

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

VOLUME LXIX

NUMBER 2

SEPTEMBER 1963

VALUES AND GANG DELINQUENCY: A STUDY OF STREET-CORNER GROUPS¹

ROBERT A. GORDON, JAMES F. SHORT, JR., DESMOND S. CARTWRIGHT,
AND FRED L. STRODTBECK

ABSTRACT

Deduced from three theoretical positions on gang delinquency, hypotheses concerning the values of gang, non-gang lower-class, and non-gang middle-class boys were tested with a semantic differential. Contrary to expectation, the data indicated no differences between gang, lower-class, and middle-class boys, both Negro and white, in their evaluation and legitimation of behaviors representing middle-class prescriptive norms. These middle-class behaviors were also rated higher than deviant behaviors governed by middle-class proscriptive norms. The samples differed most in their attitude toward the deviant behaviors, tending to form a gradient, with gang boys most tolerant, middle-class boys least tolerant.

Three recent theories of juvenile-gang delinquency view values as an important link in a causal chain leading from social status to illegitimate behavior.² The theories are seemingly in agreement as to what they mean by "values," and they differ only slightly in the content of the values which they ascribe to members of three relatively distinct social categories: lower-class gang, lower-class non-gang, and middle-class non-gang. There are, however, important differences between the theories in the assumptions underlying these values. As a result, competing, if not always mutually exclusive, hypotheses are implied. This paper attempts

to further refine thinking in this area by empirically testing some hypotheses that might reasonably be deduced from the three theories. Accordingly, relevant data gathered from both Negro and white adolescent members of each of the social categories are presented.

THE SAMPLE

Samples of Negro and white males were drawn from each of the following social categories, making a total of six populations under study.

² These theoretical statements are by Albert K. Cohen, *Delinquent Boys* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955); Walter B. Miller, "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," *Journal of Social Issues*, XIV, No. 3 (1958), 5-19; and Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, *Delinquency and Opportunity* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960). For further elaboration of the Cohen point of view see Albert K. Cohen and James F. Short, Jr., "Research in Delinquent Subcultures," *Journal of Social Issues*, XIV, No. 3 (1958), 20-37. Miller brings his viewpoint to bear on empirical data in Walter B. Miller, Hildred Geertz, and Henry S. G. Cutter, "Aggression in a Boys' Street-Corner Group," *Psychiatry*, XXIV, No. 4 (1961), 283-98.

¹ This paper reports research conducted under grants from the National Institute of Mental Health (Research Grant M-3301) and the Ford Foundation. The authors wish to express their gratitude to Kenneth I. Howard for assistance and counsel during all phases of the research, to Albert K. Cohen, Stanton Wheeler, Maria Gordon, and Patricia Leavey Hodge for helpful suggestions, to Alan E. Hendrickson for programming some of the computations for Univac I, and to Fred Hubbard and Charles N. Cooper of the YMCA for their splendid support.

Gang.—The gang boys studied are members of nine Negro and six white gangs assigned workers by the Program for Detached Workers of the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago. The samples contain 163 Negroes and 58 whites, and constitute from a third to a half of the total membership of these gangs. Police record data were obtained for all nine Negro gangs and four of the six white gangs.³ For the total memberships, the number of offenses known to the police per boy averaged 3.17 for Negroes and 2.91 for whites; for boys in the samples these figures are 3.29 and 3.39, respectively. Thus,

TABLE 1
MEAN AGES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SIX SAMPLES

Group	Mean Age	Standard Deviation
Negro:		
Gang	17.2	1.9
Lower class . . .	16.5	1.4
Middle class . . .	17.3	0.9
White:		
Gang	18.2	2.1
Lower class . . .	16.8	1.1
Middle class . . .	16.1	1.2

boys from whom data were collected do not appear to be less delinquent than the average member of their gangs. A comparison of the ages of boys in the samples with those not included reveals that the included Negroes are 0.57 years, and the included whites 0.16 years younger than members of their gangs not included. A check of rosters of gang members prepared in advance of collecting these data gave no sign that detached workers were able to produce only their more tractable gang boys for research. If newspaper headlines are any criterion, these gangs include all but one of the most notorious in Chicago during 1960–61.

Lower class.—Boys residing in the same neighborhoods as the gang boys but not

³ The police record search was conducted by John M. Wise, who furnished the data upon which these figures are based (see his "A Comparison of Sources of Data as Indexes of Delinquent Behavior" [unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1962]).

themselves members of gangs were contacted through Y's and settlement houses. Six Negro and two white groups or clubs constitute the samples, for a total of 69 Negroes and 37 whites. The search of police records revealed these boys to have had a moderate amount of official involvement in delinquency, indicating that these samples are not composed of boys who are unusually good. The mean number of offenses per boy known to the police was 0.33 for Negroes and 0.22 for whites.

Middle class.—Non-gang middle-class boys were reached through two YMCA's known to serve a middle-class clientele and located in areas of Chicago judged to be middle class according to conventional demographic criteria. A total of 24 Negro and 41 white boys—from two Negro and two white clubs—is included. Just one boy within each race was known to police for delinquent activity, for a combined total of three offenses, all minor; the corresponding means were 0.08 for Negroes and 0.03 for whites. No examples of a middle-class gang could be found locally.

The sample as a whole.—Mean ages and standard deviations for the six samples, in years, are shown in Table 1. The white gang sample includes the two oldest persons, one 24.4 and one 26 years old. Although most of the age differences between samples were statistically significant, an examination of the correlations between the main data and age indicated that none of the interpretations to be presented could be accounted for by differences in age.⁴ Although all the gang

⁴ Some selected 1960 Census statistics for the Chicago community areas and tracts from which these samples were drawn are presented in a table (Table A), which is one of three tables (indicated by alphabetic references in this paper) that, along with certain methodological notes, have been deposited with the American Documentation Institute. For a discussion of the examination of relations with age, see Note A. Order Document No. 7468 from ADI Auxiliary Publications Project, Photoduplication Service, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C. remitting in advance \$1.25 for 35-mm. microfilm or \$1.25 for 6 × 8-inch photocopies. Make checks payable to Chief, Photoduplication Service, Library of Congress.

boys are definitely lower class, for convenience this report will distinguish the gang from non-gang lower-class samples by the use of the terms "gang" and "lower class," respectively.

THE INSTRUMENT AND PROCEDURES

The data were gathered by means of a semantic differential, which consists of a number of seven-point, bipolar, adjectival scales against which any set of concepts or descriptive images may be rated.⁵ This instrument measures what Osgood terms "connotative meaning" which, for a variety of populations, has been found to have two main orthogonal dimensions when a large number of scales and concepts are administered and the scales then intercorrelated and factor-analyzed. To obtain adequate measures of these dimensions, only a small number of scales, found to have high correlations

⁵ See Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, *The Measurement of Meaning* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

with the appropriate dimensions, are required.

A score for a dimension is obtained by averaging the appropriate scale values, which ranged from 1 to 7. These dimensions and the corresponding scales used in this study are:

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Potency</i>
clean-dirty	hard-soft
good-bad	large-small
kind-cruel	strong-weak
fair-unfair	brave-cowardly
pleasant-unpleasant	rugged-delicate

Three additional scales, derived from Miller's "focal concerns" of lower-class culture, were also included. These were "smart-sucker," "lucky-unlucky," and "exciting life-boring life."⁶

The images (see Table 2) to be rated were chosen to represent salient examples of instrumental or dominant goal activity, leisure-time activity, and ethical orientation

⁶ Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

TABLE 2
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL IMAGES

Subculture	Label	Images: "Someone who . . ."
Middle class:		
Dominant goal activity	GRAD	works for good grades at school
Leisure activity	READ	likes to read good books
Ethical orientation	SAVE	saves his money
Lower class:		
Dominant goal activity	SJOB	has a steady job washing and greasing cars
Leisure activity	HANG	likes to spend his spare time hanging on the corner with his friends
Ethical orientation	SHAR	shares his money with his friends
Conflict:		
Dominant goal activity	TUFF	is a good fighter with a tough reputation
Leisure activity	HANG	(See lower class)
Ethical orientation	STIK	sticks by his friends in a fight
Criminal:		
Dominant goal activity	FENC	knows where to sell what he steals
Leisure activity	HANG	(See lower class)
Ethical orientation	CONN	has good connections to avoid trouble with the law
Retreatist:		
Dominant goal activity	PIMP	makes easy money by pimping and other illegal hustles
Leisure activity	DRUG	gets his kicks by using drugs
Ethical orientation	COOL	stays cool and keeps to himself
Additional images:		
	GIRL	makes out with every girl he wants
	SELF	Myself as I usually am
	LEGO	Myself as I would like to be
	GANG	is a member of (enter group name or if none, "your friendship group")

for each of five theoretically significant subcultures—middle class, lower class, conflict, criminal, and retreatist.⁷ Leisure activity appeared to be essentially the same for three of the subcultures, and is therefore represented for all three by a single image.

Although they do not figure prominently in this analysis, the three aspects of subcultural roles did provide a basis for sampling widely within each domain. Of four additional images included because of their theoretical interest, only the one identified by the label "GIRL" requires comment. This image was included to furnish responses relevant to sexual demonstrations of masculinity. Hopefully, images were phrased so as to be as concrete as possible and yet personify the values hypothesized to distinguish the subcultures.

Administration of the semantic differential to small numbers of subjects at a time took place in an old, rather shabby one-time apartment building, where the subjects were fed hot dogs and soft drinks. The tester was quite permissive toward all departures from normally decorous behavior that did not jeopardize the validity of measures. Considerable care was taken to explain directions and check the boys' responses. A few boys, unable to read, had the semantic differential read to them as they responded.

Seventeen factor analyses of the evaluation and potency scales, performed for seventeen of the gangs and clubs studied, revealed evaluation and potency factors for all six populations matching those previously found by Osgood.⁸ This rules out all but the most ingenious and most coincidentally patterned types of deliberately meaningless, falsified responding. It also justifies the scoring procedure.

⁷ The last three subcultures refer to types of delinquent gangs postulated by Cohen and Short, *op. cit.*, and by Cloward and Ohlin, *op. cit.*

⁸ See Robert A. Gordon, "The Generality of Semantic Differential Factors and Scales in Six American Subcultures" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1962).

STATISTICAL TREATMENT

The data consist of the mean scores for both evaluation (Table 3 below) and the "smart-sucker" scale (Table 5 below) accorded to each of the seventeen images by each of the six populations. Three-way (image by race by social category) analyses of variance (Tables B and C) have indicated high levels of over-all significance for these data.⁹ The sources of this significance are investigated further by comparing all six of the individual sample means for an image with each other, using two-tailed *t*-tests. Although this procedure carries a high risk of a Type I error¹⁰—because it inevitably compares the most extreme values in any set of six—it was felt that, because differences are theoretically more interesting here than similarities, this method is preferable to alternative tests having high risk of a Type II error. Important additional constraints upon interpretation are exerted, however, by (1) the fact that the three social categories are ordered with respect to presumed similarity (gang, lower class, middle class); (2) the presence of data for two races. Thus, any ordering of the data which is similar to that of the three categories, and which appears in both races, will strongly supplement the presence of statistical significance. This organization of the data has the advantage of possibly suggesting attitudinal trends in American society that may prove to be more useful in understanding delinquency than single comparisons holding constant race or class.

INFERENCES FROM THEORIES

Cohen.—As an explanation of juvenile-gang delinquency, the hypothesis of a reaction formation against the standards of

⁹ American Documentation Institute, *op. cit.* For a justification of the use of parametric statistics with semantic differential data, see either Note B, *ibid.*, or Robert A. Gordon, "Values and Gang Delinquency" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963).

¹⁰ See Thomas A. Ryan, "Multiple Comparisons in Psychological Research," *Psychological Bulletin*, LVI, No. 1 (1959), 26–47.

middle-class society has been proposed by Albert K. Cohen. According to Cohen, reaction formation serves as a defense against the anxiety of status frustration, common to lower-class youth and especially severe for those who join gangs. Although Cohen's theory holds that the wholesale repudiation of middle-class values "does its job of problem-solving most effectively when it is adopted as a group solution,"¹¹ and that "group interaction is a sort of catalyst which releases potentialities not otherwise visible,"¹² thus seeming at times to leave unsettled the question of whether private values are similarly affected, the logic of the mechanism of reaction formation requires that middle-class values be submerged in the consciousness of individuals as well as in the culture of the group. His point seems to be that the group experience, in which individuals come together with the common problem of status frustration, is necessary for the full unfolding and elaboration of a latent common solution, namely, total repudiation of middle-class standards. Once exposed to the mutual self-recognitions and reinforcements of collective acting out, negative attitudes that were only latent in the individual's value processes become manifest. It is reasonable to expect that the resulting modification in values, while undoubtedly subject to intensification during group interaction, remains as a relatively enduring feature of an individual's personality, even when he is apart from the group. This interpretation is consistent with Cohen's emphasis upon the over-reactive quality of much delinquent behavior. Thus, although Cohen's theory asserts that middle-class values are in fact internalized by gang boys, he clearly implies that they persist only as a repressed and unacknowledged source of anxiety.¹³

An instrument as baldly direct as the semantic differential would not be expected to bypass such a firmly established system

¹¹ Cohen, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-35.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 136.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

of neurotic defenses. Accordingly, the explicit and highly developed negativism described by Cohen should characterize the conscious private values of the gang boy and be reflected in his evaluation of middle-class images. As it was constructed, the instrument afforded subjects an opportunity to express bitterness and contempt toward rather tempting middle-class figures (see GRAD, READ, and SAVE in Table 2); they had only to avail themselves of the negativistic ends of the evaluative scales. Hence, if the hypothesis of reaction formation is correct, these evaluation scores for gang boys should be low.

In contrast, gang boys should evaluate images that are antithetical to middle-class morality higher than the middle-class images. This follows from Cohen's statement: "The hall-mark of the delinquent subculture is the explicit and wholesale repudiation of middle-class standards and the adoption of their very antithesis."¹⁴ Strictly speaking, only TUFF meets Cohen's specification that the negativism of the reaction formation is also non-utilitarian. Yet, it would seem that FENC, CONN, PIMP, and GIRL are sufficiently violative of middle-class expectations to serve also as vehicles for the expression of negativism so presumably global (DRUG is perhaps too special a case to merit consideration). Whereas Cohen asserts that utility does not constitute the chief motivation of delinquent-gang boys, there is nevertheless nothing in his theory to suggest that such negativism would be inhibited if it happened to lead to a utilitarian end. For these reasons, all of these images should be evaluated higher than the middle-class images, but special attention should be paid to TUFF. The gang boys should also evaluate these images higher than do middle-class boys.

Although not directly connected with the reaction-formation hypothesis, at least two of the lower-class images, SHAR and HANG, should, according to Cohen, be acceptable to the gang boys; the first, because it represents the lower-class ethic of reciprocity, and

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

the second, because it is an activity favored by both stable lower-class and delinquent boys. Whether gang boys would perceive the third lower-class image, SJOB, as but another form of subservience to middle-class standards rather than as an admissible lower-class occupation is not indicated in Cohen's theory.

Miller.—The proposition that the lower class possesses a relatively distinct and autonomous value system is suggested, although not stated explicitly, by Walter B. Miller.¹⁵ He does, however, clearly assert that the delinquent acts of lower-class gang members have as their "dominant component of motivation" the "directed attempt by the actor to adhere to forms of behavior, and to achieve standards of value as they are defined by that community,"¹⁶ the reference being to the lower-class community. He characterizes these standards as "focal concerns," and it is clear that, although they may be present to some degree in other strata, they receive radically different emphasis in the lower class than they might in the middle class. While it follows from this that lower-class and gang values emphasize elements not emphasized in middle-class values, Miller leaves unclear the weighting that lower-class and gang values would accord to elements that do receive great emphasis in the middle class (unless one is willing to conclude that Miller intends his description of lower-class values to be practically exhaustive, in which case elements emphasized in the middle class would be absent entirely from lower-class culture). Despite this ambiguity, it seems reasonable to infer the following expectations from Miller's statement: lower-class and gang boys should (1) not evaluate the middle-class images as high as do middle-class boys, (2) evaluate lower-class images higher than middle-class images, (3) evaluate the lower-class images higher than do the middle-class boys, (4) evaluate images that accord with lower-class focal concerns, such as the retreatist, conflict, and criminal images, higher than do middle-class boys.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Miller and others¹⁷ also postulate the existence of a sex-identity problem for lower-class males growing out of early socialization experiences in households in which adult male figures are not consistently present. According to this "female-based household" hypothesis, attempts by lower-class males to achieve masculine identity are characterized by an exaggerated emphasis on sexual and aggressive exploits. Three images offer possibilities for testing this hypothesis: TUFF, GIRL, and PIMP, the last because it emphasizes a relationship with women in which the woman is controlled, exploited, and degraded. It was hypothesized that the order of evaluation of these images would run Gang > Lower Class > Middle Class, and Negro > White within each of the three social levels. These orderings simply reflect the extent to which female-based households were assumed to occur in the family histories of members of each social category.

Because the focal concerns have themselves a dimensional character—consider, for example, *toughness*, *smartness*, and *excitement*—along which behaviors may be implicitly ordered, it might be questioned whether the evaluative responses of lower-class respondents should reflect the same ordering. Miller, however, makes it quite clear that he expects evaluation and desirability to be linear functions of the focal concerns, rather than orthogonal to them, giving as one reason for preferring to speak of "focal concerns" rather than "values" his feeling that the former is neutral with respect to the implied direction of positive evaluation.¹⁸ This indicates that the two run generally parallel to each other in his thinking.

Cloward and Ohlin.—Two fundamental orientations of lower-class youth have been distinguished by Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin.¹⁹ One is based upon attitude

¹⁷ E.g., Roger V. Burton and John W. M. Whiting, "The Absent Father and Cross-sex Identity," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, VII, No. 2 (1961), 85-95.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 90-97.

toward membership in the middle class, the other upon attitude toward improvement in one's economic position; a person may desire either, both, or none of these two objectives. The possible combinations of indifference or aspiration toward these objectives yield a typology—inspired by Merton's typology²⁰ of individual adaptation—of four kinds of lower-class youth. Cloward and Ohlin hold that it is from Type III of their typology, those indifferent toward membership in the middle class but eager for improvement in their economic position, that the "principal constituents of delinquent subcultures" are drawn.²¹ When legitimate avenues of opportunity are blocked for such boys, delinquent subcultures of different types emerge according to the pattern of illegitimate opportunities locally available.

It will be noted, however, that the middle-class images used in the semantic differential appear to stand for striving, self-improvement, and sacrifice far more than for the "big cars," "flashy clothes," and "swell dames," that Cloward and Ohlin suggest epitomize the goals of Type III youth.²² Therefore, insofar as the middle-class images represent the style of life characteristic of actual membership rather than simply middle-class economic position, it may be inferred that delinquents would be relatively cool toward them. Accordingly, they should evaluate GRAD, READ, and SAVE lower than does the middle-class sample. But if they do evaluate the middle-class images high it can be argued on a fortiori grounds that they would also evaluate images standing for middle-class consumption patterns high. Indeed, despite the typology, it would be surprising if anyone did not. Thus, if gang boys evaluate the images GRAD, READ, and SAVE high it would constitute a conservative test in favor of Cloward and Ohlin's hypothesis concerning their attitudes toward economic position. But simultaneously this would bring into question either the sepa-

rate existence of the two orientations on which the typology is founded or the supposition that gang delinquents emerge mainly from Type III. (It may be that if presented with them, gang members would evaluate images representing middle-class consumption patterns extremely high, higher even than GRAD, READ, and SAVE, and higher also than would middle-class boys. If so, there would then be reason to continue to regard the two orientations as relatively independent and distinct.) In either case it would then seem that the emphasis which Cloward and Ohlin give to exclusively economic motivation may require qualification.

Hypotheses concerning the deviant subcultural images are complicated by the fact that, according to Cloward and Ohlin, members of gangs would be expected to indorse highly the images standing for the subcultural adaptation into which their own gang best fits. There is thus no reason to believe that a gang boy would evaluate all deviant subcultural adaptations high. Since this paper makes no attempt to distinguish gangs according to this subcultural typology, any hypothesis dealing with the evaluation of illegitimate images by gang boys must be regarded as tentative.²³ In general, it might be hypothesized that gang boys would evaluate illegitimate images higher than non-gang boys.

TYPES OF COMPARISON AND SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES

Types of comparisons.—Implicit in the inferences from theory are two types of comparisons concerning the image means in Tables 3 and 5, below. One compares the six populations for a single image to detect *differentials between populations for the same image*; this comparison focuses on one *row* of a table. The other type of comparison examines different images for the same population to detect *differences in relative level of the images*; it focuses on one *column*. All of the comparisons for rows have been made,

²³ Efforts to delineate value and behavior patterns of the gangs are under way, and will be reported separately.

²⁰ Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie," *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957).

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

²² *Ibid.*

and the results are presented in Tables 4 and 6, below. Each image affords fifteen possible comparisons between the six populations, for a total of 255 comparisons for all seventeen images in each table. Of the 255 for evaluation, for example, 103 (over 40 per cent) were statistically significant, many at a very high level. The greater attention will be paid to these row comparisons. However, some reference will be made to column comparisons, which, when especially relevant, have been calculated.²⁴ As an aid to interpretation, the range of potential significance for column comparisons has been given in Tables 3 and 5 (below), with figures below each column showing the magnitude of the smallest difference possibly significant at the .05 level, as well as the smallest difference definitely significant at the .05 and .01 levels. All differences less than the former are not significant; all equal to or greater than the latter are. These boundaries tend to be extreme. On the average, a difference intermediate between these limits would probably mark the threshold of significance.

Summary of hypotheses.—On the basis of quite different assumptions, each of the theories leads to the expectation that gang boys will evaluate deviant or illegitimate images higher than do middle-class boys (Cohen's theory because of reaction formation, Miller's because these images correspond to the focal concerns of lower-class culture, and Cloward and Ohlin's because the images represent adaptations to the relative unavailability of legitimate opportunities for members of the lower class), but only Cohen's theory carries the stronger implication that gang boys will value deviant images even higher than the middle-class images. All three theories imply that middle-class values, as represented in the middle-class images, are not indorsed as highly by gang boys as by middle-class boys. A careful reading of these theories has led to the following explicit hypotheses:

1. Gang boys evaluate the middle-class images lower than illegitimate images such as PIMP, FENC, CONN, GIRL, and TUFF (Cohen). A column comparison.
2. Gang boys evaluate the middle-class images lower than do lower-class and middle-class boys (Cohen). A row comparison.
3. Gang and lower-class boys evaluate the middle-class images lower than do middle-class boys (Miller). A row comparison.
4. Gang boys evaluate the middle-class images lower than do middle-class boys (Cloward and Ohlin). A row comparison.
5. Gang boys evaluate SHAR and HANG higher than the middle-class images (Cohen). A column comparison.
6. Gang and lower-class boys evaluate lower-class images higher than middle-class images (Miller). A column comparison.
7. Gang and lower-class boys evaluate the lower-class images higher than do the middle-class boys (Miller). A row comparison.
8. PIMP, GIRL, and TUFF are evaluated higher (a) by Negroes than whites, (b) by gang boys than lower-class and middle-class boys, and (c) by lower-class boys than middle-class boys (Miller and others). All row comparisons.
9. Gang boys evaluate illegitimate images higher than do non-gang boys (Cohen; Cloward and Ohlin). A row comparison.
10. Gang and lower-class boys evaluate illegitimate images higher than do middle-class boys (Miller). A row comparison.

DATA AND INTERPRETATION

The images are discussed in the order in which they figure in the hypotheses. This leads first to a discussion of the middle-class images (where the distinction between the moral validity and the legitimacy of norms is invoked in an effort to account for the findings). The remaining images are discussed in clusters bearing upon particular hypotheses and interpretations suggested by regularities in the data.

Middle-class images.—Of forty-five differences between the six populations in evaluation of the middle-class images, only two were significant (see Tables 3 and 4). Both Negro lower-class and white lower-class boys evaluated GRAD higher than did white gang

²⁴ Such tests, which apply to several observations on the same sample, take into account the correlation between observations.

boys, in both instances at the .05 level. This is almost precisely the number of significant findings out of forty-five totally independent tests (which these are not) to be expected at this level on the basis of chance alone. In view of the high risk of a Type I error in this statistical treatment, it is fair to describe the picture presented by these data as one of overwhelming homogeneity. *All six populations evaluated images representing salient features of a middle-class style of life equally highly.*

Furthermore, no image representing the other four subcultures was evaluated significantly higher than the middle-class images by any one of the six populations. Of the sixty means for non-middle-class subcultural images, five were slightly higher than some

of the means for middle-class images. In every such instance the image involved was SHAR, standing for lower-class reciprocity, an image that could not be characterized as illegitimate.

In fact, the middle-class images were evaluated significantly higher by every one of the populations than nearly all other subcultural images, especially those that are unquestionably illegitimate.²⁵ None of the theories would have led one to expect these findings.

An explanation for the disparity between the theories and these particular data might be found in the distinction between moral validity and legitimacy. Cloward and Ohlin,

²⁵ As checked by means of the definitely significant difference (see Table 3).

TABLE 3
EVALUATION MEANS

IMAGES	NEGRO			WHITE		
	Gang	Lower Class	Middle Class	Gang	Lower Class	Middle Class
Middle class:						
GRAD.....	5.58	5.72	5.68	5.35	5.79	5.61
READ.....	5.33	5.48	5.30	5.30	5.34	5.54
SAVE.....	5.30	5.33	5.18	5.12	5.17	5.15
Lower class:						
SJOB.....	4.25	4.26	3.93	4.26	3.71	3.60
HANG.....	4.05	4.29	3.52	4.23	4.02	2.98
SHAR.....	5.38	5.51	5.52	5.03	5.28	5.39
Conflict:						
TUFF.....	3.38	3.33	2.42	3.59	3.52	2.56
STIK.....	4.65	4.75	4.58	4.61	4.92	4.41
Criminal:						
FENC.....	3.03	2.53	2.38	2.88	2.18	2.31
CONN.....	4.22	3.62	3.28	3.98	2.99	2.40
Retreatist:						
PIMP.....	3.49	3.04	2.67	2.59	2.02	1.76
DRUG.....	2.65	2.70	2.09	2.46	2.04	2.39
COOL.....	4.85	4.72	4.55	5.03	4.78	4.57
Additional:						
GIRL.....	5.32	5.09	4.96	4.32	4.24	3.52
IEGO.....	5.84	6.23	6.35	5.75	6.28	6.40
GANG.....	4.63	5.24	5.92	4.56	5.00	5.81
SELF.....	5.26	5.64	5.92	4.88	5.24	5.50
LSD: ^a						
$p = .05$	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.21	0.20	0.17
DSD:						
$p = .05$	0.38	0.55	0.99	0.58	0.86	0.60
$p = .01$	0.50	0.73	1.34	0.77	1.15	0.80

^a For each column lowest significant differences (LSD) are such that any lower are not significant; definitely significant differences (DSD) are such that any equal or higher are significant at the given level.

TABLE 4
 IMAGES EVALUATED SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER BY ROW SAMPLE
 THAN BY COLUMN SAMPLE
 (.05 LEVEL OR BETTER)^a

	NEGRO			WHITE		
	Gang	Lower Class	Middle Class	Gang	Lower Class	Middle Class
Negro: Gang.....		<i>FENC*</i> <i>CONN*</i> PIMP	SJOB HANG* TUFF*** FENC* <i>CONN*</i> <i>PIMP**</i> DRUG	SHAR PIMP*** GIRL*** SELF	SJOB* FENC*** CONN*** PIMP*** DRUG* GIRL**	SJOB*** HANG*** TUFF*** FENC*** CONN*** PIMP*** GIRL***
Lower class.....	<i>IEGO*</i> <i>GANG**</i> <i>SELF*</i>		HANG** TUFF** DRUG	<i>GRAD</i> SHAR* <i>PIMP*</i> <i>GIRL**</i> <i>IEGO*</i> <i>GANG*</i> <i>SELF***</i>	<i>SJOB*</i> CONN PIMP** DRUG* GIRL* <i>SELF</i>	SJOB** HANG*** TUFF** CONN*** PIMP*** GIRL***
Middle class.....	<i>IEGO*</i> <i>GANG***</i> <i>SELF**</i>	<i>GANG**</i>		<i>SHAR</i> <i>GIRL</i> <i>IEGO*</i> <i>GANG***</i> <i>SELF***</i>	PIMP GIRL GANG*** SELF*	<i>HANG</i> CONN* PIMP** GIRL*** <i>SELF</i>
White: Gang.....			<i>SJOB</i> HANG* TUFF*** FENC <i>CONN</i>		<i>SJOB*</i> FENC* CONN*** PIMP	SJOB** HANG*** TUFF*** FENC* CONN*** PIMP*** COOL GIRL**
Lower class.....	<i>IEGO*</i>		<i>TUFF**</i>	<i>GRAD</i> <i>IEGO</i>		HANG*** <i>TUFF**</i> <i>STIK</i> <i>CONN</i> <i>GIRL</i>
Middle class.....	<i>IEGO***</i> <i>GANG***</i>	<i>GANG**</i>		<i>IEGO*</i> <i>GANG***</i> <i>SELF**</i>	<i>GANG**</i>	

^a Italicized images are significant for evaluation, but not for smartness. Compare with Table 6.

* $p < .01$.

** $p < .001$.

*** $p < .0001$.

for example, speak of "the legitimacy of social rules," which may be questioned by members of a socially disadvantaged population quite apart from their "moral validity." They assert that gang members no longer accord legitimacy to middle-class norms because of social barriers obstructing their access to the opportunities implied by the norms.²⁶ Cohen too recognizes the importance of legitimacy when he states:

For the child who temporizes with middle-class morality, overt aggression and even the conscious recognition of his own hostile impulses are inhibited, for he acknowledges the *legitimacy* of the rules in terms of which he is stigmatized. For the child who breaks clean with middle-class morality, on the other hand, there are no moral inhibitions on the free expression of aggression against the sources of his frustration.²⁷

Even Miller may be responding to the legitimacy aspect of attitudes toward norms when he asserts that lower-class culture is relatively autonomous. If it were true that the evaluation dimension reflects moral validity rather than legitimacy, these data would not constitute a proper test of the theories.

It seems reasonable to infer that anyone who complies with norms that lack legitimacy from the viewpoint of someone else faces the prospect of being branded a "sucker," that is, someone who is taken in and fooled by superficial appearances. This line of reasoning, coupled with Miller's assurances that "smartness," in exactly this sense, is a criterion of behavior to which lower-class and gang members are sensitive, led to the "smart-sucker" scale as a measure of legitimacy.

It might be argued that the "smart-sucker" scale is subject to being construed as an "intelligent-unintelligent" scale, and that since the three middle-class images suggest rather cerebral types of performance, all the boys will rate these images high on smartness. On the other hand, the scale was always read aloud to the boys as part

of an example of how to fill out the instrument: "Is he smart? Or is he a sucker?" Calling attention in this way to the presence of "sucker" at one end of the scale should be effective in defining its dimensionality, especially, according to Miller, for lower-class and gang boys. Since these are the boys who presumably are motivated to withhold legitimacy from such images, the combination of this motivation with their sensitivity should be reflected in differential responses, even (or perhaps especially) if the middle-class boys, lacking both the sensitivity and motivation, construe the scale as an intelligence measure.²⁸ Actually, there is no reason to suppose that middle-class boys would not understand quite well a continuum delineated by "smart" and "sucker."

But the hypotheses placed in question by the evaluative findings enjoy only a brief respite. The smartness scores for all three middle-class images for all populations are also virtually identical. Of forty-five comparisons, only one is significant; Negro middle-class boys rated SAVE smarter than white lower-class boys, at the .05 level (see Tables 5 and 6). The smartness ratings of middle-class images by all populations are higher than those for any other subcultural image. Some readers may note that both gang samples rated READ noticeably lower on smartness than members of the other populations (the differences are not significant), and also that the three strata of both races were ordered for GRAD so that gang boys are lowest and middle-class boys highest. However, this ordering is offset by the fact that both gang samples rated the third image, SAVE, higher than the white middle-class boys. While slightly suggestive, this evidence falls short of the dramatic differences that the Cloward-Ohlin theory would seem to require, especially in view of the absolutely high ratings of these images as compared to the deviant images for all six populations. On the basis of significance tests, one must conclude that there is evi-

²⁸ For a more thorough discussion of this point see American Documentation Institute, *op. cit.*, Note C.

²⁶ Cloward and Ohlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-20, 136-37.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 132.

dence of neither differential nor low legitimation of the behaviors represented by the middle-class images by any population.

A sharp difference is to be noted between the smartness ratings, for all populations, of SHAR and SAVE; this difference was *not* reflected in the evaluation scores. All populations feel that it is much smarter to save

as a measure of legitimacy in the sense intended by Cloward and Ohlin appears to be justified. Intuitively, it would seem that if the smartness score registers the difference in utility of the behaviors represented by SAVE and SHAR, it should also reflect any tendency by gang boys to view the middle-class behaviors as deficient in utility.

TABLE 5
SMARTNESS MEANS

IMAGES	NEGRO			WHITE		
	Gang	Lower Class	Middle Class	Gang	Lower Class	Middle Class
Middle class:						
GRAD.....	6.35	6.61	6.58	6.43	6.54	6.66
READ.....	6.03	6.22	6.21	6.07	6.27	6.22
SAVE.....	6.37	6.49	6.67	6.55	6.03	6.29
Lower class:						
SJOB.....	4.99	4.70	4.17	4.69	4.30	4.10
HANG.....	4.34	3.99	3.17	4.40	4.14	2.61
SHAR.....	4.59	4.72	3.12	3.97	3.54	4.12
Conflict:						
TUFF.....	4.15	4.03	3.21	4.79	3.86	3.27
STIK.....	5.20	5.51	4.96	5.64	5.46	4.98
Criminal:						
FENC.....	4.99	4.38	3.75	4.98	3.24	3.15
CONN.....	5.75	5.33	4.96	5.71	3.70	3.80
Retreatist:						
PIMP.....	4.39	3.57	3.62	3.69	2.08	1.61
DRUG.....	2.37	2.04	1.17	1.93	1.19	1.15
COOL.....	5.63	5.26	4.12	5.90	4.54	3.76
Additional:						
GIRL.....	6.08	5.59	5.75	5.24	4.46	3.83
IEGO.....	6.21	6.45	6.33	6.64	6.43	6.76
GANG.....	5.58	5.71	6.00	5.40	5.43	6.05
SELF.....	5.79	5.49	5.75	5.14	5.14	5.63
LSD: ^a						
$p = .05$	0.20	0.14	0.11	0.24	0.22	0.13
DSD:						
$p = .05$	0.54	0.84	1.69	0.93	1.27	1.08
$p = .01$	0.72	1.12	2.29	1.23	1.71	1.44

^a For each column lowest significant differences (LSD) are such that any lower are not significant; definitely significant differences (DSD) are such that any equal or higher are significant at the given level.

than to share, while five out of the six evaluated SHAR higher than SAVE. (All six smartness differences between SHAR and SAVE are significant at the .0001 level.) Smartness is thus a more sensitive indicator than evaluation of behavior that a person would actually indorse after a realistic appraisal of its material consequences and the justice of its attendant social expectations. Hence its use

Hypotheses 1 through 4 are not supported by these data. And even when "legitimate" is substituted for "evaluate" in these hypotheses, they are still not supported by data based on "smartness" as a measure of legitimacy.

Lower-class images.—Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7 all deal with lower-class images. Contrary to hypothesis 5, neither white nor

Negro gang boys evaluated SHAR and HANG higher than middle-class images. Contrary to hypothesis 6, neither gang nor lower-class boys evaluated any of the lower-class images significantly higher than any of the middle-class images.

Before interpreting these results, the relevant row comparisons for hypothesis 7, involving SHAR, SJOB, and HANG, must be considered. The evaluation means for SHAR show no interpretable pattern (although all Negro samples evaluated sharing significantly higher than white gang boys). However, both gang samples evaluated SJOB and HANG significantly higher than both middle-class samples; both lower-class samples evaluated HANG significantly higher than their racially matched middle-class sample; and the Negro lower class evaluated both SJOB and HANG significantly higher than the white middle class.

Joined with the patterns of these data, these significant findings strongly support hypothesis 7, derived from Miller. In effect, this supports Miller's general contention that the values of the lower class are distinguishable from those of the middle class. The failure of hypotheses 5 and 6 suggests that these differences are based more heavily on attitudes toward lower-class norms than on those toward middle-class norms.

These findings suggest that the idea of sharing money with friends taps a set of normative expectations that is more nearly universal than those associated with work and leisure, so that SHAR differentiates the samples only when the smartness scores, raising considerations of legitimacy or practicality, are inspected. As a matter of general interest, attention is called to the fact that gang boys of both races—together with Negro lower-class boys—evaluated and legitimated higher than anyone else the idea of having a humble job in a gasoline station.

The nature of the remaining images.—The remaining subcultural images (plus GIRL) were chosen to represent behaviors that the theories hypothesize as deviant alternatives to a respectable style of life, either middle class or lower class. Not all of these behav-

iors are technically illegal or necessarily indicative of antisocial intent. The behavior described by COOL and STRK is intrinsically innocuous, and in the latter case even commendable. TUFF and GIRL, if perhaps more clearly at variance with middle-class codes, nevertheless entail no necessary legal violation. And DRUG suggests behavior that, although illegal, is often more self-injurious than harmful to others. As a result, although the images were employed principally to aid in the identification of delinquent subcultures among gangs, they also represent points in what might be regarded—from a middle-class standpoint—as the middle and lower ranges of an evaluative continuum. It is in this range of such a continuum that the most striking differences between samples appear.

Some consistent racial differences and masculinity.—Inspection of the main diagonal of the upper right quadrant (which compares the races holding social level relatively constant) of Table 4 discloses three images that Negro boys evaluated significantly higher than white boys within each one of the three social levels. These images are PIMP, GIRL, and SELF. The consistent reappearance of this constellation is slightly suggestive of a narcissistic syndrome among Negro adolescent males. That two of these images figure in the sex-identity hypothesis supplements rather than precludes this possible interpretation. However, the higher evaluation of SELF by Negroes (GANG follows the same pattern) could also be a defense against low racial self-esteem, such as was recently suggested by James W. Vander Zanden.²⁹ Sexual self-indulgence, narcissism, and defensive self-esteem all tend to shade into one another, and to disentangle these concepts would require more discriminating measures. Although tentative, such interpretations are of interest, however, in view of E. Franklin Frazier's description of Negro middle-class males as tending to "cultivate their 'person-

²⁹ See his "The Non-Violent Resistance Movement against Segregation," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXVIII, No. 5 (1963), 544-50, and the literature cited there.

alities,' " a phrase suggestive of narcissistic concern, and evidence that Negroes spend more for food, clothing, and automobiles than whites at the same income level.³⁰ Negro consumer habits are apt to be attributed to their lack of other economic outlets and status-seeking, but it may be that such behavior reflects a deeper and more pervasive kind of self-indulgence (perhaps also compensatory) that manifests itself also in non-economic behavior.

Frazier's observations are especially reassuring concerning findings, for example, for PIMP and GIRL, that show the Negro middle class to be deviant in some respects from the white middle class and perhaps even from white gang boys. Although hypothesis 8 predicted such results between the two middle-class samples, the magnitude of the differences at first aroused strong misgivings as to the representativeness of the Negro middle-class sample.

Nevertheless, the data are consistent with other information indicating that these Negro middle-class boys were definitely active sexually. Their sexual success is easy to account for in view of their strong competitive position, based on polish, money, and cars, and the sexual permissiveness of Negro lower-class girls. Probably, it is difficult for Negro middle-class girls to compete under these conditions without becoming themselves sexually accessible.

An impression of the sexual activity of these boys can be gained from an incident which occurred after one of the testing sessions. One boy raised his hand politely to inquire whether they could now ask the tester some questions. Anticipating curiosity about the tests, the tester invited any questions the boys might wish to pose. The first question, put with sincere concern, was, "If you do it (sexual intercourse) too much, is it true that you give out young?" The question drew little laughter.

Final doubts concerning the possible representativeness of this sample were then

³⁰ See *Black Bourgeoisie* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), p. 220. On the Negro consumer see, e.g., "The Negro Market," *Time*, February 9, 1962, pp. 80-81.

erased by Frazier, whose description of the Negro middle class emphasizes mediocre aspirations (the boys spoke of being physical education teachers, not doctors or lawyers), overcommitment to material satisfactions (they dressed extremely well, and arrived driving their own family cars), sexual promiscuity (already indicated), and involvement in recreation (one admitted, "all we do is party").³¹ Everything pictured by Frazier seems to fit, even down to the fact that the two clubs to which these boys belonged were the only groups to refer to themselves by Greek-letter names and to order "pledges" around in a semi-autocratic manner.

In interpreting the racial differences, however, it must be kept in mind that the Negroes in each social category really are socioeconomically lower than the whites in the corresponding category (see Table A).

Turning to the sex-identity hypothesis proper, all the various predictions from that compound hypothesis hold for the evaluative patterns of PIMP and GIRL; most of them are statistically significant as well. Furthermore, the mean scores for these two images display similar gradients, running from left to right across all six populations in Table 3. In each case Negro gang boys are highest, each succeeding sample being lower until white middle-class boys appear as the lowest. Both race and social level thus produce differences in the evaluation of PIMP and GIRL that accord with the sex-identity hypothesis; quite unexpected, however, is the finding that at every social level the Negro boys evaluated these two images higher than *any* sample of white boys.

With slight exceptions, the pattern for smartness of these two images is much the same. One noteworthy change is that non-gang Negro boys drop slightly below white gang boys in the legitimation of PIMP; since this places all non-gang boys now lower than all gang boys it suggests that the non-gang Negroes have reservations about pimping and illegal "hustling" that are not reflected in their evaluation of PIMP.

The third image included in the mascu-

³¹ *Op. cit.*

linity hypothesis was TUFF. This image was evaluated significantly higher by gang and lower-class boys of both races than by either of the middle-class samples. Within each stratum, the whites were higher, although not significantly so. This is contrary to the expectation stated in hypothesis 8 that the Negroes would evaluate TUFF higher at each social level, as they did PIMP and GIRL. However, since both gang samples also evaluated TUFF higher than did their racially matched lower-class samples—although not significantly—the strata are ordered in accordance with the hypothesis. The smartness ratings produced a similar ordering of strata, but no sign of consistently higher ratings by Negroes. In fact, white gang boys legitimated TUFF significantly higher than Negro gang boys; this is the only instance in which a deviant image received a significantly higher rating from white gang boys than from Negro gang boys.

While it is felt that the preponderance of this evidence is consistent with the hypothesis dealing with problems of sex identity (though by no means proving it), the failure of TUFF to parallel the differences for race exhibited by PIMP and GIRL is puzzling. Whether sex identity or simply subcultural norms are responsible, these results suggest a degree of independence between attitudes toward the sexual and the aggressive expression of masculinity.³² (It is interesting to note that between PIMP and TUFF, Negro gang boys favor PIMP, whereas white gang boys significantly favor TUFF at the .0001

³² A plausible case for race differences in sexual permissiveness may be derived from the comparison of sex norms as described for Negro gang boys and the Negro middle class, on the one hand, and the white lower class, on the other. For Negro gang boys see James F. Short, Jr., Fred L. Strodbeck, and Desmond S. Cartwright, "A Strategy for Utilizing Research Dilemmas: A Case from the Study of Parenthood in a Street Corner Gang," *Sociological Inquiry*, XXXII, No. 2 (1962). For the Negro middle class see Frazier, *op. cit.* For somewhat dated accounts of the white lower class as contrasted with the white middle class see William Foote Whyte, "A Slum Sex Code," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLIX, No. 1 (1943), 24-31, and Arnold W. Green, "The 'Cult of Personality' and Sexual Relations," *Psychiatry*, IV (1941), 343-48.

level for evaluation and the .01 level for smartness.) Vander Zanden has also called attention to the historical necessity for Negroes to suppress aggression; possibly this accounts for the fact that for TUFF five out of six comparisons of evaluation and smartness means, within stratum, show Negroes lower than whites, despite the tendency for Negroes to be generally more tolerant than whites toward the other deviant images.³³

The narcotics image.—Of all images, DRUG received the lowest evaluation from both gang samples, and the lowest legitimation from everyone. (Both lower-strata Negro samples evaluated DRUG significantly higher than Negro middle-class and white lower-class boys, and both gang samples and the Negro lower class legitimated it significantly higher than all three remaining populations.)

In view of the consistently low tolerance shown toward most other deviant images by the white middle class, their evaluation of DRUG seems rather high compared to the Negro middle class and the white lower class. However, these three samples are virtually identical in rejecting DRUG's legitimacy; here, the white middle class accords it the lowest smartness score in the entire table. Personal knowledge gained in working with the white middle-class boys suggests that their relatively higher evaluation score may be a reflection of sophisticated compassion. If so, this provides another indication of meaningful independence between the two scores.

Criminal images, utility, and legitimacy.—The two images representing the criminal subculture were FENC and CONN. With minor imperfections, both of these images manifest a gradient that appears repeatedly among the deviant images for both evaluation and smartness: Gang > Lower Class > Middle Class. (Perfect examples of this gradient may be noted for PIMP, GIRL, and COOL.) Negro gang boys evaluated FENC and CONN significantly higher than all four non-gang samples; white gang boys evaluated them higher than all non-gang boys except those in the Negro lower class. Both

³³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 545-46.

gang samples, and the Negro lower class, legitimated FENC and CONN significantly higher than the non-gang whites. The Negro middle class evaluated and legitimated CONN significantly higher than the white middle class.

The two criminal images are among those that differentiate gang boys from lower-class boys: PIMP, FENC, and CONN for both races and, in addition, SJOB for whites. The gang and lower-class Negroes both evaluated SJOB at virtually the same high level. These four images have in common a utilitarian emphasis, indicating that the role of material gain in the values of gang boys is by no means negligible. That gang members do not repudiate the possibility of legitimate gain is indicated by the presence of SJOB. The prominence of the illegitimately gainful images suggests, however, that a choice between legal and illegal means is determined to a lesser degree in favor of legal means for gang boys than for lower-class boys.

It can be shown, too, that the consideration of legitimacy or practicality appears even more conducive than that of evaluation to a choice of illegal means, especially for gang boys. For example, all six samples evaluated SJOB significantly higher than FENC (each at the .0001 level). However, only the non-gang whites legitimated SJOB significantly higher than FENC (white lower class, .01; white middle class, .02), while Negro gang boys now tied the two images, and white gang boys legitimated FENC higher than SJOB.

A similarly revealing comparison concerns SJOB and CONN. SJOB was evaluated significantly higher than CONN by all four non-gang samples (Negro and white lower class, .01; Negro middle class, .05; white middle class, .001), and the gang samples showed the same tendency. However, except for the non-gang whites, all samples legitimated SJOB and CONN in reverse order, with both gang samples now rating CONN significantly higher than SJOB (Negro gang, .0001; white gang, .001; and Negro lower class, .10).

Not only the respectable image, SJOB,

declines relative to criminal images when the basis of comparison is shifted to smartness. The conflict image, TUFF, follows the same pattern, thus indicating that it is not respectability per se that is the determinant, but rather differential practicality or utility. All samples evaluated TUFF higher than FENC; for the four lower strata these differences are significant (Negro and white lower class and white gang, .0001; Negro gang, .01). This order of the images is reversed for smartness by all but the non-gang whites, with the Negro gang sample now attaining significance (.001) in the new direction.

These last findings corroborate the importance that Miller attaches to smartness and Cloward and Ohlin to legitimacy. In some respects, however, they are not fully congruent with the expectations generated by these theorists. The tendency for smartness to rearrange the orderings of images for the Negro middle class, but not for the white lower class—in the examples given above—is not consistent with Miller's locating the salience of this dimension chiefly in the lower class. And the finding that gang boys grant greater legitimacy to deviant images, while not withdrawing legitimacy from middle-class images, does not accord with Cloward and Ohlin's emphasis on middle-class norms as sensitive to considerations of legitimacy. Their contention would now seem to apply to middle-class proscriptive norms, but not to middle-class prescriptive norms.

A quick review of the statistical findings and patterns for deviant images will indicate that hypotheses 9 and 10 are supported, and in this respect all three theories are correct. However, where none of the theories specified differences between each possible pairing of the three social levels, these data strongly indicate a gradient for attitudes toward deviant behaviors, such that the acceptability of these behaviors is inversely related to social level.

Another gradient.—The images GANG, SELF, and IEGO display a social level gradient opposite to that for deviant images; the higher the level, the more highly these

three images are evaluated (see Tables 4 and 6 for significance levels). For the image GANG, this trend suggests that the gang is not the close-knit, highly cohesive entity which some might expect.³⁴ Conceivably, the trend for IEGO reflects superego strength.

The images SELF and IEGO serve to indicate the direction of preference for these scores, thus ruling out the possibility that gang boys completely invert the evaluative dimension while continuing to describe behavior verbally much as middle-class people might. All six samples wanted to be significantly better (Negro middle class, .001; all others, .0001) and smarter (Negro gang, .01; Negro middle class, .10; all others .001) than they usually are. An analysis of the five individual evaluative scales for seventeen of the groups making up the total sample showed this directionality for SELF and IEGO to prevail throughout, with the scale "good-bad" always contributing its proportionate share of the gain within each of the six samples.

DISCUSSION

The finding that delinquent boys order behaviors as to their goodness much the same as do non-delinquents is not new, having been demonstrated as early as 1940 by Ruth Bishop.³⁵ Although Bishop was able to show that both delinquent and non-delinquent populations divide good from bad behaviors at the same neutral point, her technique leaves one in doubt as to whether her data reflect the affective preferences of her populations or merely their equal ability to perform a cognitive judgment task.³⁶

Osgood, however, has come to the conclusion after years of experience that semantic differential responses have an affective

³⁴ Yablonsky has also called into question the cohesiveness of gangs (see Lewis Yablonsky, "The Delinquent Gang as a Near-Group," *Social Problems*, VII [Fall, 1959], 108-17).

³⁵ "Points of Neutrality in Social Attitudes of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents," *Psychometrika*, V, No. 1 (1940), 35-45.

³⁶ The ambiguities involved in making this determination are discussed by Warren S. Torgerson, *Theory and Methods of Scaling* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958), pp. 48-49.

tive character, apparently coinciding in dimensionality with universal dimensions of affective meaning applicable to all sensory modalities. He also feels that these dimensions typify ways in which people respond or react to their environment, rather than ways in which they receive and organize incoming stimuli.³⁷ This would seem to imply a greater relevance for behavior than if semantic differential responses merely recorded the passive categorizing of external stimuli. In addition, the global connotative richness of the five evaluative scales, the direction of the differences between IEGO and SELF, and the fact that for college students rating Morris' "ways to live" on a semantic differential the correlation between a heavily evaluative factor and preference was .66 for individual scores and .93 for group means³⁸—all indicate strongly that evaluation and preference are closely related.

Although such considerations do much to clarify the meaning of the observed responses, it is nevertheless difficult to comprehend their full significance until the data are tied into a complex net of additional evidence. For despite the specificity of the images, the behaviors they represent were necessarily judged entirely apart from the contexts in which they are normally encountered by members of the six populations. The responses, therefore, must be viewed as having an "in principle" quality,³⁹ which, from the standpoint of assessing values, is not at all inappropriate, although it does imply that the information so obtained may be seriously incomplete for the purpose

³⁷ Charles E. Osgood, "Studies on the Generality of Affective Meaning Systems," *American Psychologist*, XVII (January, 1962), 10-28.

³⁸ Charles E. Osgood, Edward E. Ware, and Charles Morris, "Analysis of the Connotative Meanings of a Variety of Human Values as Expressed by American College Students," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LXII, No. 1 (1961), 62-73.

³⁹ This "in principle" quality corresponds to the idea of "potential demand" in values as used by Cyril S. Belshaw, who elaborates further its implications for behavior ("The Identification of Values in Anthropology," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXIV, No. 6 [1959], 555-62).

of explaining behavior. For example, some of the populations may view their own *real* school experiences in a highly unfavorable light, for a variety of both objective and subjective reasons, and yet maintain an essentially positive attitude toward the idea of education in general. This does not imply that it is any less important to know what these more abstract attitudes are.

The data imply that acceptance of middle-class prescriptive norms (the middle-class images) is quite general, while middle-class proscriptive norms (the deviant images) either decline in force or are rejected more strongly as social level goes down. The former alternative suggests a weakening of inhibitory mechanisms as social level declines, perhaps ultimately traceable to a superego construct, such as was suggested by the IEGO gradient for evaluation. The latter alternative, of rejection, raises somewhat more strongly the possibility of a "rationally" motivated choice, as indicated by the sensitivity of the images CONN and FENC to the practical emphasis of smartness for gang boys. The two alternatives need not be mutually exclusive.

In any case, the delicacy of the prescriptive-proscriptive balance achieved in their evaluations by gang boys raises the question of whether it indicates ambivalence toward middle-class culture as a whole of the sort claimed by Cohen. Certainly, that would be a plausible interpretation. However, given that the hypothesis of reaction formation does not seem to be supported,⁴⁰ and that ambivalence can be said to exist whenever competing alternatives are present, the concept of ambivalence by itself lacks explanatory force.

In addition, it remains to be demonstrated that gang boys perceive legitimate and illegitimate behaviors as being in some sense mutually exclusive, so that a choice of one has strong implications for their realization of the other. Without such a demon-

⁴⁰ For other evidence against the reaction-formation hypothesis see Albert J. Reiss, Jr., and Albert Lewis Rhodes, "Delinquency and Social Class Structure," *American Sociological Review*, XXVI, No. 5 (1961), p. 729.

stration, even equal evaluation of both kinds of behavior would not constitute sufficient evidence for ambivalence.

The implication in these data that gang boys evaluate highest behavior that appears as remote from their actual conduct as that depicted by GRAD, READ, and SAVE will undoubtedly strike many persons as an absurdity. Certainly, if the finding is valid, three separate theoretical formulations failed to make sufficient allowance for the meaningfulness of middle-class values to members of gangs. To others, the apparent pervasiveness of middle-class values in American life may come as no surprise; Cloward and Ohlin, it will be recalled, actually postulated that gang boys share middle-class consumption values, although contrary to this paper's indications they also held that middle-class norms are not legitimated by gang boys. Miller has given reason to believe that he would dismiss these findings as indicative merely of "official" ideals.⁴¹

A number of points, bearing also on the more general problem of accounting for the disparity between theories and these findings, can be made in response to such a criticism. For one thing, the allegation that gang boys mirror official ideals in their responses is consistent neither with the finding that they rated images which are highly deviant, such as PIMP, significantly higher than non-gang boys, nor with the social level gradients for deviant images.

A second point concerns both the role of values in social theory and the methodology by means of which values are identified. Unless it is to be seriously maintained that values strictly determine behavior, or vice versa, one must be prepared for findings such as these. The discrepancy between these findings and the values reported for lower-class culture (with respect to middle-class values) by Miller may be related to his anthropological methodology. The anthropologist often assesses values by inferring them from extended observation of a population's spontaneous behavior, including verbal behavior. Since Miller has described the focal

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

concerns as more readily derivable from direct observation than values, and also reflecting "actual behavior," it follows that this was also his method.⁴²

When studying an entire primitive society in this way one can be fairly certain of having witnessed the full range of behavior that members of that society hold in high regard, given the relatively constant constraints of the physical environment. However, when this method is applied to subcultures contained within a single society, it is apt to lead to fallacious results; for, in such an instance, the values of the populations studied can never be reported as other than those implied by their behavior.

Within a complex society, the existence of a differentiated segment of population may result from the operation of processes that constrain behavior in ways independent of, and in addition to, the constraints imposed by the values of that particular segment's members. To deny this is to favor an overly simple model of society. Such constraining processes can be either external or internal to a subculture. The limitation on opportunity that the larger society imposes on certain minority groups would be an example, from the Merton tradition, of an external constraint. The hypothesized female-dominated household would be an internal constraint. This hypothesis asserts that within lower-class culture there exists a self-maintaining process that leads males to behave in self-defeating ways; this, in turn, implies the frustration of tendencies to behave in ways that may actually be held in high regard.

Not even the anthropologist's use of verbal behavior, especially public or spontaneous verbal behavior, is free from this criticism if it is granted that what members of a subculture verbalize may itself reflect or even constitute a basis for their being differentiated from the larger population, despite their own deepest preferences. This criticism gains plausibility when it is noted that behaviors readily available to gang and lower-

class members and hence visible to the anthropologist, such as criminality, promiscuity, and pimping, are ones upon which Miller and the semantic differential are in accord; behaviors whose realization may be limited for lower-class persons—as represented by the middle-class images—are ones over which Miller and the semantic differential disagree.

In view of the unexpected nature of some of these findings, additional efforts to test their validity are being undertaken. If they are valid, the interpretations that may prove most important to the refinement of delinquency theory are the following: (1) For all six populations, the indorsement "in principle" of middle-class prescriptive norms is uniformly high. (2) Gang, lower-class, and middle-class boys differ most in their attitudes toward behaviors proscribed by the middle class, and they tend to be ordered as listed with respect to their tolerance toward these behaviors. (3) Legitimacy or practicality, as measured by a "smart-sucker" scale, seems to be a meaningful basis for distinguishing behavior. There is some evidence that gang boys, more than other boys, may be led by this distinction to a choice of criminal behavior over legitimately gainful behavior. (4) The hypothesis of a sex-identity problem for lower-class and gang boys appears worth pursuing further.

Since these interpretations are not derived from true probability samples, it will be necessary for readers to employ discretion in applying them to other universes. A consideration of the degree to which other universes might reasonably be expected to differ in these respects from this paper's samples should be of some guidance.

It is anticipated that the implications of these findings will be better understood if their further development is deferred until other relevant data have been analyzed.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
AND
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

⁴² *Ibid.*