He found that most were products of broken homes or hostile parents and had trouble achieving close social relationships with other people. In addition, they reported having a rewarding sexual experience with an older man. They were thus encouraged to view sex as a means to achieve personal gains and rewards.

Perhaps an even more important research question than why individuals deviate initially is why they continue their deviant acts in the face of potential punishment and disapproval. Many sociologists have used the viewpoint of "differential association" proposed by Sutherland (see, for example, Sutherland and Cressey, 1966) to explain this phenomenon. Those who commit deviant acts on a recurring basis have learned their ways just as others learn to respond in conformist ways. A group to which the individual belongs and whose membership he values engages in this activity on a regular basis. During his initiation the individual is taught the ideologies of the group, including justification for behaving in this manner, as well as "tricks of the trade", influential contacts and group history.

Bryan (1965) describes the apprenticeships which his sample of 33 served upon entering into prostitution. The first step for all but one girl was a personal contact with either a pimp or another "working girl". Once contact has been made and the girl had decided to become a call girl, it was then necessary for her to serve an apprenticeship period, usually lasting two or three months. Training is usually provided by another call girl. During this period the girl is taught the do's and don't's of dealing with pimps, other call girls, and "johns" or customers. She is also taught the ideologies of her new found profession.

Another Bryan paper (1966) examines these ideologies. One element of the call girl ideology holds that prostitution serves major functions for society. Prostitution is important for preventing rape, for holding marriages together, and for providing psychotherapeutic help in the form of comfort and companionship for lonely men. The call girls also feel that the customer is trying to exploit them, and so should be exploited by the girls. The girls believe that call girls are more honest and sincere than individuals in other professions. Another popular belief is that whenever any woman engages in sex, that act is, in essence, an act of prostitution. The housewife or girl friend who engages in sexual relations does so because she expects some favor in return.

The ideologies of deviant subcultures, therefore, serve several functions for members of those subcultures. They pro-

vide a justification for engaging in behavior which many people regard as wrong and immoral. They offer explanations for the injustice of the sanctions and stigmatization which accompany these deviant activities. They therefore make it easier for the individual deviant to reconcile the conflicting pressures to which he is subjected and maintain his rule-breaking behavior.

If the deviant has been placed in a total institution designed to deal with his particular kind of aberrant behavior, such as a prison or mental hospital, then the process of training will often be greatly facilitated. On the one hand he is placed in the perfect setting for learning from acknowledged professionals how and why to continue deviant behavior. The best place to learn how to crack a safe, or forge a check, is a prison. On the other hand, very often the total institution is not equipped, financially or with the proper manpower, to serve any other function than housing and controlling its inmates. Rehabilitation and treatment are beyond the capabilities of many total institutions.

Goffman (1961a) has written extensively of the characteristics of total institutions. In addition to many other characteristics of total institutions, he writes of the indignities that inmates of many institutions, such as mental hospitals, must suffer. Inmates are under constant surveillance, and enjoy little or no privacy from hospital staff or other inmates. Punishments for transgressions are often severe. The hospital makes every effort to destroy the inmate's old self-image and

create a new one that is subdued and obedient. Goffman feels that these conditions are prime factors in the creation and maintenance of the kinds of behavior that the hospital is supposedly trying to reform. As he has written in another work (Goffman, 1963: 224-5):

At Central Hospital (St. Elizabeth's in Washington, D. C.) I have observed an otherwise well-demeaned (albeit mute) youth walking down the ward halls with a reasonably thoughtful look on his face and two pipes in his mouth; another conducted himself with similar nicety while chewing toothpaste; another, with soap on his shaved head...the aim, then, of these bizarre acts is, no doubt, to demonstrate some kind of distance and insulation from the setting, and behind this, alienation from the establishment.

Total institutions thus reinforce deviant behavior in two ways. First, inmates learn deviant behavior by observing and listening to fellow inmates. Second, Goffman feels that inmates will often use some form of deviant behavior to react to the conditions under which they live in total institutions. As he writes in another book (Goffman, 1961 b: 147):

If you rob people of all customary means of expressing anger and alienation and put them in a place where they have never had better reason for these feelings, then the natural response will be to seize upon what remains - situational improprieties (deviant behavior).

There is another way in which groups act to reinforce

deviant behavior. Much research indicates that social policies and social conditions lead to some forms of deviant behavior. For example, Davis (1937) believes that when there are barriers to the sexual freedoms which the men in a society have, the rate of prostitution will rise. Schur (1964) argues that the drug addiction rate is much lower in England than America largely because of the non-punitive policies which the British government has towards addicts. Their societal reaction to the addict holds that he has a medical problem which can best be treated by a physician. The doctor, therefore, has the responsibility to determine whether someone is an addict and then prescribe drugs for him, preferably prescribing a decreasing dosage over time. The addict is therefore able to lead a fairly normal life and need not resort to crime to support his habit, as his American counterparts must so often do.

Again, the preceding articles serve to illustrate the usefulness of the career model of deviance for interpreting existing research and for suggesting problems and questions for future research. Another useful concept which has evolved from this model is that of career contingencies. These are conditions in a person's life which affect the likelihood of his progressing from one step on the career continuum to the next. These could include social class and family background, visibility of the offense, and availability of agencies to deal with the

offender. See Goffman (1961 a: 134-5) for a discussion of career contingencies.

Two studies reported in an article by Schwartz and Skolnick (1962) illustrate the effects of the "career contingency" of occupational status on job opportunities following criminal trial proceedings. In their first study, they compiled four employment folders on four imaginary unskilled job applicants. The first "applicant's" folder included a record of conviction and sentencing for assault; the second was tried for assault and acquitted; the third was also tried and acquitted, but the folder included a letter from the judge re-emphasizing the applicant's innocence. The fourth folder made no mention of any criminal record. The researchers found an indirect relationship between severity of record and interest by employers in the applicant, with the first applicant receiving the least positive response and the fourth applicant getting the most.

The second study investigated the effects of malpractice suits on a group of 58 doctors. Regardless of the results of the trial, most (52) of the doctors reported no negative effects of the trial and 5 of the other 6 reported their practices improved. The authors feel that one of the main reasons for the differences between the results of these studies, in terms of the effects of trial and conviction on the subjects, was the strong professional support which the medical profession gives its fellow members. No such support

is available to unskilled workers.

Each of the dozen references just cited illustrate and support some portion of the career model of deviance. Using these references, Becker's four stage model can thus be restated as follows:

1. An individual commits an act which violates someone's rules. In the majority of cases, nothing ever results from this act (see Wallerstein and Wyle, 1947). A number of studies have questioned why this first act of deviance took place (such as Greenwald, 1958). Other studies have investigated the factors which mitigate against an individual's progressing beyond step one (see Reiss, 1961).

2. The individual may be caught and labelled for his deviant act. A number of career contingencies (see Goffman, 1961 a) make it more likely that some will be caught than others. Several experiences may result. The person may be placed in a total institution. He may be ostracized by society, or punished in more subtle ways such as denying him employment (Schwartz and Skolnick, 1962). He may find that the only persons he is allowed to interact with are other deviants. This treatment by total institutions and the community in general will often leave him bitter and angry (see Goffman, 1963 and 1961 b).

3. Limited or ostracized in his interaction with "normal" society, and limited in his job opportunities, the deviant may respond by returning to his deviant ways. There is

therefore a self-fulfilling prophecy operating, with the individual told that his treatment is necessary because he is deviant, after which he responds with deviant behavior. The article by Schur (1964) provides an illustration of the self-fulfilling prophecy with regard to American drug addicts, who must support their habit by engaging in other kinds of deviant activity.

4. The deviant may find that the only place where he can find friendship and psychological support is with other deviants. Therefore, like the homosexuals in the study by Leznoff and Westley (1956) he may enter a deviant subculture. In addition to psychological support, this subculture provides training in how to deal with the "straight" world as well as other deviants (see Bryan, 1965). He will also receive indoctrination into the ideologies of his new group, including justification for continuation of their activities and criticisms of their accusers (see Bryan, 1966). These factors explain, in part, why the deviant actor often chooses to continue his rule-breaking behavior.

A major question which the literature of this school fails to answer concerns the nature of the concept of societal reaction. How much societal reaction is necessary to achieve effective labelling? Who must be doing the reacting: public agencies, organized groups, private individuals? As Simmons (1965:223) notes: "With a few notable exceptions, there has been remarkably little

explicit investigation of public attitudes towards deviants." Gibbs (1966) wonders exactly what kind of reaction identifies deviant acts. In other words, reactions to deviant behavior may range from "mild" to "harsh". At what point along this continuum is behavior considered deviant?

It will doubtless require many separate studies of attitudes and reactions before these questions can be answered. Hopefully, this present research will contribute to that endeavor.

METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

In his overview of the sociology of deviance, Erickson (1964:12) has written:

The difference between those who earn a deviant label and those who go their own way in peace depends almost entirely on the way in which the community sifts out and codes the many details of behavior to which it is witness. In this respect, the community screen may be a more relevant subject for sociological research than the actual behavior which is filtered through it.

The fact is there has been very little research into this "community screen". In addition to the Simmons (1965) data reported in the first chapter, there is also a major article by Kitsuse (1962). He was interested in the process by which the community or society:

- 1) interprets behavior (in the case of his study, homosexuality) as deviant,
- 2) defines persons who behave in this way as being deviant

(i.e., the imputation of homosexuality), and
3) reacts to the imputation of homosexuality.

With regard to the latter category, he found that there were four types of reaction: a) explicit disapproval and immediate withdrawal, the most negative reaction; b) explicit disapproval and subsequent withdrawal. These two were the most frequent types of reaction. There were, however, two other types of reaction: c) implicit disapproval and partial withdrawal; and d) no disapproval and relationship sustained ("live and let live"). Kitsuse (1962: 257) concludes:

...these data do indicate that reactions to homosexuals in American society are not societal in the sense of being uniform within a narrow range; rather, they are significantly conditioned by subcultural as well as situational factors... The larger implications of these data are that a sociological theory of deviance must explicitly take into account the variety and range of conceptions held by persons, groups, and agencies within the society concerning any form of behavior.

The notion of the complexity of attitudes towards deviants is supported by a poll conducted by Louis Harris (1965). A sample of adults was asked whether they thought various kinds of people were more harmful or more helpful to American life. Among other responses, 70% considered both homosexuals and prostitutes harmful, 68% considered civil rights demonstrators and 65% considered college demonstrators as harmful. Beatniks were considered harmful by 52% of the sample and members of

the John Birch Society by 34%. Subdividing the sample by income and occupational level, Harris found that the more educated and affluent an individual was, the more tolerant he was of deviant and nonconformist behavior.

SUMMARY

This chapter has explored in some length the explanations of deviant behavior provided by the "societal reaction" school of thought. We have also studied the sequential model which many writers in this school, such as Becker, have proposed, and the ways in which this model can prove useful for interpreting present research and improving future research. A critical concept in this school is that of societal reaction. Behavior is considered to be deviant behavior when there is some form of reaction against that behavior, and a label given to an individual engaging in that behavior. For example, killing another human being is not necessarily a deviant act. Killing someone in self defense, or killing an enemy soldier in war, are examples of acceptable forms of killing. When some group or society does not approve of the conditions under which an individual kills another, then that group will confer a deviant label on that individual.

As we have noted earlier, an inadequacy of this school pertains to the concept of societal reaction. Describing reaction as societal implies that attitudes towards deviants are generally uniform throughout society. The data by Simmons,

Kitsuse, and Harris contradict this assumption. There are many subcultures within a society, based upon such diverse criteria as age, religion, social class, sex, education, income level and occupation, among others. There are also many different forms of deviant behavior. Do each of these subcultures react in a similar manner to each of the kinds of deviant behavior? It seems obvious that they do not. Elaboration of the concept of societal reaction would explain how each subculture reacts to each kind of deviant behavior.

The present research will explore the ways in which differences in social class are related to attitudes towards various kinds of deviants. Chapter Three will set forth the specific hypotheses which this research will test, and will define, conceptually and operationally, the concepts which will be used in this study.

CHAPTER THREE: HYPOTHESES AND VARIABLES

This study will investigate the attitudes of a sample of heads of households towards various kinds of deviants. As I stated previously, this research will attempt to answer three questions:

1. Do members of different social classes identify different groups as being deviant?
2. Do members of different social classes differ in their attitudes of acceptance or rejection of various kinds of deviants?
3. If the concept of liberalism-conservatism were introduced as a control variable, would the relationship between social class and attitudes of acceptance-rejection be changed?

The small amount of research which has been conducted in this area gives very little insight into the directions which these relationships might take. For this reason, the three hypotheses which will be tested by this research are stated in null form as follows:

- Ho1: There is no relationship between social class and the identification of deviants.
- Ho2: There is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of various types of deviants.
- Ho3: There is no relationship between social class and the degree of acceptance or rejection of deviants when liberalism-conservatism has been introduced as a control variable.

VARIABLES

There are, therefore, four major variables in this study:

1. INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: SOCIAL CLASS

Social class was selected as the independent variable for the reasons given in Chapter One of this paper. Social class refers to the rankings of individuals or families in terms of the differential amounts of power, prestige, or wealth that they have. A number of factors determine what social class an individual will belong to. Among these are education, occupation, income level, residence, and family background. The two factors which will be used to measure social class in the present study are education and occupational status.

In their study of social class and mental illness, Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) divided their sample into five social class categories and discovered the following social class percentages:

<u>SOCIAL CLASS</u>	<u>%</u>
I	3.4
II	9.0
III	21.4
IV	48.5
V	17.7

The Upper Class, Class I, is composed of the wealthy business and professional leaders of the community. They are the most highly educated class. They are predominantly Protestant. Often their wealth is inherited.

Class II, the Upper Middle Class, are managers and lower ranking professionals who usually have had some college. They are upwardly mobile and sensitive to class differences. They are members of a large variety of organizations and clubs.

Class III, the lower middle class, is composed primarily of employees in positions such as clerks, bookkeepers, section heads in government or business offices, or semi-professionals. One-fourth of this group own their own small businesses. The majority of the adults in this class are high school graduates with no college work. Usually most of their children attend college, usually a state college. 47 percent of the families are Roman Catholic, 14 percent are Jewish, and 39 percent are Protestant. This class tends to be optimistic about the future and their chances of achieving an acceptable standard of living.

The large majority of Class IV members are either semiskilled employees, such as assembly line workers, or skilled manual employees. Their income is low compared to the higher classes. Median years of education is 9.4 years for husbands and 10.5 years for wives. Parents do not expect themselves or their children to be able to attend college. Most members of this class are Catholic. Husbands typically belong to an occupational union, and wives to neighborhood women's groups.

Class V is composed of adults and families who are

either on relief or are employed in semiskilled factory jobs or unskilled jobs. The income, the savings, the educational achievement, the level of occupational skill, are the lowest in this class than any of the other classes. This fact often makes members of this class bitter towards those in authority or higher classes. 41 percent of the children under seventeen years of age whose parents are in this class live in broken homes. Family ties are fragile, and membership in other groups or organizations is also limited. A basic characteristic of this class is the struggle to survive from one day to the next.

Some characteristics of these social classes have doubtless changed in the years since this study by Hollingshead and Redlich. For example, many individuals employed in the skilled trades, such as plumbers and carpenters, who would in most cases be members of Class IV, make as much income as members of the upper classes. Nonetheless, their study indicates that a number of conditions, life styles, and attitudes are common to members of the same social class, and vary from one social class to another. The question for this research is whether attitudes relating to deviant behavior vary from one class to another.

2. DEPENDENT VARIABLES.

a. IDENTIFICATION OF DEVIANTS.

This variable is identical to the variable used in the study by Simmons (1965) in which he asked a sample of

individuals to name the kinds of persons and acts that they considered to be deviant. This variable was chosen for this study to provide comparison to the Simmons data. Also, this variable gives one indication of attitudes towards deviants. The assumption being made by asking this question is that people will mention those groups or acts which are salient to them, which are uppermost in their minds. Those groups they don't mention are probably not as important to them, either because they don't consider them threatening or dangerous or worthy of attention. These assumptions can partially be tested by comparing results from this question with the responses of acceptance and rejection of deviants.

b. ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION OF DEVIANTS.

This refers to the degree of social distance that an individual feels towards various kinds of deviants. On one end of the continuum he might be willing to become very close friends with a particular kind of deviant. At the other extreme he might prefer that that person be expelled from the country.

Thus, the two dependent variables together will give considerable insight into the nature of attitudes towards deviants. Not only will we discover which acts and groups are regarded by the sample as being deviant, but also the degree to which the members of the sample are willing to interact with members of deviant groups.

3. CONTROL VARIABLE: LIBERALISM-CONSERVATISM

Liberalism-Conservatism refers to the degree to which a person is willing to accept changes, whether political, economic, or personal. The assumption being made is that "liberals" will be more willing than "conservatives" to accept such changes as enactment of civil rights legislation, improvement in relations with communist countries, equal rights for women and minorities, and support of the United Nations.

OPERATIONALIZATION

1. Social class will be measured by using the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (see Hollingshead, 1957). The two factors which this index uses to measure social class are occupation and education. This index was selected because it combines the two factors which are perhaps the most important determinants of position in the status structure in our society, occupation and education. It is also a procedure that is quickly and easily used for survey-type social research.

To measure a sample member's social class, it is necessary to know his occupation and his educational level. Occupation is then classified according to one of the following seven categories:

1. Executives, major proprietors, major professionals
2. Business managers and lesser proprietors

3. Administrative personnel and small business owners
4. Clerical and sales workers
5. Skilled manual workers
6. Machine operators and semi-skilled workers
7. Unskilled employees or those on relief

Education is also classified into one of seven categories:

1. Graduate degree
2. College graduate
3. Partial college
4. High school graduate
5. Partial high school
6. Junior high school
7. Less than 7 years of school

Social class is determined by multiplying the occupation score (1 to 7) by seven, and multiplying the education score (1 to 7) by four, adding these two figures, and then checking the total against the range of computed scores given below:

	<u>SOCIAL CLASS</u>	<u>RANGE OF COMPUTED SCORES</u>
I	Upper Class	11-17
II	Upper middle class	18-27
III	Lower middle class	28-43
IV	Upper lower class	44-60
V	Lower lower class	61-77

As an example, the social class of an electrician with a high school diploma would be determined as follows:

$$5 \text{ (Occupation Score)} \times 7 = 35$$

$$4 \text{ (Education Score)} \times 4 = \underline{16}$$

Total 51, or Social Class IV.

By comparison, the social class of a credit manager with a bachelor's degree in accounting would be computed as follows:

$$3 \text{ (Occupation Score)} \times 7 = 21$$

$$2 \text{ (Education Score)} \times 4 = \underline{8}$$

Total 29, or Social Class III.

Therefore, it is interesting to note, although the electrician might make twice as much per year as the credit manager, he is nonetheless in a lower social class category.

This example suggests one problem with the Hollingshead technique: it is more accurate to say that this procedure measures social status than social class. Max Weber distinguished three separate but interacting stratification systems (see his essay "Class, Status, and Party" in Gerth and Mills, 1946). Social class is determined primarily by economic and property considerations. Social status is determined by the prestige or respect which individuals enjoy in the community. Parties, especially political parties, are based upon differences in power. Because the Hollingshead scale uses two factors which are related more closely to prestige than income, as the previous example indicated, it is more accurate to say that it measures social status than social

class.

Hollingshead himself is unclear about this point. At first he writes that the Index of Social Position measures positions in the status structure of our society (Hollingshead, 1957:2). Later he writes that by combining the Range of Computed Scores into the five groups listed previously, five "class status" categories will result (Hollingshead, 1957: 10-11). He therefore seems to imply the element of prestige in his concept of social class.

To provide continuity and comparability with results obtained by Hollingshead, these problems will be ignored for the remainder of this paper. We should keep in mind, however, that when we refer to social class rankings in this study, we are implying that differences in prestige were a major determinant of those rankings.

Each member of the sample in this study has been classified as being in one of five social classes, based upon the Hollingshead procedure. However, these five classes were combined for this study into three social class groups. This was done by collapsing the first two classes into one category and the last two classes into one category. Classes I and II thus become Class I-II, the Upper Class; Class III remains Class III, the middle Class; and Classes IV and V become Class IV-V, the Lower Class. This conversion was necessary for statistical purposes. The sample for this study was small, and the

chi-square statistic which will be used here requires that cells not contain less than five individual responses. The concept of social class that will be used in this study, therefore, refers to broad social class categories and social class differences.

2. IDENTIFICATION OF DEVIANTS

The following open-ended question will elicit information concerning identification of deviants. "Sometimes certain individuals engage in acts of behavior which do not conform to what we consider to be appropriate behavior. We usually call such persons deviant. I would like for you to list for me those types of persons whom you regard as being deviant." The percentage responding for each deviant type can be computed for the sample as a whole and for various social categories, particularly the social classes.

3. ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION OF DEVIANTS X

The concept of acceptance rejection of deviants refers to the degree of social distance or intimacy which sample members feel towards deviants. Under the broad heading of acceptance-rejection of deviants is included a wide range of attitudinal combinations and statistical operations.

All aspects of acceptance and rejection of deviants and social distance to various kinds of deviants will be measured using a revised Bogardus social distance scale (see Goode and Hatte, 1952:243-8 for a discussion of this

scale and its validity and reliability). Bogardus developed his social distance scales using the Guttman scaling technique. A Guttman scale contains a number of statements which are ordered and cumulative, so that the first statement given represents one end of a continuum of response and the last statement represents the other end of the continuum. The Bogardus social distance scale contains seven statements, with the first statement indicating a willingness to be on very close terms with a member of some group or subculture, and the seventh statement indicating strong feelings of social distance and rejection of that group or subculture. A favorable response to one statement assumes a favorable response to the statements which follow. In other words, if a respondent is willing to have members of this group as speaking acquaintances, it is reasonable to assume he would not have some member of that group removed from his neighborhood or his country. Bogardus scored the responses to his scale by assigning a score corresponding to the lowest numbered statement to which the respondent agrees. If responses are made to several groups, such as various racial categories, these individual scores may be added and an overall social distance score for those groups assigned to each respondent. The social distance scale has been used successfully to measure attitudes towards various ethnic and racial groups (see, for example,

The interviewer first read statement number five, as follows:

"Regarding mentally ill individuals: Would you have members of this group live outside of this country? In other words, if it were up to you, would you prefer that these people live outside of your country?

"How about embezzlers?

"Hippies?"

Etc.

After the sample member had responded for all eight types, he was then asked question 4, then 3, 2, and finally 1. Each time he indicated agreement with a statement for a particular type of deviant, the interviewer placed an "X" in the corresponding box.

There were two main variations between the procedures used by Bogardus to measure social distance and those used here. First, two of the seven statements used by Bogardus were not used for this study. One statement indicated a willingness to see a member of one's family marry a member of this group. The other stated that the respondent would be willing to work beside a member of this group in an office. I did not feel that these statements were necessary for this research. For the analyses and statistics planned for this study, it was not necessary to know if the respondent would be willing to have a member of his family

marry a homosexual, for example. Rather, I was interested in knowing if he was generally favorable or disapproving of various kinds of deviant behavior.

As we will see later in this chapter, the decision to eliminate these statements did not adversely affect the validity coefficients of the social distance scales.

The second variation is in the scoring method. The Bogardus method assigned a social distance score based upon the lowest numbered statement to which the respondent agreed. The maximum score using the Bogardus method, therefore, is 1. The procedure used for this project was to assign a score based on the number of favorable statements he agreed to and the number of unfavorable statements that he did not agree to. Of the five statements in the social distance scale just listed, the first three are worded positively, indicating a willingness to interact with members of that group to some extent. The last two statements are worded negatively, indicating some degree of rejection of members of that group. The maximum score using this procedure, therefore, was 5. A score of 5 would indicate the least amount of social distance to members of that deviant group. Thus, social distance to "mentally ill individuals", for example, is measured by adding the X's in the top three boxes in that column (the positive statements) plus the number of blank spaces in response to statements 4 and 5 in that column (the negative statements).

I felt that this procedure did a better job of

measuring social distance than the procedure used by Bogardus. If, for example, an individual agreed to statements 1 and 3, the Bogardus method would award him with the highest score, a 1. The procedure used here, however, would have given him a 4, one less than the maximum. For a person to score a maximum of 5, he would have to agree to all three positive statements and disagree with both negative statements. This procedure, then, gives a better indication of the respondents' true range of social distance attitudes.

Scoring the social distance scale in this way makes possible a wide variety of conceptual and statistical operations. We will look at the descriptive statistics, particularly averages, pertaining to social distance. We will also categorize sample members as acceptors or rejectors and compute chi-square statistics with social class used as the independent variable.

Using the social distance scale, the following concepts can be measured under the general title of acceptance-rejection of deviants:

A. SOCIAL DISTANCE TO INDIVIDUAL TYPES OF DEVIANTS

Using the scoring procedure already outlined, social distance to each of the eight individual types of deviants can be measured. Averages for each of these eight types, within the range of 0 to 5, can be computed and compared

for the sample as a whole and for each social class category.

B. SOCIAL DISTANCE TO AGGREGATE TYPES OF DEVIANTS

The above table permits analysis of social distance to three different aggregates of deviants. For each of these aggregates, averages can be computed and compared for the total sample and for each social class category.

1. SOCIAL DISTANCE TO CULTURAL DEVIANTS.

This is measured by adding scores of social distance to four individual types of deviants: Mentally ill individuals, hippies, drug addicts, and marijuana smokers. These deviants are combined into one aggregate because they are violating the norms of society dealing with dress, demeanor, hair, and other day-to-day activities. The range of possible scores is 0-20.

2. SOCIAL DISTANCE TO SEXUAL DEVIANTS.

This is measured by adding scores of social distance to homosexuals and prostitutes. The range for this variable is 0-10.

3. SOCIAL DISTANCE TO CRIMINAL DEVIANTS

This is the sum of the scores of social distance to embezzlers and murderers. The range for this variable is also 0-10.

C. SOCIAL DISTANCE TO DEVIANTS IN GENERAL

This is the sum of the social distance scores for

all eight types of deviants. The range of possible scores for this variable is 0-40.

D. ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION OF AGGREGATE TYPES OF DEVIANTS

Sample members have been categorized as either acceptors or rejectors of each of the three aggregate types of deviants. This was done by striking a mid-point for each of the three scores measuring social distance to aggregates and determining whether each sample member ranked above or below that midpoint. For example, about half of the sample members scored 13 or above in terms of social distance to cultural deviants. Those who scored 13 or above were then categorized as acceptors of cultural deviants; those scoring 12 or less were categorized as rejectors of cultural deviants. The cut-off score for both sexual and criminal deviants was 5.

Thus, each sample member has been categorized as either:

1. an acceptor or rejector of cultural deviants.
2. an acceptor or rejector of sexual deviants.
3. an acceptor or rejector of criminal deviants.

E. ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION OF DEVIANTS IN GENERAL.

Each person in the sample has also been categorized as either an acceptor or a rejector of deviants in general. This was also accomplished by computing a midpoint on the scores measuring social distance to deviants in general, and determining whether each sample member was above or

below that midpoint. The midpoint for this variable, on a scale of 0-40, was 23.

For these computations to be valid, it was necessary to determine first whether each of the eight social distance scales was valid. Therefore, for each of the eight scales, two coefficients were computed. The first is the coefficient of reproducibility. The second is the coefficient of scalability. These coefficients are listed for all eight scales in Table I.

TABLE I
GUTTMAN SCALE COEFFICIENTS

	COEFFICIENT OF REPRODUCIBILITY	COEFFICIENT OF SCALABILITY
Mentally Ill Individuals	.9500	.7805
Embezzlers	.9222	.6706
Hippies	.9111	.6404
Drug Addicts	.9222	.6056
Murderers	.9056	.5854
Homosexuals	.9222	.6706
Prostitutes	.9167	.6471
Marijuana Smokers	.9278	.6977
\bar{X}	.9222	.6622

The coefficient of reproducibility is an indication of the extent to which a respondent's score is a predictor of his response pattern. A coefficient higher than .9 is considered to indicate a valid scale. The coefficient of

scalability indicates whether a scale is undimensional and cumulative. This coefficient should be at least .6. (see Nie, 1970:201, for an explanation of the computation of these coefficients.)

This table therefore provides strong statistical support for the use of these scales to measure the social distance and acceptance-rejection variables mentioned above.

The social distance scale will make possible a wide variety of operations and statistics. We can measure social distance to individual types of deviants, to aggregate types of deviants, and to deviants in general. We can compute social distance averages for the whole sample and for various social classes. Also, by classifying sample members as acceptors or rejectors of aggregate types of deviants and deviants in general, we can determine the likelihood, using the chi-square statistic, that members of different social classes will be favorable or unfavorable towards various kinds of deviant activity.

4. LIBERALISM-CONSERVATISM

The concept of liberalism-conservatism was measured using a modification of a scale developed by F. N. Kerlinger (see Shaw and Wright, 1967: 322-324). This scale consisted of 26 modified Likert items which he selected by factor analysis. 13 of these items were conservatively worded; 13 were worded from a liberal point of view. The author estimated the split-half reliability of this scale to be .78 for liberalism and .79 for conservatism, based

on a sample of 168 subjects.

To measure validity, Kerlinger administered his social attitudes scale with a number of other tests, including Rokeach's Opinionation Scale, the F scale, and the Wonderlic Intelligence test. Using factor analysis, the conservatism items loaded .86 on one factor (A) and very little on other factors. The liberalism items loaded .57 on factor C and .29 on factor B. Shaw and Wright concluded that the scale has adequate content and construct validity.

Kerlinger's sample was presented his scale with liberalism items and conservatism items listed at random. Respondents could respond to each item in one of six ways. He could agree very strongly (scored as +3), agree strongly (+2) agree (+1), disagree (-1), disagree strongly (-2), or disagree very strongly (-3). Liberally worded items were scored by assigning these weights to the corresponding responses. Conservatism items were scored by assigning reverse weights to the corresponding responses. The respondent's final score was the sum of these weights for all twenty-six items. Higher scores indicate liberal attitudes.

The twenty-six items deal with a variety of social and economic issues. Examples of liberalism items are:

"Large fortunes should be taxed fairly heavily over and above income taxes."

"Both public and private universities and colleges should get generous aid from both state and federal governments."

"Society should be quicker to throw out old ideas and traditions and to adopt new thinking and customs."

Examples of conservatism items are:

"Individuals who are against churches and religions should not be allowed to teach in colleges."

"The well-being of a nation depends mainly on its industry and business."

"There are too many professors in our colleges and universities who are radical in their social and political beliefs."

For the present study, I decided not to use all of Kerlinger's 26 items. The main reason was because of time: Because of military commitments that were pending at the time I was ready to begin my interviews, I was considering collecting my data over the phone. Therefore, it was important to keep the interview time at less than 15 minutes. I also felt that 12 items would be sufficient to measure this variable.

To determine which 12 items did the best job of predicting liberalism and conservatism, I presented the original 26 item test to a pre-test sample of 76 introductory sociology students. This was done in November, 1972. I then added up the scores for each of the 76 sample members. Wishing to differentiate a group of liberals and a group of conservatives, I selected the 20 highest scoring sample

members as my liberal pre-test sample and the 22 lowest scoring members as my conservative pre-test sample. Then for each of the twenty-six items I computed a mean for the liberals and a mean for the conservatives. The greater the difference between the two means, the better the predictability of that item. I then selected the six liberal items and the six conservative items which had the highest difference between means. These twelve items served as the liberalism-conservatism scale for this study.

X Appendix C is the questionnaire used for this research study. The twelve items used to measure liberalism-conservatism are included as question 11 on that questionnaire. Conservatism items are indicated with an asterisk.

Another change from the methods used by Kerlinger was in the scoring procedures. For each statement a respondent could strongly agree or agree, be undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree. I did not feel that the fine variations in attitudes which were obtained by Kerlinger's methods, allowing for three degrees of agreement and three degrees of disagreement, were necessary for this research. I was more interested in general attitudes of liberalism and conservatism.

For scoring purposes, strong agreement with a liberally worded item was assigned a weight of 4, an agree earned a 3, an undecided earned a 2, a disagree earned a 1, and a strongly disagree earned a 0. For conservatively worded items, the scoring procedure was reversed. The range of scores for this

scale, therefore, was 0 to 48, with higher scores indicating more liberal attitudes than lower scores.

All sample members were then classified as liberal or conservative. This was done by determining a midpoint, above which everyone was considered liberal and below which everyone was considered conservative. The midpoint for this scale was 22.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the three hypotheses which will be tested by this research, the four variables which are contained in those hypotheses, and conceptual and operational definitions of those four variables. Those variables include social class, identification of deviants, acceptance-rejection of deviants, and liberalism-conservatism. Under the general concept of acceptance-rejection of deviants included five sub-concepts: social distance to individual types of deviants, social distance to aggregate types of deviants, social distance to deviants in general, acceptance-rejection of aggregate types of deviants, and acceptance-rejection of deviants in general. We also discussed briefly the statistical operations which will be performed to test the relationships between these variables.

These operations will make it possible to answer a number of questions concerning the relationship between social class and attitudes towards deviants. We will see which groups are identified as deviant by the various social classes. We will discover the degree of social distance expressed by social

classes towards individual and aggregate kinds of deviants. We will also see if certain social classes are more likely to be classified as acceptors of deviants than other classes. Finally, we will see how the control variable of liberalism-conservatism affects this relationship between social class and acceptance-rejection of deviants.

Chapter Four summarizes the procedures used in selecting a sample and collecting the data for this research. Chapter Five presents the results of that research.

CHAPTER FOUR: SAMPLING AND RESEARCH METHODS

THE SAMPLE

There were several considerations which guided the selection of a sample for this research. The primary consideration was that the sample provide a variation in social class. Secondly, I felt that the sample should be comprised of adult heads of households. I intended to collect my data by interview, and I felt that the head of the household would provide the best representation of the views of that household. Finally, I wished to interview sample members from more than one section of the City of Omaha.

A goal which I did not set for myself was to select a sample which would be representative of the citizens of the City of Omaha. I realized from my previous knowledge of survey research that the highest response rate I could expect would be 50 percent or less. It is impossible to generalize to a population any conclusions which are based on a sample return rate of this size. Therefore, it was not my original intent to select a sample that would be representative of the entire city, but rather to end up with a sample that had an adequate number of members of all social classes.

Based upon these considerations, the following procedures were used in selecting a sample. I decided, first of all, to select three census tracts from the possible 87 within the City of Omaha. To insure social class variation, I collected

information concerning the median income level and median education level for each of the 87 tracts. I then ranked each of these tracts according to a combined measure of both education and income. Next, I ranked these tracts into three groups of 29 tracts each, with the highest ranking 29 in Group 1, the 29 middle ranking tracts in Group 2, and the lowest ranking 29 tracts in Group 3. I averaged the income and education level for Groups 1, 2, and 3. One tract was then selected from each of the three groups, using the primary criterion of approximating the group average on both education and income. These three tracts formed the base from which the sample was selected.

The three census tracts that were selected are numbered for census purposes as 74.07, representing Group 1; number 49, representing Group 2; and number 6, representing Group 3. To select sample members from these three census tracts, it was important that households be selected in such a randomized way that every household within those tracts would have an equal opportunity to be included in the sample. I decided, therefore, to select 10 blocks within each census tract. Excluding those blocks with fewer than 10 households per block, 10 blocks within each tract were selected at random (using a table of random numbers). I then drove to each of the thirty blocks selected and wrote down the addresses of every house and apartment in those blocks. From the list of over 700

households which this procedure yielded, 70 households within each census tract were then selected at random. The original sample base, therefore, included 210 households.

Next, it was necessary to determine the names and telephone numbers for all 210 households. I was able to acquire a special telephone directory from the telephone company, with listings made by address rather than last name. Subtracting the 17 vacant houses from the original 210 households, this project had a sample population base of 193 households. Seventy-two of those households, or 37.3%, agreed to participate in the study. Table II outlines the participation and non-participation rates for each of the three census tracts.

TABLE II - SAMPLE PARTICIPATION IN STUDY,
BY CENSUS TRACT

<u>CENSUS TRACT</u>	<u>ORIGINAL HOUSEHOLDS</u>	<u>VACANT HOUSES</u>	<u>SAMPLE BASE (COLUMN 2 MINUS VACANCIES)</u>	<u>NON-PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>SAMPLE CONTRIBUTION</u>	<u>% PARTICIPATION</u>
6	70	12	58	42	16	27.6
49	70	4	66	44	22	33.3
74.07	<u>70</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>49.3</u>
TOTALS	210	17	193	121	72	37.3

The low participation rate by census tract 6, which

represented Group 3, the lower income census tract group, suggests that this sample would be under-represented by lower class members, and consequently over-represented by upper classes. This was in fact the case, as Table III indicates.

TABLE III - SOCIAL CLASS CHARACTERISTICS OF
SAMPLE

<u>SOCIAL CLASS</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
I	13	18.1
II	11	15.3
III	18	25
IV	23	31.9
V	<u>7</u>	<u>9.7</u>
TOTAL	72	100.0

Comparing social class percentages in Table III with those reported in the last chapter which were obtained by Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) supports the observation that the lower classes are under-represented in this sample. 12.4 percent of their sample was placed in the upper two classes (I and II), compared with 33.4 percent of this sample. 66.2 percent of their sample were members of the lower classes (IV and V), compared with 41.6 percent of this sample.

A comparison of income for the sample group with the population of households in the City of Omaha provides further

support for the hypothesis of under-representation by the lower classes in this sample. Table IV presents the figures on family income for this sample, as well as the median income levels for all families in the City of Omaha, as determined by the 1970 census.

TABLE IV - FAMILY INCOME FOR SAMPLE
AND FOR CITY OF OMAHA

<u>INCOME LEVEL</u>	<u>SAMPLE (%)</u>	<u>OMAHA (%)</u>
1. Under \$5999	13.9	20.9
2. \$6000 - \$8999	18.1	20.1
3. \$9000 - \$11999	12.5	21.5
4. \$12000 - \$14999	16.7	15.7
5. \$15000 - \$24999	19.4	16.7
6. \$25000 and over	<u>19.4</u> 100.0	<u>5.1</u> 100.0

There may be several reasons for the lower participation rates for the lower classes in this study as compared to the upper classes. The upper class individuals seemed to be more willing to be interviewed, perhaps because they were more convinced of the importance of higher education than the lower classes. The lower classes may also have felt a greater concern for a stranger entering their homes, regardless of his motives. This may be because of the high crime rates experienced in this section of the city.

Several incidents which occurred at the time of the interviews illustrated the fears and reservations of lower class members. On four occasions I was unable to keep an appointment with a potential sample member in census tract 6 because a dog prevented entry into the fenced-in yard. Others in this area who agreed to participate seemed to be more skeptical of the purposes of this research than participants from other areas.

Whatever the reasons for this social class variation in participation, it is important to use caution when analyzing the data in this chapter and the next. Because this sample is not a good cross-section of citizens in the City of Omaha, it will not be valid to generalize any conclusions from this sample to the population of Omaha.

In addition to the information already given concerning this sample, it might be useful to know additional facts about the sample. Table V, on the following page, includes this additional information.

RESEARCH METHODS

At the time I was ready to begin my interviewing, December of 1972, I realized that very soon I would have to leave for military duty for several months. For this reason I wanted to experiment with the idea of gathering my data over the phone. As a small pilot study, therefore, I contacted

TABLE V - SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

<u>SOCIAL CHARACTERISTIC</u>	<u>CATEGORIES</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Age	1. 30 years and under	8	11.1
	2. 31 years to 40 years	21	29.2
	3. 41 years to 50 years	17	23.6
	4. 51 years and over	26	36.1
2. Sex	1. Male	52	72.2
	2. Female	20	27.8
3. Race	1. White	66	91.7
	2. Black	6	8.3
4. Religion	1. Roman Catholic	22	30.6
	2. Protestant	41	56.9
	3. Jewish	6	8.3
	4. other	0	0.0
	5. No religious affiliation	3	4.2
5. Marital Status	1. Single	4	5.6
	2. Married	58	80.6
	3. Separated	0	0.0
	4. Widowed	5	6.9
	5. Divorced	5	6.9
6. Occupation	1. Executives, professionals	14	19.4
	2. Business managers	11	15.3
	3. Administrative personnel	7	9.7
	4. Clerical and sales	18	25.0
	5. Skilled manual workers	14	19.4
	6. Semi-skilled workers	4	5.6
	7. Unskilled workers	4	5.6
7. Education	1. Graduate degree	7	9.7
	2. College graduate	17	23.6
	3. Partial college	18	25.0
	4. High school graduate	18	25.0
	5. Partial high school	9	12.5
	6. Junior high school	1	1.4
	7. Less than 7 years	2	2.8

the first 10 members of my sample by letter, explaining that I would be calling soon to interview them by phone and asking their cooperation. A copy of that letter is included as Appendix B. Because I was not satisfied with the response rate using this procedure (4 of 10 participating), nor with the conduct of the interviews themselves, I decided to conduct the remainder of my interviews by visiting the respondent at his or her own home.

Each of the remaining 183 subjects was first sent a letter, explaining the reason for the interview and the fact that they would be called very soon by me. This letter is included as Appendix A. My procedure was to send out a group of about twenty letters, and then call those twenty homes to set up an interview time convenient for them. In all cases I scheduled the interview with that person who identified himself or herself as the head of the household. Usually I was able to set up two or three or more interviews in the same area within a two or three hour time period.

Prior to collecting any data, I made the assumption that the person whose name was listed in the telephone directory was the head of the household. That was the person to whom the letter was addressed, and this was also the person with whom I asked to speak to set up an interview appointment. In the vast majority of cases, this assumption proved valid. When addressing envelopes and telephoning for appointments I

attempted to guess the sex of the head of the household. In several cases these guesses proved wrong. If a name was listed in the directory as "M. K. Jones", I addressed the letter to "Mr. M. K. Jones". Then, when calling for an interview appointment, I asked for Mr. M. K. Jones. In several cases I was told that there was no Mr. M. K. Jones, that M. K. Jones stood for Mary K. Jones. In those cases I apologized for the misunderstanding and explained the purpose for my call. In the majority of cases the party did not appear to be offended or disturbed by this misunderstanding.

If a household had a number listed but I received no answer, then repeated calls were made at staggered times during the day. If no phone was listed for a particular address, then I visited the house and asked if I could interview the head of the household at that time, or at another time if that was more convenient. Unfortunately, these efforts did not pay off in several cases. Several of the 121 non-participants listed in Table II are households which I was never able to contact.

A majority of the interviews were conducted in December of 1972 and January of 1973. I was assisted during this time period by my sister Cathy, whom I trained by having her join me on several of my interviews. During the months of February through April of 1973 Cathy conducted many interviews while I was serving my military duty. I completed the interviews after my return from the service, in May of 1973.

The interviews generally lasted less than thirty minutes. Upon arriving at the house at the scheduled time, I asked to see the head of the household. I identified myself and the purposes of my research. I stressed the anonymity of the information which he or she would give me. In most cases these remarks reinforced assurances which I gave the individual over the phone, when I scheduled the interviews.

I conducted the interviews by reading each of the questions to the individual, and then recording his response on the questionnaire. I considered this preferable to his reading the questionnaire and recording his responses, because I thought that some respondents might have reading difficulties, and I wanted all sample members to respond to the same stimuli.

Each question was asked without the interviewer providing any additional input to the respondent. This procedure was most critical for question number nine, which asked the respondent to name those kinds of persons that they considered deviant. The interviewer did not offer examples, even if the respondent appeared unable to think of any persons he considered deviant. In those cases, question nine was left blank.

After the data was collected from the 72 sample members, the questionnaires were submitted to the computer center at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. A programmer at this center, Larry Kelley, assisted me in analyzing this data using programs available in the Statistical Package for the Social

Sciences (S.P.S.S.). The data and analyses which resulted are presented in Chapter Five.

The interview method of collecting data has a number of disadvantages, particularly when a sample is spread out throughout a city. It is much more time consuming than other methods, such as the mail-out questionnaire. Interviewing can also be a tedious job, with the same questions asked of all respondents. The advantages, however, of this technique for survey-type research greatly outweigh the disadvantages. By explaining my motives and my project on a face-to-face basis, I was able to establish my credibility to most of my 72 respondents. More importantly, however, when fairly complex scales are used, it is critical that someone be available to answer questions and define terms to any respondent who has trouble with them. Only in this manner can the standardization of research methods be validly established, where all questions are asked in the same way and all respondents understand the basics of what is being asked of them.

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

A number of interesting differences appeared between the results of this research and the results obtained by Simmons (1965). His sample of 180 subjects listed a total of 1154 items for a mean of 6.4 per sample member. The present sample of 72 persons listed a total of 171 items for a mean of only 2.37 per sample member. His sample listed 252 different acts or persons as being deviant. This sample listed 76 different acts or persons. Those 76 items are listed in Appendix D, along with the frequencies with which they were mentioned. The most frequently mentioned items, for both the study by Simmons and for this study, are listed in Table VI.

TABLE VI
IDENTIFICATION OF DEVIANTS FOR
THIS STUDY AND FOR SIMMONS

<u>Response</u>	<u>%(This Study)</u>	<u>%(Simmons)</u>
Criminals	20.8	18
Homosexuals	18.1	49
Drug Addicts	18.1	47
Murderers	15.3	22
Alcoholics	11.1	46
Mentally Ill	11.1	12
Sex Deviants	9.7	-
Robbers	6.9	-
Hippies	5.6	-
Lesbians	4.2	13
Prostitutes	2.8	27
Atheists	2.8	10
Juvenile Delinquents	1.4	13
Perverts	1.4	12
Beatniks	-	12
Communists	-	10
Political Extremists	-	10

One of the most noteworthy facts about these two sets of data is the fact that they are so dissimilar. A few of the items (criminals, mentally ill, murderers) have somewhat similar rates of response. A majority of the items, however, are

mentioned as deviant by vastly different percentages of the two samples.

Although there were marked differences in the rates of response for the two studies, the rankings of the various types of deviants were quite similar. Homosexuals and drug addicts ranked quite high in both studies. With the exception of one response, there was agreement between the two studies on the five most frequently mentioned deviant groups.

The few subgroup differences which Simmons could find were listed on pages 7 and 8 of this paper. There were also very few subgroup differences for this study. This was largely due to the fact that the percentage response for each of the above categories was so small. One of the interesting subgroup differences there was based on sex. 30% of the females, as opposed to 17.3% of the males, mentioned drug addicts and peddlers. 30% of the females, as opposed to 13.4% of the males, mentioned homosexuals. 25% of the females mentioned criminals, compared with 19.2% of the males.

Ho1: SOCIAL CLASS AND IDENTIFICATION OF DEVIANTS

There were some social class differences in terms of which groups of individuals were mentioned as deviant. Table VII presents the percentage data for each of three social class categories for the eight most frequently mentioned deviant groups.

TABLE VII - IDENTIFICATION OF DEVIANTS,
BY SOCIAL CLASS

Social Class	Drug Addicts & Peddlers *		Criminals		Homo-sexuals		Murderers		Robbers **		Mentally Ill ***		Alcoholics		Sexual Deviants ***	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
I - II n = 24	6	25	11	45.8	6	25	4	16.7	1	4.2	6	25	1	4.2	7	29.2
III n = 18	2	11.1	1	5.6	2	11.1	4	22.2	2	11.1	0	0	2	11.1	3	16.7
IV - V n = 30	7	23.3	3	10	5	16.7	3	10	5	16.7	2	6.7	5	16.7	5	16.7

* The responses drug addicts and drug peddlers were combined in this table.

** "Robbers" included the responses thieves, armed robbers, purse snatchers and shoplifters.

*** "Mentally ill" includes mentally retarded, psychotics, schizophrenics, and manic depressives.

**** "Sexual deviants" includes prostitutes, rapists, perverts, expositors, nudists, wife swappers.

As Table VII indicates, there were interesting differences and similarities between response rates by the various social classes for each of the eight types of deviants listed. For two types, drug addicts and peddlers and for murderers, there were very small differences between the upper classes (I and II) and the lower classes (IV and V). On the other hand, the upper classes were more likely to mention four of the types, criminals, homosexuals, mentally ill individuals, and sexual deviants, than lower class individuals. For the other two types, robbers and alcoholics, lower class individuals were more likely to mention these than the upper classes. In most cases the percentage differences between upper and lower classes were not large. In two cases ("criminals" and "mentally ill individuals") there were fairly large differences in response between upper and lower classes. *

To determine whether these differences in percentages were statistically significant, or whether they could have occurred by chance, chi-square computations were made for each of these eight types of deviant categories, using social class as the independent variable. These tables were also broken down for both liberals and conservatives. However, each of these tables had a number of cells with less than five per cell, and many had a zero or one in them, thus violating the assumptions of the chi-square statistic.

One statistic that is available is the t-test to measure the level of significance of the differences between proportions.

This test tells us the likelihood that the differences between two percentages could have occurred by chance. Of the eight t-tests which were computed, the only ones which proved to be significant were the following:

1. The difference between the percentage of upper class individuals who responded "criminals" (45.8) and lower class individuals who also responded in this way (10%) proved to be a statistically significant difference. T was equal to 2.98, significant at the .01 level of confidence.
2. The difference between the percentage of upper class individuals who replied that "mentally ill individuals" were deviant (25%) and lower class individuals who responded in the same way (6.7%) was not quite large enough to prove statistically significant at the .05 level. T was computed to be 1.92. To be statistically significant at the .05 level, a t of 2.01 is necessary.

The first null hypothesis, which stated there were no differences among the social classes in terms of identification of deviants, has been supported for the majority of types of deviants. Although there were some differences in the response rates for each type of deviant, those differences were not large enough to be statistically significant at the .05

level. The one exception to this statement was the category of criminal deviants. A much larger percentage of upper class members than lower class members listed criminals as deviant. For this deviant category, the null hypothesis must be rejected.

Ho2: SOCIAL CLASS AND ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION OF DEVIANTS

Table VIII provides a ranking of deviant types in descending order in which the total sample expressed social distance to them. The number opposite each type represents the mean social distance for the total sample on a five point scale. The percentage figure listed in the third column of Table VIII represents the percentage of the total social distance points that were possible (five). In other words, the mean social distance score expressed by the sample towards mentally ill individuals (3.75) represents 75% of the 5 points that were possible for this scale. This percentage figure simplifies the process of comparing social distance responses towards the eight deviant categories.

TABLE VIII - SOCIAL DISTANCE TO INDIVIDUAL
TYPES OF DEVIANTS

<u>TYPE OF DEVIANT</u>	<u>SOCIAL DISTANCE</u>	<u>%</u>
Mentally Ill Individuals	3.75	75
Hippies	3.3472	66.94
Marijuana Smokers	3.0556	61.11
Embezzlers	2.7083	54.16
Prostitutes	2.625	52.5
Homosexuals	2.4583	49.16
Drug Addicts	2.375	47.5
Murderers	1.6944	33.88

This table indicates that the least amount of social distance was expressed towards mentally ill individuals, and the greatest social distance towards murderers. Prostitution and homosexuality were disapproved more strongly than embezzlement. The sample was also willing to differentiate marijuana smoking from drug addiction: a considerably smaller amount of social distance (and hence, disapproval) was expressed towards the former group than the latter.

The eight deviant types listed in Table VIII may be combined into three aggregate types of deviants. The aggregate "cultural deviants" includes mentally ill individuals, hippies, marijuana smokers, and drug addicts. "Sexual deviants" includes homosexuals and prostitutes. "Criminal deviants" includes embezzlers and murderers. Social distance to each of these

aggregates may be obtained by combining social distance scores for each of the corresponding individual types of deviants. Table IX lists the social distance scores expressed by the total sample towards each of these aggregates. Because the aggregate of cultural deviants is based upon a 20 - point scale and the other two aggregates are based upon 10 - point scales, comparisons between aggregates cannot be made based upon social distance score. Rather, they must be made based upon the percentages which are listed in the third column. These percentages were computed in the same way as the percentages listed in Table VIII. In other words, the mean score of social distance to cultural deviants was 12.5278. This figure represents 62.64% of the 20 points that were possible for this aggregate.

TABLE IX - SOCIAL DISTANCE TO AGGREGATE
TYPES OF DEVIANTS

<u>Type of Aggregate</u>	<u>Social Distance</u>	<u>%</u>
Cultural Deviants (20-point scale)	12.5278	62.64
Sexual Deviants (10-point scale)	5.0833	50.83
Criminal Deviants (10-point scale)	4.4028	44.03

The sample, therefore, expressed least amount of social distance to the cultural deviants. They were less favorable towards sexual deviants. The greatest amount of social distance was expressed towards criminal deviants.

To determine if there were differences among the social classes in terms of their reaction to the eight individual types of deviants, social distance scores were computed for each of three social class groups. Those results are included in Table X.

TABLE X - SOCIAL DISTANCE TO INDIVIDUAL TYPES
OF DEVIANTS, BY SOCIAL CLASS

<u>Type of Deviant</u>	<u>Social Class</u>	<u>Social Distance Score (5-point Scale)</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Mentally Ill Individuals	I - II	3.792	75.84
	III	3.818	76.36
	IV - V	3.633	72.66
2. Embezzlers	I - II	2.5	50
	III	3	60
	IV - V	2.8	56
3. Hippies	I - II	3.5833	71.66
	III	3.235	64.7
	IV - V	3.333	66.67
4. Drug Addicts	I - II	2.2916	45.83
	III	2.471	49.42
	IV - V	2.4666	49.33
5. Murderers	I - II	1.375	27.5
	III	1.706	34.12
	IV - V	1.666	33.33
6. Homosexuals	I - II	2.5416	50.83
	III	2.882	57.64
	IV - V	2.2333	44.66
7. Prostitutes	I - II	2.625	52.5
	III	2.765	55.3
	IV - V	2.633	52.66
8. Marijuana Smokers	I - II	3.5	70
	III	3.0	60
	IV - V	2.8333	56.7

It is easiest to compare social distance scores for the three social class categories by comparing the percentages listed in the last column of Table X. This procedure indicates that the upper classes (I - II) are more favorable than the lower classes (IV-V) towards mentally ill individuals, hippies, homosexuals, and marijuana smokers. The lower classes are more favorable than the upper classes towards embezzlers, drug addicts, and murderers. Both class categories indicate almost identical social distance towards prostitutes. However, for all eight deviant categories listed, these differences are not large. For six of the eight categories, percentage differences between upper and lower classes did not exceed 6%. The two cases which did exceed this figure were for homosexuals (6.17%) and marijuana smokers (13.3%). T - tests confirmed that none of these percentage differences was large enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level.

An attempt was also made to determine if there were social class differences in terms of social distance to aggregate types of deviants or to the overall category of deviants in general.

Table XI presents those results.

TABLE XI - SOCIAL DISTANCE TO AGGREGATE TYPES OF
DEVIANTS AND TO DEVIANTS IN GENERAL,
BY SOCIAL CLASS

<u>Type of Deviant</u>	<u>Social Class</u>	<u>Social Distance</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Cultural Deviants (20-point scale)	I - II	13.1616	65.83
	III	12.647	63.23
	IV - V	12.2666	61.33
2. Sexual Deviants (10-point scale)	I - II	5.1666	51.66
	III	5.647	56.47
	IV - V	4.8666	48.66
3. Criminal Deviants (10-point scale)	I - II	3.875	38.75
	III	4.706	47.06
	IV - V	4.8	48
4. Deviants in General (40-point scale)	I - II	22.2083	55.52
	III	23	57.5
	IV - V	21.9333	54.83

This table indicates that the upper classes tend to be slightly more favorable than the lower classes towards cultural and sexual deviants. The largest social class differences, however, occurred with regard to criminal deviants. The lower classes expressed less social distance to criminal deviants than the upper classes. However, the differences between these two percentages (38.75 and 48) did not prove to be statistically significant at the .05 level, using a t-test.

Comparing social distance scores among social classes provides one indication of social class differences with regard to reactions towards deviants. Another indication is

provided by comparing the likelihood that members of different social classes will be classified as acceptors or rejectors of aggregate kinds of deviants or deviants in general. Thus, four chi-square computations were made, plotting social class against acceptance-rejection of each of three deviant aggregates and the overall category of deviants in general. Results of those chi-square analyses are as follows:

1. There was no relationship between social class and acceptance or rejection of cultural deviants. The chi-square value for this table was 2.32941, which yielded a significance level of .5069 with three degrees of freedom. When broken down by the control variable of liberalism and conservatism, there was no relationship for either liberals or conservatives.
2. There was no relationship between social class and acceptance or rejection of sexual deviants. With a chi-square value of 1.7046, the significance level with three degrees of freedom was .6359. There was also no relationship for either liberals or conservatives.
3. There was no relationship between social class and acceptance or rejection of deviants in general. The chi-square value for this table was 2.1522 with

three degrees of freedom. The significance level was .5414. Controlling for liberalism-conservatism also provided no relationship.

4. Table XII indicates the relationship between social class and acceptance-rejection of criminal deviants.

TABLE XII - ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION OF CRIMINAL
DEVIANTS, BY SOCIAL CLASS

<u>Social Class</u>	<u>Acceptors</u>	<u>Rejectors</u>
I - II	7	17
III	8	10
IV - V	17	13

$$\chi^2 = 4.9308$$

2 degrees of Freedom

$$p = .1769$$

$$\text{Cramer's } V = .2617$$

The table indicates that the lower class members of the sample were more likely to be classified as acceptors of criminal deviants. The upper class members were more likely to be classified as rejectors. However, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected with confidence because the probability value is not less than .05.

The preceding pages have noted many social class variations with regard to social distance to individual and

aggregate types of deviants and to deviants in general, and with regard to acceptance and rejection of aggregate types of deviants and deviants in general. In spite of these variations, the second null hypothesis, stating no relationship between social class and acceptance and rejection of deviants, cannot be rejected. In every case where variations were found, the differences were not large enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. In other words, whenever differences were noted, we cannot with confidence say that social class was the major cause of those differences. These differences could have been the result of chance.

Ho3: Social Class and Acceptance-Rejection of Deviants, by
Liberalism-Conservatism

As we have noted, when sample members were divided into liberal and conservative categories, there proved to be no social class differences in terms of the likelihood of being classified as acceptors or rejectors. There were, however, some interesting differences between liberals and conservatives with regard to acceptance-rejection of criminal deviants, as Table XIII indicates.

TABLE XIII - ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION OF CRIMINAL DEVIANTS,
BY SOCIAL CLASS AND LIBERALISM-CONSERVATISM

<u>Social Class</u>	<u>LIBERALS</u>		<u>Social Class</u>	<u>CONSERVATIVES</u>	
	<u>Acceptors</u>	<u>Rejectors</u>		<u>Acceptors</u>	<u>Rejectors</u>
I - II	3	6	I - II	4	11
III	6	5	III	2	5
IV - V	10	7	IV - V	7	6

$$x^2 = 1.6709$$

$$p < .50$$

$$x^2 = 2.51$$

$$p < .30$$

Although neither of these tables are statistically significant at the .05 level, nonetheless each presents some interesting data. Among liberals, the lower classes are more likely to accept criminal deviants than the upper classes. Among conservatives, the upper and middle classes strongly reject criminal deviants, while the lower classes are fairly evenly split in terms of acceptance and rejection of this group.

SUMMARY

The following is a summary of the results that were obtained for this study:

1. When asked what groups of persons they considered to be deviant, the sample as a whole responded with an average of 2.37 responses per sample member. The

most frequently mentioned type of deviant (criminals) was mentioned by only a small minority of the sample (20.8%). Because there was such a small rate of response for each type of deviant that was mentioned, there were also very few sub-group differences in terms of response rate for each deviant type.

2. There were some social class differences in terms of the frequency with which different types of persons were identified as deviant. The largest difference was for the response "criminals". The upper classes were much more likely to respond in this way than the lower classes. Because the difference in these percentages was large enough to be significant at the .01 level, we can reject the first null hypothesis for the response "criminals". None of the percentage differences for the other responses was large enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level. Thus for all other types of deviants the first null hypothesis has been supported.
3. The sample as a whole expressed the least amount of social distance to the cultural types of deviants, particularly mentally ill persons, hippies, and marijuana smokers. They were less tolerant of sexual deviants (homosexuals and prostitutes), and criminal deviants (murders and embezzlers).
4. There was one social class difference in terms of social distance to deviants and acceptance or rejection

of deviants. That difference occurred with the reactions of the social classes to criminals. The lower classes expressed less social distance to the aggregate "criminals" than the upper classes. The lower classes were also more likely to be classified as acceptors of criminals than the upper classes.

5. Although these and other social class variations were noted, none of the differences relating to social distance to and acceptance-rejection of deviant types was large enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level. For this reason, the second null hypothesis cannot be rejected. We cannot conclude that differences in social class lead to differences in attitudes of social distance towards deviants.
6. When liberalism-conservatism was introduced as a control variable, social class differences were again not large enough to be significant at the .05 level. Thus the third null hypothesis also cannot be rejected by this data.

CHAPTER SIX: ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

ANALYSIS

The previous chapter noted a disappointingly small number of statistically significant differences among the social classes relating to attitudes towards deviant behavior. Nonetheless I feel that this research has made three major contributions to the existing theory and research pertaining to this area. The first major contribution has been to improve on the study by Simmons, by building on his design and testing his assumptions. Secondly, clarification of the concept of "societal reaction" provides input to the "labelling" model of deviant behavior. Finally, the data which has been generated by this research suggests a number of interesting observations about the variations of reactions to deviant activity which are possible, and the conditions under which those reactions take place.

The study conducted by J. L. Simmons was intended to fill a major gap in the area of research into attitudes towards deviants. Chapter One discussed some of the strong points and shortcomings of his pilot study. His research indicates that certain deviant acts are given greater attention by society than others. His results also suggest that subgroups within society differ in terms of the amount of attention which they devote to various deviant actions. The question raised in Chapter One asked whether attention correlated with disapproval.

That is, does calling a group deviant mean that that group is disapproved of? Are the groups which are identified most frequently as deviant the ones who are disapproved of most strongly?

The first major contribution of the research reported here has been to develop an instrument which builds on the Simmons design and makes it possible to answer these questions. This instrument includes two measures of attitudes towards deviants: Simmons' concept of identification of deviants, and the additional concept of social distance to deviants. The social distance scale provides a much more accurate indication of attitudes towards deviant groups than the simple concept of identification of deviants. Using this scale, sample members have the opportunity to indicate their placement on an attitudinal continuum, from social rejection to social acceptance, for a number of deviant types. The flexibility which this scale provides is impressive. A researcher interested in measuring attitudes towards deviant categories could list any number of deviants, including individual and aggregate types. Different independent and control variables could also be substituted for those used here. The basic research design developed for this study can therefore be easily adapted by a social researcher to measure variations in social reaction towards any kinds of deviants in which the researcher was interested.

The results reported in Chapter Five do not provide a

a conclusive answer to the question of the correlation between identification of deviants and social distance to deviants. This is because the responses based upon these variables do not match up perfectly. For example, the fifth most frequently mentioned type of deviant (alcoholics) was not included in the social distance scale, and so no measure of social distance to this group is available. Nonetheless, there are some remarkable similarities between the two sets of data generated by these two concepts.

These similarities are particularly remarkable considering the independence of these two variables. As Chapter Four explained, the sample members were asked early in the interview the open-ended question of what kinds of persons or groups they considered to be deviant. No input or examples were provided by the interviewer. If a respondent couldn't think of any group that he considered deviant, then that question was left blank. After the respondent was satisfied that he had listed all types of deviants that he could think of, he was then asked to give his reactions to various kinds of deviants, using the social distance scale.

A close examination of the responses to these two variables demonstrates their similarities. The six most frequently mentioned deviants (identified by at least 10% of the total sample), listed in order of frequency of response, were:

Criminals

Homosexuals

Drug Addicts

Murderers

Alcoholics

Mentally Ill Individuals

By comparison, individual social distance scores which were obtained on four of those six categories indicated strong disapproval of murderers, drug addicts, and homosexuals. Least amount of disapproval was expressed on the social distance scale towards mentally ill individuals. In addition, the aggregate "criminals" was given the strongest rejection among three aggregates.

Another consistency between identification of and social distance to deviants was the attitudes of the social classes towards criminal deviants. The upper classes were much more likely than the lower classes to identify criminals as deviant. The upper classes also expressed greater social distance to criminals, and were more likely to be classified as rejectors of criminals.

As inconclusive as this data is, nonetheless it strongly suggests a direct relationship between the frequency with which a sample identifies a group as deviant and the degree of disapproval they feel towards members of that group. This statement provides clarification of Simmons' concept of identification of deviants. It also lends impact to his results. The fact that 49 percent of his sample identified homosexuals as deviant does not mean that the other 51 percent

did not consider homosexuals to be deviant. But the fact that this group was most frequently mentioned very likely does mean that his sample disapproved of homosexuality more strongly than any other deviant activity. The fact that female sample members mentioned prostitution more frequently than males is strong evidence that they disapproved of this activity more than men.

In spite of the fact that these two variables yielded a number of similarities, I don't believe that they are measuring the same concept. Rather, the concepts of identification of deviants and social distance to deviants are complementary variables, insofar as the former is an open-ended measure and the latter is a forced-choice measure. The fact that criminals, murderers, homosexuals, and drug addicts were given strong disapproval based on the social distance scale does not necessarily mean that these deviant types are the most strongly rejected deviant groups in society. However, the fact that these were the groups most frequently identified as deviant supports the hypothesis that these are indeed the most strongly disapproved deviant groups.

This example illustrates the first major contribution of the present research. By combining the two concepts of identification of deviants and social distance to deviants, a more complete indication of attitudes towards deviants is provided. Results obtained here have given some support to the hypothesis that the groups most frequently identified as deviant by society are also the ones that are most strongly

rejected by society.

The second contribution which this research makes is to clarify some concepts and statements which are central to the "labelling" theory of deviant behavior. To reiterate the main points of this theory, deviant behavior is defined as any action which violates some group's norms and which is followed by some form of reaction against the individual committing the act. This reaction is usually referred to as "societal reaction." The individual who is caught violating these norms is given a label which identifies him as someone different from the rest of society. The characteristic, then, that distinguishes deviant behavior from simple rule-breaking behavior is that deviant behavior is noticed and reacted to, and it subsequently earns a deviant label for the actor engaging in this activity.

The research reported here has shed some light on this process. These results suggest, first of all, which acts are most likely to be given strong disapproval if they become noticed, and what the relative degrees of disapproval will be. Criminal activity, murder, drug addiction, and homosexuality have been shown to lead to strong disapproval. Being mentally ill or being a hippie are considered much less serious offenses.

The results obtained here also discourage the use of the term "societal reaction" when referring to the disapproval which deviant behavior may lead to. Reaction to deviant behavior has been shown to be anything but societal in nature.

Some forms of deviant behavior receive stronger disapproval than others. In addition, some variations in reactions have been demonstrated by the data obtained here and the data obtained by Simmons. Simmons found that female sample members disapproved of prostitution more strongly than male sample members. In my sample females also seemed to disapproved of drug addicts and peddlers and homosexuals more strongly than men. In addition, upper class members disapproved of criminal behavior more strongly than lower class members. It would be more accurate, therefore, to describe this reaction as social reaction rather than societal reaction.

These results also have implications for the career model which some labelling theorists have developed. The Becker model, for example, describes four stages in the deviant career. After committing a deviant act (step one), the actor may be caught and punished for his behavior (step two). Several things may follow. The individual may find that he is treated differently by people he comes in contact with. He may be denied employment. He may be regarded with constant suspicion by police and other officials. Thus, in step three a self-fulfilling prophecy may take place, where a deviant actor may be forced to pursue a deviant career because non-deviant options are denied to him.

The final step takes place when the individual accepts the deviant label and eventually finds a number of advantages in joining a deviant subculture.

The Becker model describes the progression of a deviant career from the deviant act, to the subsequent label, to the social reaction which follows the imputation of the label, and finally the act of entering a deviant group. The results of this research have implications for each of the last three stages.

This research, first of all, clarifies to some degree the concept of the deviant label. The results have shown that the nature of this label is strongly influenced by the degree of disapproval with which society views that behavior. The label which Becker describes is not a uniform "badge" that everyone wears who has been caught doing something that breaks some rule. Rather it is a complex variable that ranges from strong disapproval to little or no disapproval.

The nature of the social interaction which takes place in step three is influenced by the kind of label which society confers. Members of society will be much more concerned about limiting their interaction with criminals and drug addicts than with hippies or marijuana smokers. Someone who has spent time in prison for murder will be regarded with much more suspicion and disapproval than someone who has been a patient in a mental hospital.

The disapproval with which society views the various kinds of deviant behavior also determines their treatment of subcultures which are made up of those deviants. Society will regard a subculture made up of homosexuals or drug addicts much more harshly than one made up of hippies or mental patients.

The results of this research, then, serve to clarify a number of points which the labelling theory and career model of deviant behavior take for granted. The degree of disapproval with which society views each type of deviant behavior determines the nature of the label which is conferred on the deviant actor. It also influences the amount of social interaction which members of that society will be willing to have with those kinds of deviants, and the number of restrictions which will be put on their freedoms.

The final contribution of this research has been to generate data which suggest some conditions under which disapproval of deviant actions takes place. The most consistent finding of this research has been the varying social class reactions to criminal behavior. The upper classes identified criminals as deviant much more frequently than lower class members. The upper classes also expressed more social distance to the aggregate "criminals", and were more likely than the lower class members to be classified as rejectors of criminals.

The reasons for this pattern are unclear. Part of the problem of interpreting this pattern is that there are at least two definitions of criminals operating here. When the sample responded that they regarded criminals as deviant, they most likely had in mind many kinds of criminal activity, including murder, assault and battery, robbery, and perhaps many other crimes. However, when the sample expressed their

social distance to the aggregate "criminals", this included only two kinds, embezzlers and murderers. We must therefore use caution when interpreting social class differences in regard to attitudes towards criminals.

One conclusion that is possible is that the lower classes disapprove of criminal behavior less than the upper classes because, as many studies have shown, more criminal activity takes place in lower class neighborhoods than in upper class neighborhoods. However, the "propinquity theory", as this explanation might be called, is probably not valid because the same pattern does not hold for other kinds of deviant behavior. An examination of Table X illustrates this point. The lower classes also experience more instances of mental illness (see Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958) and yet their score on social distance to this group was almost identical to that of the upper and middle classes. The opposite pattern occurred with regard to embezzlers. Sutherland (1960) found that the upper classes experienced more instances of embezzlement, but Table X indicates that the lower classes are more favorable towards this group than the upper classes.

A more valid explanation might be provided by recalling from Chapter One Cohen's discussion of the values characteristic of the middle class. Before describing those values, it is important to specify the social class category for which they apply. Cohen uses the term "middle class" loosely, to contrast with the values of the "working class". The segment

of society that is characterized by the middle class values is that group of business and political leaders and professionals who "run things". These are the norms of the dominant American culture, established by the prominent persons in the community and nation. Thus, Cohen did not intend that the values he described be regarded as characteristic of Class III only. In fact, he feels that these values are present in all classes in the American status structure. However, they are more tenuous in working class and lower class families. Therefore, for the purpose of comparison with the present study, it would be most accurate to regard these values as characteristic of the upper two classes, Classes I-II.

These American values which Cohen describes hold that manners and courtesy should be developed from early childhood. Aggression and violence should be controlled. Property that belongs to others should be respected; the owner should have the right to do as he wants with his property.

The analysis which this discussion suggests is that all classes disapprove of criminal behavior. The differences in the degree of disapproval, however, is a result of the differences in the degree to which the different social classes subscribe to the cultural values described by Cohen. As Table XI indicates, none of the social class categories averaged as many as half of the total social distance points that were possible in regard to criminal deviants. The upper

classes averaged 38.75%, the middle class averaged 47.06% and the lower classes averaged 48%. Thus all classes disapproved of criminal deviants. However, the upper classes expressed more social distance to this aggregate because they believe more strongly in the values prohibiting violence and disrespect for the property of others. The lower classes also subscribe to these values, but to a lesser degree than the upper classes. They therefore express a lower level of disapproval towards criminals than the upper classes.

Other results of this research suggest some interesting conclusions about the societal reaction to deviance. There was, for example, a wide variety of persons and groups identified as deviant by one or more sample members (see Appendix D for the complete list). The diverse responses included the following:

Juvenile Delinquents

Blacks

Loners

Masochists

Catholics

Indians

College professors

High school students

Strike breakers

Anyone contrary to the establishment

People who make excuses not to come to work

People who don't take care of animals

The variety and number of responses reaffirms Simmons' suggestion that almost everyone is deviant from the standpoint of at least some persons. A further postulate of these results is that every person has an internalized normative perspective from which they evaluate the behavior of others. That normative structure is partly made up of norms shared by the majority of society or by social groups. It is also composed of norms which are idiosyncratic or shared by a very small number of persons.

Some additional insight into the complexities of societal reaction is provided by a close examination of Table VIII, regarding the sample's feelings of social distance to eight kinds of deviant behavior. Disapproval was generally not strong towards four kinds of deviant behavior: mental illness, being a hippie, marijuana smoking, and embezzlement. Disapproval was fairly strong or very strong towards another four kinds of deviation: prostitution, homosexuality, drug addiction, and murder. An important research question is posed by this data. Why should the first four receive less disapproval than the last four? What are the conditions which determine the degree of disapproval which will follow any form of deviation? There are many forms of deviance which were not included in the present research. Examples are atheism, suicide, and juvenile delinquency. Do the data in this study provide any clues concerning the kinds of reactions which these and other

forms of deviance will lead to? By interpreting some of the patterns which evolved from the present research, some tentative conclusions are possible concerning the conditions under which disapproval will take place.

* It was discovered, first of all, that the least amount of disapproval was expressed towards mentally ill individuals. A majority of the sample most likely regarded mental illness as a sickness which is brought about by forces beyond the control of the individual. Of the eight types of deviants to which the respondents expressed reaction, the sample members probably felt that the mentally ill person had the least amount of freedom in choosing how he was going to act. One conclusion we can make, therefore, is that if an individual feels that deviant behavior was brought about by influences beyond the control of the deviant actor, he will be less likely to limit his interaction with that person.

A second observation which can be made concerning mental illness is that the person who is suffering from mental illness is probably the one type of deviant of the eight deviants listed whose behavior is most unlike the respondents' own behavior. In other words, the respondents expressed a small degree of disapproval of this kind of deviant in spite of the fact that the day-to-day behavior of this deviant perhaps varied the most from the respondent's behavior. Accepting this assumption, we can conclude that the amount of x disapproval that an individual feels towards behavior which is

different from his own is influenced only to a small degree by the amount of difference which there is between the deviant behavior and his own behavior.

The sample was also willing to interact with the category called "hippies". It is true that it is difficult, if not impossible, to define this concept. But if we think of hippies as young persons whose looks, clothes, hair, and liberal ideologies differ from the majority of adults, then some interesting conclusions can be reached concerning the social reaction to this deviant category. Although the majority of adults may disapprove of these differences to some degree, the disapproval will not be strong as long as these "hippies" mind their own business and don't do anything that will hurt themselves or others. As the strong disapproval of drug addicts and murderers indicates, when rule violations reach the point of someone's getting hurt, whether that person is the deviant actor himself or some other victim, then disapproval of these actions becomes strong.

An observation that was made earlier was that the sample was willing to differentiate marijuana smoking from drug addiction. The latter category very likely conjured up a picture of an addict destroying himself with his habit and having to turn to crime to support it. The sample disapproved of this individual much more than the person who gets high on marijuana. Again, the sample may have felt that the addict is hurting himself and others by his deviant behavior; the marijuana smoker is not.

It is interesting that prostitutes and homosexuals were disapproved more than embezzlers. This fact makes it necessary to qualify the conclusion that deviation will be disapproved if it results in some victim getting hurt. The crime of embezzlement has a number of victims: initially, the bank or organization; ultimately, the stockholders of the insurance company that has to recover the losses, and the bank stockholders whose company has to pay higher premiums. However, these victims may have been too remote to warrant the attention of the sample members. It may be that the only victim of embezzlement that they can perceive are big, rich, powerful companies like banks or insurance companies, not individual persons.

The strong disapproval of prostitution and homosexuality suggests a couple of explanations. It is possible that the sample agreed with Schur (1967) that these acts are "crimes without victims." However, they consider these acts to be serious because they represent violations of two very important sexual mores.

The second explanation is that the sample does perceive that these crimes have victims: because the sexual mores of our society are so critical and central to the American way of life, then those who engage in this behavior are "moral" victims of their own crimes. Homosexuals and prostitutes are hurting themselves morally by their reprehensible behavior.

These conclusions suggest that a theory of social reaction to deviance may be possible, stating the conditions under

which disapproval of various kinds of deviance will occur. Some of the postulates of this theory that are suggested by the present research are:

1. Regardless of how a person acts, there will very likely be some persons who will consider him deviant and respond to him accordingly.
2. Deviant behavior which differs greatly from the behavior of the majority of society will not necessarily receive a great deal of disapproval by society.
3. Deviant behavior which is perceived as being brought about by forces beyond the control of the individual deviant actor will receive a relatively small amount of disapproval.
4. Deviant behavior will bring about strong disapproval by members of society when it results in some victim's being hurt, either physically, financially, or morally, unless the victim or victims are remote.
5. Lower class members will disapprove less strongly than upper class members of behavior which violates norms that are a part of the dominant American culture.

The above postulates do not represent a complete theory of social reaction to deviance. These postulates have certainly not been thoroughly tested by this research. In most cases they are interpretations of inconclusive research data. But these postulates do suggest some of the dynamics of social reaction to deviance. And they suggest further some ideas and

questions which future research can help answer.

EVALUATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Many of these conclusions could be tested by a comprehensive research project designed to investigate attitudes towards deviants. In addition to asking what groups are considered deviant by a sample, the researcher might also provide a check-off list on which the respondent could indicate which groups on the list he considered deviant.

Additional research might attempt to determine if social classes differ in terms of the kinds of deviant behavior they disapprove of. For example, the respondents might be given a list of criminal, sexual, and cultural deviants and asked to choose the one they consider the "worst" and the one which is the "least bad". They might further be asked some open ended questions designed to find out why they have these feelings about these groups.

Finally, this study could attempt to determine what social class differences resulted from these questions. How did the social classes differ in terms of their responses to these questions?

If such a research project were going to incorporate into its design some of the methods and techniques used for this study, the researcher would have to deal with the problems which were encountered in doing this project. The most critical problem was the low sample response rate. With less

than 40 per cent of the population responding, it is difficult to make any inferences about attitudes of members of various social classes. It is possible that the 62 per cent of the population that did not respond have attitudes towards deviants similar to the attitudes of those who did respond. It is more likely, however, that those who refused may have differed in some patterned way from those who agreed. It may be, for example, that their refusal was based on a fear of allowing strangers into their homes. This same fear may lead them to a strong disapproval of deviant behavior. It is possible, therefore, that those who did not participate felt a stronger disapproval of deviant activity than those who did participate.

This low participation rate, and subsequent small sample size, led to several decisions which may have compromised the results of this research to some degree. Because of the small sample size, the decision was made to dichotomize two variables. All sample members were categorized as either liberal or conservative, and as either acceptors or rejectors of aggregate types of deviants and deviants in general, based upon social distance score. It is more realistic to view each of these variables as complex attitudes which have many degrees and shades of response. A larger sample would have made it statistically possible to categorize sample members into three or more categories. This would have provided a much more realistic insight into each sample member's

social attitudes.

A second problem concerned the liberalism-conservatism scale which was selected for this study. First of all, it was unrealistic to believe that responses to twelve statements would yield an accurate picture of an individual's social attitudes, particularly an attitude as complex as liberalism-conservatism. Secondly, the wording of some of the statements in this scale was sometimes confusing. For example, one statement said that we should radically change our present system of privately controlled medical care. The term "radical" was an unfortunate choice. Many felt that changes were needed, but were unsure if those changes had to be radical changes.

The statement "Large fortunes should be taxed fairly heavily over and above income taxes" is equally unclear. How much is "fairly heavily"? What does "over and above income taxes" mean?

Agreement with the following statement is supposed to indicate a conservative ideology: "Individuals with the ability and foresight to earn and accumulate wealth should have the right to enjoy that wealth without government interference and regulations." But isn't taxation an example of government interference and regulations? And no one felt that these persons shouldn't pay taxes.

The result of these and other complaints about this scale is that classification as a liberal or conservative for

this study doesn't really mean very much. A scale with a larger number of statements, covering a wide variety of social issues and worded in an ambiguous way, is necessary to give a true indication of an individual's social attitudes.

The third problem concerns the time span over which this research was carried out. Some interviews were conducted in December of 1972. Some were conducted in May, 1973. This six month time span may have had some effect, either on the results or the response rate. If comparisons are going to be made between the responses of two groups, it is best that those responses be collected within a fairly reasonable time of one another.

If such a research project were able to overcome some of these problems, as well as incorporate some of the suggestions listed previously, the result would be a tremendous contribution to our knowledge of the social reaction to deviance.

CONCLUSIONS

Chapter One expressed the hope that this research would serve both research and theoretical functions. I believe that, based upon the three contributions which this chapter has discussed, each of those functions has been served.

The first contribution has been to build upon the research design developed by J. L. Simmons. His method was simply to ask a sample to name the kinds of persons they considered

deviant. This research design added the additional concept of acceptance-rejection of deviants, using the social distance scale. This scale made it possible to verify the assumption that those groups that are named as deviant will also be the ones strongly disapproved of.

The second contribution of this research has been to clarify some concepts and statements central to the labelling theory and career model of deviant behavior. We have seen that the degree of disapproval with which a form of deviant behavior is regarded will have a strong influence on the reaction of society towards members of these groups, the kind of label he is given, and the amount of interaction which they will permit between the individual and the other members of society.

The final contribution has been to generate data which suggest some of the dynamics of the social reaction to deviance. One conclusion was that upper class members disapprove more strongly of criminal deviants because they subscribe more completely to the basic values of the American culture. Other, more tentative, conclusions were also suggested by this research: the fact that almost everyone is deviant from someone's viewpoint; that disapproval of deviant behavior is based not upon the amount of variation of behavior but rather on the perception that that behavior results in some victim's being hurt; and that disapproval will be slight if the respondent feels that this behavior was caused by forces

beyond the control of the deviant actor.

These are some of the factors in the social reaction to deviance which were suggested by the present research. When combined with the results of future research, such as that suggested in this chapter, a comprehensive theory of social reaction to deviance will be possible.



APPENDIX A - LETTER SENT TO SAMPLE MEMBERS INTERVIEWED BY VISIT
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

P.O. Box 688 Omaha, Nebraska 68101
Telephone 402/553-4700

University of Omaha 1908-31
Municipal University of Omaha 1931-68

College of Arts & Sciences
Department of Sociology

This is to introduce you to Mr. Michael Mendenhall, who is one of our graduate students in sociology here at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Mr. Mendenhall is currently conducting research to fulfill the requirements for a Master of Arts degree.

Since your name has been randomly selected as part of his sample, he would like to ask you some questions having to do with social attitudes. This should take no more than fifteen minutes of your time, and information you give will not be used for any purpose other than for his study and will be strictly anonymous.

In a few days he, or one or two of his assistants, will contact you at your home. We would appreciate your willingness to grant them this interview.

Should you wish to verify his project as authorized by and under supervision of the University, I encourage you to contact either me, or Professor George Barger. I am serving as chairman of the faculty committee that is guiding Mr. Mendenhall's research and Professor Barger is chairman of the Department of Sociology at UNO. We can be reached during the day at 553-4700, extension 626 or 627.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert Simpson
Robert Simpson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

RS:sk



University of Omaha 1908-31
Municipal University of Omaha 1931-68

APPENDIX B - LETTER SENT TO SAMPLE MEMBERS INTERVIEWED BY
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA PHONE

P.O. Box 688 Omaha, Nebraska 68101
Telephone 402/553-4700

College of Arts & Sciences
Department of Sociology

This is to introduce you to Mr. Michael Mendenhall, who is one of our graduate students in sociology here at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Mr. Mendenhall is currently conducting research to fulfill the requirements for a Master of Arts degree.

Since your name has been randomly selected as part of his sample, he would like to ask you some questions having to do with social attitudes. This should take no more than fifteen minutes of your time, and information you give will not be used for any purpose other than for his study and will be strictly anonymous.

In a few days he will contact you at your home. Since he has been called to military service and must complete his interviews by the latter part of January, he will be contacting you by phone rather than personal visit. We would appreciate your willingness to grant him this interview.

Should you wish to verify his project as authorized by and under supervision of the University, I encourage you to contact either me, or Professor George Barger. I am serving as chairman of the faculty committee that is guiding Mr. Mendenhall's research and Professor Barger is chairman of the Department of Sociology at UNO. We can be reached during the day at 553-4700, extension 626 or 627.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert Simpson
Robert Simpson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

RS:sk

APPENDIX C - QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age _____
2. Sex _____
3. Race _____
4. What is your religious preference?
 - ___ a. Roman Catholic
 - ___ b. Protestant
 - ___ c. Jewish
 - ___ d. other
 - ___ e. no religious affiliation
5. What is your average annual family income?
 - ___ a. under \$5999
 - ___ b. \$6000 - \$8999
 - ___ c. \$9000 - \$11999
 - ___ d. \$12000 - \$14999
 - ___ e. \$15000 - \$24999
 - ___ f. \$25000 and over.
6. What is your marital status?
 - ___ a. single
 - ___ b. married
 - ___ c. separated
 - ___ d. widowed
 - ___ e. divorced
7. What is your occupation? Be specific, please. _____

8. What was your last completed year in school? _____
 - ___ 1. Graduate professional training (with degree).
 - ___ 2. College graduate (16)
 - ___ 3. Partial college (13-16 years, no degree)
 - ___ 4. High school graduate (12)
 - ___ 5. Partial high school (10 or 11)
 - ___ 6. Junior high (7, 8, or 9)
 - ___ 7. Less than 7 years.
9. Sometimes certain individuals engage in acts of behavior which do not conform to what we consider to be appropriate behavior. We usually call such persons deviant. I would like for you to list for me those types of persons whom you regard as being deviant.

I am going to list several types of persons whom some people regard as deviant. I would like you to tell me the kinds of reactions which you might have to such persons.

	MENTALLY ILL INDIVIDUALS	EMBEZZLERS	HIPPIES	DRUG ADDICTS	MURDERERS	HOMOSEXUALS	PROSTITUTES	MARIJUANA SMOKERS
I would have members of this group as regular friends.								
I would have several families of this type in my neighborhood.								
I would be willing to have members of this group as speaking acquaintances.								
I would have members of this group live outside of my neighborhood(i.e., if it were up to me).								
I would have members of this group live outside of my country(i.e., if it were up to me).								

Finally, I have listed below several statements on various social problems about which we all have beliefs and opinions. This scale is an attempt to let you express your opinions. Please respond to each of the items as follows: Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, or are you undecided?

Individuals who are against churches and religions should not be allowed to teach in colleges.

SA A U D SD
 0 1 2 3 4

Large fortunes should be taxed fairly heavily over and above income taxes.

SA A U D SD
 4 3 2 1 0

The well being of a nation depends mainly on its industry and business.

SA A U D SD
 0 1 2 3 4

Both public and private universities and colleges should get generous aid from both state and federal governments.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4	3	2	1	0

Science and society would both be better off if scientists took no part in politics.

SA	AA	U	D	SD
0	1	2	3	4

To ensure adequate care of the sick, we need to change radically the present system of privately controlled medical care.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4	3	2	1	0

If the United States takes part in any sort of world organization, we should be sure that we lose none of our power and influence.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0	1	2	3	4

Public enterprises like railroads should not make profits; they are entitled to fares sufficient to enable them to pay only a fair interest on the actual cash capital they have invested.

SA	A	U	SD	SD
4	3	2	1	0

Government laws and regulations should be such as first to ensure the prosperity of business since the prosperity of all depends on the prosperity of business.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0	1	2	3	4

True democracy is limited in the United States because of the special privileges enjoyed by business and industry.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4	3	2	1	0

Unemployment insurance is an inalienable right of the working man.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4	3	2	1	0

Individuals with the ability and foresight to earn and accumulate wealth should have the right to enjoy that wealth without government interference and regulations.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX D - GROUPS IDENTIFIED BY SAMPLE AS DEVIANT

<u>DEVIANT TYPE</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>
Criminals	15
Drug Addicts	13
Homosexuals	13
Murderers	11
Alcoholics	8
Sex deviants / sex offenders	7
Robbers / thieves	6
Hippies	4
Law Breakers	4
Mentally retarded/Mentally ill	4
Molesters	4
Draft dodgers	3
Lesbians	3
Violent reactionaries	3
Atheists	2
Child beaters	2
Drug peddlers	2
Irresponsible persons	2
Militants	2
Prostitutes	2
Protesters	2
Psychotics	2
Rapists	2
Religious fanatics	2

<u>DEVIANT TYPE</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>
Anyone contrary to the establishment	1
Black militants	1
Black Muslims	1
Black Panthers	1
Blacks	1
Burglars	1
Bystanders	1
Catholics	1
College professors	1
Communes	1
Confirmed bachelors	1
Convicts	1
Destructive persons	1
Draft deserters	1
Embezzlers	1
Exposers	1
Extroverts	1
Fraudulent persons	1
Freshmen and sophomores in college	1
Hell's Angels	1
High school students	1
Hostile acts on individuals	1
Hustlers	1
Hypocrites	1
Indians	1

<u>DEVIANT TYPES</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>
Introverts	1
Juvenile Delinquents	1
Loners	1
Manic Depressives	1
Marchers	1
Masochists	1
Minutemen	1
Negligent parents	1
Nudists	1
Offensive language users	1
Pacifists	1
People who are mean or obnoxious or undiplomatic	1
People who don't get along with anyone	1
People who don't take care of animals	1
People who make excuses not to come to work	1
Perverts	1
Protesters	1
Purse Snatchers	1
Race rioters	1
Racists	1
Recluse	1
Schizophrenics	1
Shoplifters	1
Strike breakers	1
Undesirables	1
War	1
Wife Swappers	1

REFERENCES

- Becker, Howard S.
1963 "Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance".
New York: The Free Press.
- Becker, Howard S.
1967 "Whose Side Are We On?" Social Problems 14
(Winter): 239-247.
- Bensman, Joseph and Israel Gerver
1963 "Crime and Punishment in the Factory: The Function
of Deviancy in Maintaining the Social System".
American Sociological Review 28 (August): 588-598.
- Bogardus, Emory S.
1928 "Immigration and Race Attitudes". Boston and
New York: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Bogardus, Emory S.
1933 "A Social Distance Scale". Sociology and Social
Research 17 (Jan-Feb): 265-271
- Bryan, James H.
1965 "Apprenticeships in Prostitution". Social Problems
12 (Winter): 287-297.
- Bryan, James H.
1966 "Occupational Ideologies and Individual Attitudes
of Call Girls". Social Problems 13 (Spring): 441-450.
- Cohen, Albert K.
1955 "Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang."
New York: The Free Press.
- Cohen, Albert K.
1966 "Deviance and Control". Englewood Cliffs, N. J.:
Princeton-Hall, Inc.
- Davis, Kingsley
1937 "The Sociology of Prostitution". American Sociological
Review 2 (October): 744-755.
- Durkheim, Emile
1958 "The Rules of Sociological Method". New York:
The Free Press.
- Erikson, Kai T.
1964 "Notes on the Sociology of Deviance". pp. 9-21
in Howard S. Becker (ed.), The Other Side. New York:
The Free Press.

- Erikson, Kai T.
1966 "Wayward Puritans" A Study in the Sociology of Deviance". New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Gibbs, Jack P.
1966 "Conceptions of Deviant Behavior: The Old and The New". Pacific Sociological Review 9 (Spring): 9-14.
- Goffman, Erving
1961 a "Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates". Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Goffman, Erving
1961 b "Encounters". Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Goffman, Erving
1963 "Behavior in Public Places". New York: The Free Press.
- Goode, William J. and Paul K. Hatte
1952 "Methods in Social Research". New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenwald, Harold
1958 "The Call Girl". New York: Ballantine Books, Inc.
- Harris, Louis
1965 "Majority Consider Nonconformists Harmful". †
The Louisville, Kentucky Courier-Journal
(September 27).
- Hollingshead, August B.
1949 "Elmstown's Youth". New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Hollingshead, August B.
1957 "Two Factor Index of Social Position". New Haven: Yale University.
- Hollingshead, August B. and Frederick Redlich
1958 "Social Class and Mental Illness". New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Homans, George C.
1969 "Output Restriction Norms and Social Sanctions".
Pp. 4-11 in William A. Risher (ed.), Deviant Behavior and Social Process. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Kahl, Joseph A.
1957 "The American Class Structure". New York: Rinehart. †

- Kitsuse, John I.
1962 "Societal Reaction to Deviant Behavior: Problems of Theory and Method". Social Problems 9 (Winter): 247-256.
- Lemert, Edwin M.
1951 "Social Pathology". New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Leznoff, Maurice and William A. Westley
1956 "The Homosexual Community". Social Problems 3 (April): 257-263.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin
1959 "Democracy and Working - Class Authoritarianism". American Sociological Review 24 (August): 482-501.
- MacKinnon, William and Richard Centers
1956 "Authoritarianism and Urban Stratification". American Journal of Sociology 61 (May): 610-620.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw
1926 "Crime and Customs in Savage Society". New York: Humanities Press.
- Merton, Robert K.
1957 "Social Theory and Social Structure". New York: The Free Press.
- Miller, Walter B.
1958 "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency". Journal of Social Issues 14 (Fall) 5-19.
- Nie, Norman, Dale H. Bent and C. Hadlai Hall
1970 "SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Science". New York: McGraw-Hill Company.
- Porterfield, Austin L.
1946 "Youth in Trouble". Fort Worth, Texas: Leo Potishman Foundation
- Reiss, Albert J., Jr.
1961 "The Social Integration of Queers and Peers". Social Problems 9 (Fall): 102-120.
- Reiss, Albert J. and Albert Lewis Rhodes
1961 "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the Social Class Structure". American Sociological Review 26 (October): 720-732. f

- Robins, Lee N., Harry Gyman and Patricia O'Neal
 1962 "The Interaction of Social Class and Deviant Behavior". American Sociological Review 27 (August): 480-492.
- Schur, Edwin M.
 1964 "Drug Addiction Under British Policy". Pp. 67-83 in Howard S. Becker (ed.), The Other Side. New York: The Free Press.
- Schur, Edwin M.
 1967 "Crimes Without Victims". Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Selvin, Hanan and Warren O. Hagstrom
 1960 "Determinants of Support for Civil Liberties". British Journal of Sociology 11 (March): 51-73.
- Shaw, Marvin E. and Jack M. Wright
 1967 "Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes". New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Simmons, J. I.
 1965 "Public Stereotypes of Deviants". Social Problems 13 (Fall): 223-232.
- Sutherland, Edwin H.
 1960 "White Collar Crime". New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wriston, Inc.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey
 1966 "Principles of Criminology". Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
- Schwartz, Richard D. and Jerome H. Skolnick
 1962 "Two Studies of Legal Stigma". Social Problems 10 (Fall): 133-142.
- Vincent, Clark
 1961 "Unmarried Mothers". New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Wallerstein, James S. and Clement J. Wyle
 1947 "Our Law-Abiding Law-Breakers". Probation 25: 107-112
- Weber, Max
 1946 "Class, Status, Party". Pp 180-195 in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.