

Journal of Rural Social Sciences

Volume 31
Issue 2 *Special Issue: Rural Crime*

Article 3

8-31-2016

Criminal Futures on the Ruralside: A Preliminary Examination of Antisocial Behaviors of Rural and Urban Students

Raymond Biggar Jr.
University of Louisiana, Lafayette

Jing Chen
University of Louisiana, Lafayette

Craig J. Forsyth
University of Louisiana, Lafayette

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jrss>



Part of the [Rural Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Biggar, Raymond, Jing Chen, and Craig Forsyth. 2016. "Criminal Futures on the Ruralside: A Preliminary Examination of Antisocial Behaviors of Rural and Urban Students." *Journal of Rural Social Sciences*, 31(2): Article 3. Available At: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jrss/vol31/iss2/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Population Studies at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Rural Social Sciences* by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

Journal of Rural Social Sciences, 31(2), 2016, pp. 16–34.
Copyright © by the Southern Rural Sociological Association

**CRIMINAL FUTURES ON THE RURALSIDE: A PRELIMINARY
EXAMINATION OF ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIORS OF RURAL AND
URBAN STUDENTS**

RAYMOND BIGGAR, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA, LAFAYETTE

JING CHEN

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA, LAFAYETTE

and

CRAIG J. FORSYTH

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA, LAFAYETTE

ABSTRACT

Based on data from the 2012 Communities that Care Youth Survey (CCYS), the authors compare the delinquency of rural and urban adolescents across eight behaviors that comprise the surveys antisocial behavior profile. The authors created a two category urban/rural variable.

The idea of urban-rural differences has been integrated into the sociological literature since the study of crime began. In 1930, Sorokin, Zimmerman and Galpin published a Sourcebook for Rural Sociology; which indicates there was a cache of knowledge that existed before then. Scholarly attention to urban rural differences continued with the result being that by the 1950s there existed stacks of knowledge devoted to a host of sociological variables (Lentz 1956). Yet criminology has given little attention to the subject of rural crime or police officers (Bankston and Jenkins 1982; Gibbons 1972). The exception may be the occupation of game warden and the crime of poaching which has received recent scholarly attention (Carter 2004, 2006; Dizard 2003; Eliason 2003, 2008; Eliason and Dodder 1999; Forsyth 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 2008; Forsyth and Forsyth 2009; 2010; 2012; Forsyth and Marckese 1993a, 1993b; Forsyth, Gramling and Wooddell 1998; Hampshire et al. 2004; Jacoby 2001; Lawson 2002, 2003; McMullan and Perrier 2002; Sherblom, Keranen and Withers 2002; Tobias 1998). Recently, rural sociology has become more focused on environmental crime, corporate mistakes, and pollution. In addition, most criminologists have not bothered looking directly at the problem; taking for granted that nothing of interest was there; until the manufacture of

CRIMINAL FUTURES ON THE RURALSIDE

17

methamphetamine became part of rural commerce and marijuana redefined the terms cash crop and truck farming. The purpose of this research is to broaden the scholarly interest in rural crime by focusing on the delinquency of rural students.

In the study of crime, rural data like the theft of farm equipment and livestock have been lacking; however, rural-urban differences in crime and delinquency formed an extensive literature in the past. Lower rates of crime were found in rural places as compared with urban areas; yet since the collection and study of crime data originated in the urban arenas and the concepts framing such behaviors were created there, looking for the same acts in rural became fruitless. Interestingly it was the rural police force of game wardens who were first burdened with a rural crime ripple. Recent research on game wardens has served notice that their jobs had become increasingly dangerous and both crime and criminals had moved into the hinterlands of America (Gibbons 1972). The literature of the dangers of policing in rural environments is evident in wildlife law enforcement (Carter 2004), and recently on drug criminals. The idea is that rural America had become more urban-like regarding crime and change in the work of game wardens is representative (Osgood and Chambers 2002; Ousey and Wilcox 2007).

The literature on game wardens has mainly focused on the interactional dynamics of warden/poacher confrontations. Forsyth (1993b, 2008) describe the factors associated with likelihood of poachers being caught. These included: poaching alone, very experienced at poaching, never talks about their poaching activities, the use of informants, remaining mobile, being familiar with the geographic area in which one poaches, and poaching in a large area (not relegated to hunting in a relatively small specific area). Forsyth and Marckese (1993a) describe the thrill seeking and skill level of poachers as they out maneuver game wardens. The data reveal the high skill level of poachers and the risks that game wardens face as they encounter hunters who will use deadly force to escape capture. Forsyth et al. (1998) studied poaching as a folk crime and the culture conflict that exist among poachers in the Atchafalaya River Basin of south-central Louisiana. Eliason and Dodder (1999) revealed excuses and justifications for poacher behavior. While all work on game wardens and poachers (Hampshire et al. 2004; McMullan and Perrier 2002; Lawson 2002, 2003; Tobias 1998; Sherblom et al. 2002; Jacoby 2001) implicitly focus on the dangers of the job, only Carter (2004), Forsyth (1993b; 2008), Palmer and Bryant (1985) and Walsh and Donovan (1984) contain data on the dangers of the work of game wardens.

The work of game wardens, in isolated areas, is made even more dangerous in a night time environment (Dizard 2003; Forsyth 2008). Additionally there are less than 8000 Federal and state wilderness officers in the United States. Previous research (Carter 2004; Forsyth 1993b; Palmer and Bryant 1985) has found that most wardens considered their work to be physically hazardous. The job is dangerous with wardens getting killed and assaulted on the job (Eliason 2008). Carter's (2004) research that compared the dangerousness of the work of police and game wardens supports these ideas. Wardens are seven times more likely to be assaulted with a firearm or cutting object than police and game wardens are more than twice as likely to be injured by an assault than are police (Carter 2004). Implicit in these foci are the parallels that can be drawn between literature on urban police officers and game wardens and poachers, drug dealers, and other criminals.

Game wardens work in a dangerous environment. Complicating that danger is that wardens are usually unaccompanied in remote areas far from a backup, encountering individuals who are nearly always armed with and proficient in the use of weapons. The fact that game wardens more often encounter lawfully and unlawfully armed citizens may have attributed to the higher rate of use of force by game wardens than state police (Carter 2004). Reisner (1991) describes a group of poachers in California. "These outlaws . . . were a well-armed, violent, and suspicious bunch, and beyond fear when drunk" (p. 75). As indicated by this research and supported by the research of others even fishers can present dangers to the game wardens. In addition, the apprehension of drug sales and manufacture is more likely to occur in rural areas than in the past. The point taken is that these rural police officers perform more dangerous work than urban police officers; because the settings are more dangerous and becoming increasingly so.¹ Still the general feeling in criminology is that these crimes are committed by urban visitors and represent urban problems/influences in rural areas. This small amount of research makes a very conclusive point: that police work in rural areas is becoming

¹Louisiana State Game Wardens are federally commissioned which allows them to enforce fisheries laws in the United States Territorial Seas, and laws associated with the United States Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Additionally, *all* Louisiana State Game Wardens are POST certified. POST (Peace Officer Standards and Training) certified law enforcement officers of the state can enforce all laws within the state. While the emphasis is on wildlife, fisheries, and boating laws, they are tasked regularly with enforcing other laws such as: criminal, traffic, and drugs. Increasingly their jobs are more like traditional police officers and less like the descendants of the keepers of king's game.

CRIMINAL FUTURES ON THE RURALSIDE

19

remarkably similar to more urban arenas- urban problems of drug, crimes, violence, gangs has crept into the rural areas (Gibbons 1972).

Ecological systems also play a vital role in students' perceptions of school safety. According to Bronfenbrenner (1977), the microsystem more directly affects the individual than other ecological systems. At this level social and physical interactions during school can influence perceptions of school safety. Schools that are disorganized or fail to enforce rules increase student fears of becoming a victim of school violence (Akiba 2008). Peer influence and/or association also have an influence on perception of school safety. Association with delinquent friends increases fear of victimization while association with prosocial groups has a protective effect (Schreck and Miller 2003; Welsh 2000). Urban students often attend more populated schools. This increases the risk of negative peer groups, such as gangs, which can negatively affect safety concerns. This is particularly relevant among inner city communities where students report higher rates of witnessing violence or being a victim of a violent crime (Scherzer and Pinderhughes 2002). According to a study conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics (1996), students attending urban schools were more likely to bring a weapon (e.g., gun) to school than students attending rural schools.

Rural/urban differences in social interaction and institutions are frequently attributed to corresponding differences in value systems. In delinquency reference can be made to informal means of social control employed in rural areas; compared with the more formal means used in urban areas (Osgood and Chambers 2002). Rural areas are seen as places where everyone knows what everybody does so that every act is visible. Local law enforcement is also less likely to formally charge any but the most serious crime. Yet explanations of delinquency still revolve around the idea regarding urbanization of the area. Approximately 50 percent of the U.S. population lives in urban areas of 500,000 or more, but much of what we know about youth crime is based on those communities. Indeed, one in four Americans lives in a rural community with a population of 2,500 or fewer, and an additional 12 percent live in towns or cities with populations below 50,000.

For as long as arrests data have been compiled in the United States the number of arrests has been highest in large cities; moderate in suburban communities, and lowest in rural places. This pattern of crime partially reflects that a large part of the population of the United States has lived in urban areas for more than a century. But FBI arrest rates confirm that the larger the community, town, or city the higher the *arrest rate*. While the number of offenses cleared by arrest still reflects

a profoundly urban concentration; the gap in arrest rates between cities; suburban communities, and rural places has been narrowing. The tendency toward the equalization of arrest rates is said to be due to the expansion of the urban population and concomitant social problems into smaller places that extend the fringe of the central cities. Several theories of juvenile delinquency exist but all were constructed with urban delinquency data in mind. Research that has been mainly urban in character has produced nearly all the current sociological explanations of delinquency (Lentz 1956).

Rural communities have been characterized as dominated by extended family where traditional values were not penetrated and supervision was constant. Is criminology/sociology mired in these tired stereotypes in which rural characteristics are seen as protective factors for youth while urban characteristics are seen as risk factors?

METHODOLOGY

This research compares the self-reported delinquency of rural youth because their behaviors reflect the criminal future for the area. We compare their behavior with urban youth to examine differences. This is a preliminary study of antisocial behaviors collected from the 2012 CCYS. Subsequent studies will use data from additional years and include salient risk and protective factors associated with antisocial behaviors and any differences between rural and urban factors.

Data for this study was collected from the 2012 Louisiana Communities that Care Youth Survey (CCYS). This biennial survey is administered on even years, to sixth, eighth, tenth, and twelfth grade private or public school students. A report is completed by late March of the following year. The survey is designed to assess students' involvement in a specific set of indicators, as well as, their exposure to a scientifically valid risk and protective factors identified in the Risk and Protective Factor Model of adolescent problem behaviors. Examples of indicators include: drug use prevalence, antisocial behaviors, bullying, mental health, etc. Table 1 shows the number of students and the characteristics of survey participants in 2012. Each student completes the survey via pencil during a designated class period/time. The survey is administered on paper, in Scantron format. Students are given approximately 60 minutes to complete 131 questions. Passive consent was used to secure parental permission for participation. Teachers were provided with a short script to read to students just before administration. The script served as informed assent and included references to the voluntary nature of the survey and privacy.

CRIMINAL FUTURES ON THE RURALSIDE

21

No identifiable data is collected from the survey. The data was analyzed using optical mark recognition imaging scanners and populated into reports. The results are disseminated at various aggregated levels, including State, region, and parish and by individual schools. All school level reports are password protected and require consent to access. Analysis of rural and urban differences are not included as part of the CCYS analysis at any level. Therefore, reporting differences that may exist will add to existing reports and begin to fill the reporting gap that accounts for differences in populations.

The survey focuses on students across Louisiana in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12. Because some schools surveyed students in the odd grades and some students were eliminated because they were not honest in their responses, the final statewide sample in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12 used for the statewide summary was 92,605 students. Participation in the CCYS across Louisiana has been consistent over the past seven administrations, but showed a decrease in 2014. In 2002 there were 107,357 participants, in 2004 there were 97,449 participants, in 2006 there were 106,357 participants, in 2008 there were 109,765 participants, in 2010 there were 105,514 participants, and in 2012 there were 111,135 participants in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12 that participated in the CCYS. Table 1 contains the characteristics of the students from the State of Louisiana who completed the survey in 2012:

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF LOUISIANA STUDENTS COMPLETING CCYS IN 2012.

	NUMBER	PERCENT
GRADE		
6	34,720	31.2
8	31,590	28.4
10	25,144	22.6
12	19,681	17.7
GENDER		
Male	51,667	47.8
Female	56,332	52.2
ETHNICITY		
African American . . .	41,174	35.1
Asian	3,081	2.6
Hispanic	5,758	4.9
Native American . . .	4,420	3.8
Pacific Islander	1,978	1.7
White	56,522	48.2
Other	4,412	3.6

This research compares antisocial behaviors across the four (6, 8, 10, 12) grades in the year 2012 comparing rural and urban students. The rural/urban variable created from the 2010 U.S. Census data has ten categories; each calculated by percent rural starting with less than 10 percent and ending with more than 90 percent with a zip code. Table 2 has the number of zip codes in each category. The zip codes shown in Table 2 show uneven/lower numbers in some categories. The categories can be seen as a continuous variable or it could be collapsed into fewer categories. We choose two extreme categories (0-10% and 90.1-100%) because it is a more valid reflection of the difference between urban/rural. However, future studies may want to stratify beyond two categories to capture suburban population characteristics. Students taking this anonymous survey were asked to provide their zip code of residence. Researchers using CCYS data *are not allowed to report zip codes in any research or reports nor are they allowed to report numbers within any single zip code.* Table 2 represents *allowed data* that protects school identity, a requirement of the Louisiana Office of Behavioral Health (OBH). The data was collected by individual schools, under guidance provided by the Cecil Picard Center for Child Development and Lifelong Learning on the campus of the University of Louisiana at Lafayette.

TABLE 2. NUMBER OF ZIP CODES IN EACH CATEGORY

Percent Rural	No of zip codes
0% - 10%	111
10.1% - 20%.	35
20.1% - 30%.	34
30.1% - 40%.	31
40.1% - 50%.	23
50.1% - 60%.	23
60.1% - 70%.	15
70.1% - 80%.	7
80.1% - 90%.	5
90.1% - 100%.	232

Self-report surveys are one of three major ways of measuring involvement in delinquent and criminal behavior. The basic approach of the self-report method is to ask individuals if they have engaged in delinquent or criminal behavior, and if so, how often they have done so. The growth and refinement of the self-report since its initial use in the 1950's in criminological research, especially longitudinal research on the etiology of delinquent and criminal behavior.

CRIMINAL FUTURES ON THE RURALSIDE

23

Particular attention is paid to assessing the reliability and validity of self-reported measures of delinquency. We also discuss specialized data collection methods, such as random response techniques and audio assisted computer-based interviewing, which have the potential to increase the accuracy of responses. Overall, we conclude that the psychometric quality of the self-report method has increased considerably since its inception in the 1950s. Although there is much room for continued improvement, *self-report data appear acceptably valid and reliable for most research purposes.*

Some limitations of FBI crime data are overcome by self-report studies. Several researchers rather than relying on official reports of arrests, have drawn upon samples of various populations and have directly inquired through survey questionnaires regarding the respondents past delinquent behavior. This method aimed at adolescents not identified by law enforcement agencies as juvenile delinquents is designed to reveal and measure under identified and unreported instances of juvenile delinquency. Self-report studies clearly show that delinquent behavior is far more common and widespread than is indicated by official statistics. Findings from these studies over time have led researchers to conclude that enormous numbers of young people may be involved in delinquent acts. The conclusion does not deny that crime may be more concentrated in some groups, but that being absent in other groups is also unlikely. Such studies clearly support the contention that official statistics fail to completely measure delinquency and the incidence of many specific delinquent acts. (Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis 1979; Hirschi 1969)

Every delinquent act committed by a person is witnessed by him; he cannot commit delinquency acts without knowing it (otherwise, there is nothing to explain). Obviously, the police do not have such omnipresence...In short, the records of the police are, on a priori grounds, a weaker measure of the commission of delinquent acts than presumably honest self-reports (Hirschi 1969, p.64).

Other researchers indicate that, besides delinquency self-report measures has been considered valid data sources for sex, race social class, general demographic data and domains of behavior (Arnold and Brungardt 1983; Hindelang et al. 1979). A self-report study is a type of survey, questionnaire, or poll in which respondents read the question and select a response by themselves without researcher

interference. A self-report is any method that involves asking a participant about their feelings, attitudes, and beliefs and so on.

Self-report surveys also provide demographic information about offenders, such as age, race, gender, as well as information-unavailable through official data or victimization surveys-about personal characteristics of offenders, such as family backgrounds and social class. Importantly, self-report surveys enable researchers to explore the attitudes, beliefs, motivations, and personality characteristics of offenders (Burfeind and Bartusch 2006, p.93).

FINDINGS

The findings of this research are presented in Table 3. The table presents the behavior and corresponding rate on eight antisocial behaviors captured by the survey. Students are asked how often they have engaged in the behavior(s) in the past year (e.g., attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them, stolen a vehicle) or related consequences (e.g., been suspended from school, been arrested). Antisocial behavior (ASB) is a measure of the percentage of students who report any involvement with the eight antisocial behaviors listed in the charts (see Table 3) during the past year. In most ASBs throughout all four grade levels rural students had lower levels. This is as expected; yet exceptions exist and many of these differences were not significant. Out of 32 possible comparisons rural students had higher frequencies in 5 and same in 2 and lower in 25 ASBs. Twenty of the differences were significant ($p < .05$) and 12 were not significant.

Carrying a Handgun and Carrying a Handgun to School

Within all grade levels rural students had higher levels of carrying a handgun (in grade 12 the differences were not significant). Yet further inquiry indicated that the circumstances of rural and urban students carrying a gun are very different. For example, rural students carrying a handgun when hunting and fishing is probably much more common than their urban counterparts. Interestingly, the percentage of rural students that endorsed (answered yes) carrying a handgun declined after 8th grade. The exact opposite occurred among urban students. Looking at carrying a handgun to school reveals different findings. Urban students were more likely to carry a handgun to school when compared with their rural cohorts. The exception was 10th grade, where the percentage was equal. However, only the differences in

TABLE 3. EIGHT MEASURES OF ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR BY GRADE LEVEL.

Antisocial Behavior	Grade 6				χ^2	p-value	Significant?	Cramer's V
	Percent Rural							
	0.0-10.0%		90.1%–100.0%					
Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample					
Been suspended from school	16.8%	9017	13.8%	3985	19.0	.000	Yes	0.04
Been drunk or high at school	2.9%	8959	2.3%	3976	3.8	.052	No	0.02
Sold illegal drugs	0.8%	8905	0.6%	3958	1.6	.205	No	0.01
Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle	1.5%	8974	1.5%	3972	0.0	.848	No	0.00
Been arrested.	3.2%	8956	2.2%	3975	9.9	.002	Yes	0.03
Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them	13.9%	8963	12.2%	3981	7.6	.006	Yes	0.02
Carried a handgun	4.1%	9010	7.8%	3975	79.6	.000	Yes	0.08
Carried a handgun to school	0.6%	8918	0.4%	3958	3.1	.078	No	0.02

TABLE 3. EIGHT MEASURES OF ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR BY GRADE LEVEL (*CONTINUED*).

Antisocial Behavior	Grade 8				χ^2	p-value	Significant?	Cramer's V
	Percent Rural							
	0.0-10.0%		90.1%-100.0%					
Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample					
Been suspended from school	21.5%	8797	17.2%	3459	28.3	.000	Yes	0.05
Been drunk or high at school	8.5%	8755	5.9%	3445	22.9	.000	Yes	0.04
Sold illegal drugs	2.7%	8725	1.4%	3426	18.8	.000	Yes	0.04
Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle	2.3%	8765	1.9%	3444	2.2	.138	No	0.01
Been arrested.	7.2%	8748	3.6%	3449	56.7	.000	Yes	0.07
Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them	18.7%	8766	15.4%	3452	17.8	.000	Yes	0.04
Carried a handgun	5.6%	8790	8.1%	3450	26.6	.000	Yes	0.05
Carried a handgun to school	1.2%	8716	0.8%	3444	4.1	.043	Yes	0.02

TABLE 3. EIGHT MEASURES OF ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR BY GRADE LEVEL (*CONTINUED*).

Antisocial Behavior	Grade 10				χ^2	p-value	Significant?	Cramer's V
	Percent Rural							
	0.0-10.0%		90.1%–100.0%					
Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample					
Been suspended from school	15.0%	7391	13.2%	2847	5.0	.025	Yes	0.02
Been drunk or high at school	13.4%	7352	10.5%	2833	15.4	.000	Yes	0.04
Sold illegal drugs	5.0%	7327	3.7%	2820	7.7	.005	Yes	0.03
Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle	2.5%	7379	2.2%	2838	1.1	.287	No	0.01
Been arrested.	6.7%	7355	5.5%	2834	4.3	.037	Yes	0.02
Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them	14.6%	7366	13.2%	2838	3.3	.068	No	0.02
Carried a handgun	5.2%	7376	7.0%	2841	12.1	.000	Yes	0.03
Carried a handgun to school	1.2%	7330	1.2%	2825	0.1	.763	No	0.00

TABLE 3. EIGHT MEASURES OF ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR BY GRADE LEVEL (*CONTINUED*).

Antisocial Behavior	Grade 12				χ^2	p-value	Significant?	Cramer's V
	Percent Rural							
	0.0-10.0%		90.1%–100.0%					
Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample					
Been suspended from school	11.0%	5936	11.2%	2248	0.1	.815	No	0.00
Been drunk or high at school	15.3%	5904	11.5%	2238	19.0	.000	Yes	0.05
Sold illegal drugs	6.7%	5896	3.9%	2238	22.5	.000	Yes	0.05
Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle	2.1%	5915	1.3%	2242	5.0	.025	Yes	0.02
Been arrested.	6.0%	5906	4.1%	2240	12.1	.001	Yes	0.04
Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them	11.8%	5913	11.3%	2247	0.5	.493	No	0.01
Carried a handgun	6.1%	5929	6.4%	2248	0.1	.710	No	0.00
Carried a handgun to school	1.6%	5894	1.1%	2233	2.7	.101	No	0.02

CRIMINAL FUTURES ON THE RURALSIDE

29

grade 8 were significant. The carrying of a handgun by rural students although for protection from game during hunting and fishing is exactly the type of problems encounter by rural police and game wardens. This cultural habit combined with alcohol creates has created violent situations. Much like urban youth –the presence of a firearm can escalate any event into violence.

Attacked Someone with the Idea of Hurting Them

Rural students in all grades had lower levels attacking someone with the idea of hurting them. These differences were significant in all but grade 12. This has important implications for juvenile delinquency. One early predictor of future delinquency is physical aggression or aggressive acts toward another individual.

Been Arrested

Rural students in all grades had been arrested less than urban students. These differences were very significant across levels. This suggests urban students are much more likely to be arrested than their rural cohorts.

Stolen or Tried to Steal a Motor Vehicle

Rural students were involved in the theft of a motor vehicle at the same level in grade 6; at less but not significant levels in grades 8 and 10; and a lesser and significant level in grade 12.

Sold Illegal Drugs

Rural students sold illegal drugs at lower frequencies than urban students at every grade level. These differences were significant at all grades but grade 6.

Been Drunk or High at School

Rural students had been drunk or high at school at lower frequencies than urban students at every grade level. These differences were significant at all grades but grade 6. This is not surprising given, illegal drug activity (e.g., selling) occurred less frequently among rural students.

Been Suspended from School

Rural students had been suspended from school at lower frequencies than urban students at grades 6, 8, and 10. These differences were significant. At grade 12 rural students were suspended more; but the differences were not significant.

Suspensions are good indicators of future prior research indicates that approximately 80 percent of students are never suspended, while 15 percent are suspended are relatively low number. Those students who comprised the highest 5 percent deserve more attention if they are to exit their current paths (Forsyth et al. 2013, 2014, 2015). Additionally, rural schools are more likely to use corporal punishment for delinquent behaviors in lieu of suspension. Corporal punishment serves as the need to control rebellious behaviors that are frequently exhibited by juveniles (Wallace 2001).

DISCUSSION

Research on the delinquency of students is important because it reflects the criminal future for an area. Our findings indicated that rural students are closer to urban students in antisocial behaviors than the literature indicates. Researchers (Forsyth et al. 2011; Patterson 1986; Patterson, DeBaryche and Ramsey 1989; Ratcliff and Robins 1979) found that serious antisocial behavior in adults rarely takes place without high levels of childhood antisocial behavior. The best predictor of criminal behavior at any age is prior criminal behavior. Many researchers claim that 5 to 10 percent of delinquents commit the vast majority, 75 to 90 percent, of serious offenses by delinquents. These chronic or habitual delinquents typically begin committing serious offenses before 13 years of age (Forsyth et al. 2011; Kempf-Leonard, Tracy, and Howell 2001; Shoemaker 2009; Tracy, Wolfgang and Figlio 1990; Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin 1972). Generally, the earlier the age delinquency begins the more persistent and serious the later crimes (Wolfgang, Thornberry, and Figlio 1987). Further research will examine risk and protective factors within these same areas.

Examining the ecological systems along with social control theory will add to the robustness of potential findings related to antisocial behaviors and risk and protective factors. Attachment, community norms and school environment are related to perceptions of safety within the school setting (Hong and Eamon 2012). A closer examination of macro (culture) and microsystems and their interactions with individuals will add to the preliminary findings of this study. Social control theory and its dimensions are also congruent with the literature on risk and protective factors (Wallace 2001).

REFERENCES

- Akiba, M. 2008. "Predictors of Student Fear of School Violence. A Comparative Study of Eighth Graders in 33 Countries." *Effectiveness and School Improvement* 19(1): 51–72.
- Arnold, W.R. and T.M. Brungardt. 1983. *Juvenile Misconduct and Delinquency*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Bankston, William B. and Quentin A.L. Jenkins. 1982. "Rural Crime in The South: An Overview Of Research Traditions And Theoretical Issues." *The Rural Sociologist* 2:233–41.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. 1977. "Toward an Experimental Ecology of Human Development." *American Psychologist* 32(7):513–31.
- Burfeind, J.W. and D.J. Bartusch. 2006. *Juvenile Delinquency: An Integrated Approach*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Carter, Timonthy, J. 2004. "Force By And Against Game Wardens In Citizen Encounters." *Police Quarterly* 7:489–508.
- _____. 2006. "Police Use Of Discretion: A Participant Observation Study Of Game Wardens." *Deviant Behavior* 27(6):591–627.
- Dizard, Jan E. 2003. *Mortal Stakes: Hunters and Hunting In Contemporary America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Eliason, Stephen L. 2003. "Throwing the Book Versus Cutting Some Slack: Factors Influencing the Use of Discretion by Game Wardens in Kentucky." *Deviant Behavior* 24:129–52.
- _____. 2008. "Wildlife Crime: Conservation Officers' Perceptions of Elusive Poachers." *Deviant Behavior* 29(2):111–28.
- Eliason, Stephen L. and Richard Dodder. 1999. "Techniques of Neutralization Used by Deer Poachers In The Western United States: A Research Note." *Deviant Behavior* 20(3):233–52.
- Forsyth, Craig. 1993a. "Factors Influencing Game Wardens In Their Interactions With Poachers: The Use Of Discretion." *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology* 21(1):51–6.
- _____. 1993b. "Chasing And Catching Bad Guys: The Game Warden's Prey." *Deviant Behavior* 14(3):209–26.
- _____. 1994. "Bookers and Peace Makers: Types of Game Wardens." *Sociological Spectrum* 14(1):47–63.
- _____. 2008. "Night Work and Game Wardens: The Dangers of Duty In The Dark." *The International Journal of Crime, Criminal Justice and Law* 3(1):11–5.

- Forsyth, Craig J., Gary Asmus, York A. Forsyth, Billy R. Stokes, and Mike Mayne. 2011. "Child Delinquents: Examining the Market for Criminal Futures" *Deviant Behavior* 32 (5):441–50.
- Forsyth, Craig J., Gary Asmus, Holly Howat, Lai K. Pei, York A. Forsyth, and Billy Stokes. 2014. "Examining the Relationship Between School Suspensions/Expulsions and Felonies: A Research Note." *Criminal Justice Studies* 27 (2):149–58.
- Forsyth, Craig J., Raymond Biggar, York A. Forsyth, and Holly Howat. 2015. "The Punishment Gap: Racial/Ethnic Comparisons in School Infractions by Objective and Subjective Definitions." *Deviant Behavior* 36:276–87.
- Forsyth, Craig J. and York A. Forsyth. 2009. "Dire And Sequestered Meetings: The Work of Game Wardens." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 34 (3/4):213–23.
- _____. 2010. "Amateurs and Professionals: Analyzing Stories and Accounts of Game Wardens about Apprehending Poachers." *The International Journal of Sociological Research* 3(1/2):119–28.
- _____. 2012. "Examining the Responses of Game Wardens to Types of Poachers." *Kentucky Journal of Anthropology and Sociology* 2(1): 27–36.
- Forsyth, Craig J., Holly Howat, Lai K. Pei, York A. Forsyth, Gary Asmus, and Billy Stokes. 2013. "Examining the Infractions Causing Higher Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions: Racial and Ethnic Considerations." *Laws* 2:20–32.
- Forsyth, Craig J., Robert Gramling and George Wooddell. 1998. "The Game of Poaching: Folk Crimes In Southwest Louisiana." *Society and Natural Resources* 11(1):25–38.
- Forsyth, Craig J. and Thomas A. Marckese. 1993a. "Thrills And Skills: A Sociological Analysis of Poaching." *Deviant Behavior* 14:157–72.
- _____. 1993b. "Folk Outlaws: Vocabularies of Motives." *International Review of Modern Sociology* 23(1):17–31.
- Gibbons, Don C. 1972. "Crime in The Hinderland." *Criminology* 10:177–92.
- Hampshire, Kate, Sandra Bell, Gillian Wallace, and Faustas Stepukonis. 2004. "Real Poachers and Predators: Shades of Meaning In Local Understandings Of Threats To Fisheries." *Society and Natural Resources* 17(4):305–18.
- Hindelang, M.J., T. Hirschi and J. Weis. 1979. "Correlates of Delinquency: The Illusion of Discrepancy Between Self-report and Official Measures." *American Sociological Review* 44 (December):995–1014.
- Hirschi, T. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

CRIMINAL FUTURES ON THE RURALSIDE

33

- Hong, J. and M. Eamon. 2012. "Students' Perceptions of Unsafe Schools: An Ecological Systems Analysis." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 21(3):428–38.
- Jacoby, Karl. 2001. *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kempf-Leonard, Kimberly, Paul Tracy and James Howell. 2001. "Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders: The Relationship of Delinquency Career Types To Adult Criminality." *Justice Quarterly* 18:449–78.
- Lawson, Helene M. 2002. "Wildlife Managers: Boundary Workers between the Human Community and the Wilderness." *International Review of Modern Sociology* 30(1):46–64.
- _____. 2003. "Controlling The Wilderness: The Work of Wilderness Officers." *Society and Animals* 11(4):329–51.
- Lentz, William P. 1956. "Rural Urban Differentials and Juvenile Delinquency." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*. 331–9.
- McMullan, John L. and David C. Perrier. 2002. "Lobster Poaching and the Ironies Of Law Enforcement." *Law and Society Review* 36(4):679–718.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. 1996. *Urban Schools: the Challenge of Location and Poverty*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Osgood, D.W. and J.M. Chambers. 2002. "Social Disorganization Outside the Metropolis: An Analysis of Rural Youth Violence." *Criminology* 38: 81-115.
- Ousey, G.C., and P. Wilcox. 2007. "The Interaction of Antisocial Propensity and Life-Course Varying Predictors of Delinquent Behavior: Differences by Method of Estimation and Implications for Theory." *Criminology* 45(2):313–54.
- Palmer, C. Eddie and Clifton D. Bryant. 1985. "Keepers of the King's Deer." Pp. 111–37 in *The Rural Work Force* edited by Clifton D. Bryant, Donald J. Shoemaker, James K. Skipper and William E. Snizek. South Hadley, Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey.
- Patterson, G.R. 1986. "Performance Models for Antisocial Boys." *American Psychologist* 41:432–444.
- Patterson, G.R., B.D. DeBaryche, and E. Ramsey. 1989. "A Developmental Perspective on Antisocial Behavior." *American Psychologist* 44:329–35.
- Ratcliff, Katherine S. and Lee N. Robins. 1979. "Risk Factors in Continuation of Childhood Antisocial Behaviors into Adulthood." *International Journal of Mental Health* 7:96–116.
- Reisner, Marc. 1991. *Game Wars*. New York: Viking.

- Scherzer, T. and H. Pinderhughes. 2002. "Violence and gender: Reports from and urban high school." *Violence and Victim* 17(1):57-72.
- Schreck, C. and J. Miller. 2003. "Sources of Fear of Crime at School: What Is the Relative Contribution of Disorder, Individual Characteristics, and School Security?" *Journal of School Violence* 2(4):57-79.
- Sherblom, John C., Lisa Keranen and Lesley A. Withers. 2002. "Tradition, Tension, and Transformation: A Structural Analysis Of A Game Warden Service In Transition." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 30(2):143-62.
- Shoemaker, Donald J. 2009. *Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Sorokin, P., Carle Zimmerman and Charles Galpin. 1930. *A Systematic Sourcebook in Rural Sociology*. Minneapolis, MN: Schribers.
- Tobias, Michael. 1998. *Nature's Keepers: On The Front Lines of The Fight To Save Wildlife In America*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tracy, Paul, Marvin Wolfgang, and Robert Figlio. 1990. *Delinquency Careers in Two Birth Cohorts*. New York: Plenum.
- Wallace, L. 2001. "Reports from Rural Mississippi: A look at school violence." *Journal of Security Administration* 24(2):15-32.
- Walsh, William F., and Edwin J. Donovan. 1984. "Job Stress in Game Conservation Officers." *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 12:333-8.
- Welsh, W. 2000. "The effects of school climate on school disorder." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 567(1):88-107.
- Wolfgang, Marvin, Robert Figlio and Thorsten Sellin. 1972. *Delinquency in a Birth Cohort*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wolfgang, Marvin, Terence Thornberry, and Robert Figlio. 1987. *From Boy to Man, From Delinquency to Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press