DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 198 UD 016 167

AUTHOR McPartland, James M.; McDill, Edward L.
TITLE Research on Crime in the Schools.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 64p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression; Change Strategies; *Crime; Definitions; *Delinquency; Drug Addiction; Research Needs; Research Problems; *School Environment; *School Role; School Systems; School Vandalism; Social Action; Social Change; *Socially Deviant Behavior; Social Problems; Theories; Violence; *Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

The main themes of some prominent theories of youthful offenders are reviewed, and some of the far reaching reforms implied by these themes are outlined. The main goal is to consider how schools may respond to the problem, and attention is restricted to changes in schools that may help, even though more fundamental reforms in society would have much greater impact. The presentation has three parts: definitions and classifications of the problem of crime in the schools are offered; a brief review of five major theories of the causes of juvenile offenses and implications of those theories for reforms in the larger society are presented; and an analysis of whether schools play a distinct role in the problem and a brief review of evaluations of specific school changes to address the problem are given. Two broad generalizations are highlighted in the conclusion. The first underscores the need for additional serious studies on what schols can do about the violence problem. The best that can be said is that the present knowledge is indirect, dealing mostly with forces deeply embedded in American instit utions and the social structure outside of the school. The second is the belief that schools presently play a direct or unique role in the violence problem, independent of the underlying conditions of employment, family, and juvenile law enforcement institutions. (Author/AM)

RESEARCH ON CRIME IN THE SCHOOLS

James M. McPartland

Edward L. McDill

Juvenile delinquency, youth gangs and teenage drug abuse are not new topics to social scientists. The books and articles on these subjects could fill a small library. Sociologists and psychologists have devised elaborate theories to describe young offenders and the source of their problems, and some have conducted studies with extensive data and careful scientific standards. But the subject of serious deviant behavior in schools is a quite recent emphasis, and most existing studies of youthful crime have not focused on the school as a distinct element in the problem. Thus we have a vast literature on juvenile offenses, but we have little direct information about the independent role that schools may play.[1]

We will briefly review the main themes of some prominent theories of youthful offenders and outline some of the far reaching reforms implied by these themes. But our main goal is to consider how schools may respond to the problem, and much of our attention will be restricted to changes in schools that may help, even though more fundamental reforms in society would surely have much greater impact. Is crime in schools entirely a reflection of problems in the larger society, or do schools, through the ways they are operated, contribute to making the problem better or worse?

To address this question we will attempt to isolate statistically the effects of school experiences from other factors, and we will look at available evaluations of how specific changes in school programs have affected the

extent and severity of student offenses. Although most recent work on crime in schools has involved only the informal insights and testimonial evidence of interested observers and educators, we will concentrate on studies that have collected and analyzed data. We will also offer some new tentative results from our own recent analyses of existing survey data.

Our presentation will have three parts: First, definitions and classifications of the problem of crime in the schools. Second, a brief review of five major theories of the causes of juvenile offenses and implications of those theories for reforms in the larger society. Third, an analysis of whether schools play a distinct role in the problem and a brief review of evaluations of specific school changes to address the problem.

1. Definitions and Classifications

Presently there is no well established classification system for grouping student offenses into categories that have empirical scientific or practical meaning. Most current definitions are restricted to a small set of serious offenses, or include a mixed bag of violent crimes, ethnic tensions, student demonstrations and the "victimless" crimes of drug or alcohol abuse.[2]

The restricted definitions do have the advantage of yielding convenient, precise measurement for describing trends over time.[3] But when restricted definitions are used exclusively, they may give a false picture of the true saliency and intensity of the problem, or they may cause educators to overlook some less serious offenses that can serve as early warning signs of potential trouble. For example, official crime statistics based on legal definitions usually do not identify the number of people who actually experience threats or never officially report minor abuses, and cannot show the level of fear of crime in a school population. The omission of specific offenses which are not crimes in the larger society, such as high levels of truancy or disregard for school rules, may fail to alert educators to true problems of school effectiveness

and legitimacy which can surface later in serious criminal behavior. On the other hand, grouping together a wide variety of individual, collective, and victimless offenses will mask the possibility that certain schools may have a concentration of particular offenses because of local conditions of enrollment or school organization. We need to know whether offenses fall into categories because of the types of students or schools involved, if we are to develop appropriate preventive and remedial procedures. Criminologists have also been trying to develop an empirical classification of crimes in the larger society because of the potential scientific and practical payoff they expect from this endeavor.[4]

To realize important gains, we need to develop definitions and classifications on the basis of empirical regularities that occur in the incidence of various specific offenses. Data from individual and school records can be used to discover intercorrelations between rates of different crimes or to specify relationships between characteristics of local situations and particular criminal incidences.

On the basis of intercorrelations between rates of different crimes, offenses would be grouped together which were frequently committed by repeat offenders or which occurred with unusual relative frequency in different schools. Some individuals and schools may be "specialists" in one set of offenses but not others. On the basis of relationships with local situations, categories of offenses would be defined according to their relative frequency among students or schools of particular types.

We have recently analyzed some survey data that suggests a four-category

classification of the incidents often included in reports of school crime. This tentative classification groups incidents that are usually found among schools or students with similar characteristics, and separates incidents -- severe and not so severe -- that are frequently committed by different individuals or in different schools. The details of these analyses and the serious shortcomings in the available data are provided in the appendix.

First: School Attacks, Thefts, and Withdrawals. This category includes most of the legally defined serious crimes: vandalism of school property, stealing from students and staff, and physical attacks on school members. But the category also includes high levels of suspensions from school, reports to the school office, and absenteeism or truancy.

Depressed socioeconomic conditions are characteristic of this category of offenses. Although most low-income students are not involved in such incidents, and middle class schools are not free from these problems, attacks on persons and property and withdrawals from school appear to be most frequent and most severe for students and schools from economically depressed families and neighborhoods.

Second: Drug and Alcohol Abuse. The illegal use of drugs and alcohol are serious problems, and these problems seem to be more evenly spread through the population of students and schools without regard to socioeconomic levels.[5] In other words, the correlation of socioeconomic background characteristics with drug or alcohol abuse appears noticeably lower than with other three offense categories.

The public images of drug users would suggest that drug abuse and student thefts are related because of the need for money to satisfy a drug habit. Although this connection surely exists in some individual cases, earlier studies of youth gangs have indicated that many acts of vandalism and theft are not committed primarily for monetary gain. The studies found that stolen

property is often discarded or destroyed,[6] suggesting that frequently the motive for the first category of offenses is other than the need for drug and alcohol money.

Third: Student Protests and Demonstrations. This category seems to differ from the others in at least two important ways. Protests and demonstrations are much more a phenomenon of economically and academically advantaged high school student bodies than are other classes of problems, especially when race and sex are taken into account. This is opposite to the direction of the relationship for attacks and withdrawal in school, and involves a stronger association with socioeconomic variables than is found for drug and alcohol abuse.

In addition, the rate of high school demonstrations does not seem to be following the same upward trend as other problems. More generally, there seem to be periods when demonstrations flare up and other school years when the level is much lower. Changing political conditions in the larger society and a contagion effect from the college level may be important parts of the story.[7]

There is some additional evidence from the college level that student protests represent a separate class of problems, at least with regard to drug abuse. Studies of advantaged students in some leading colleges indicate that those who play leading roles in protests are usually different individuals than those deeply involved in the drug culture, and their earlier family experiences are frequently described in very different terms.[8]

Fourth: Racial and Ethnic Group Tensions. This may be a special case mainly because it occurs necessarily only in schools with mixed student enrollments, especially where the mix is close to evenly divided between two identifiable groups.[9] This is not to say there is anything inevitable about mix and tensions, for many mixed schools have probably established a reasonable pluralistic community. However, we need better data and considerable further to determine whether intergroup tensions play an identifiable role in other

problem areas. For example, victimization studies of the racial and ethnic identity of individuals committing and suffering personal attacks relative to their proportions in a school are needed to clarify the connection between racial or ethnic tensions and school attacks or thefts.

This four-category classification remains very tentative because of the serious inadequacies in the available data on which it is based. However, it does suggest two points of potential importance to guide future research and development. First, there are four classes of problems that can be thought of separately in devising explanations and preventive or remedial approaches. If further studies document that different individuals and schools actually stand out in each category, the development of a differentiated approach to school reform becomes sensible, with the hope of linking reform priorities to the characteristics of the student enrollment or community characteristics of particular schools.

Second, there is a clue to heading off some problems of school attacks and thefts in the early grades because of the strong association that is suggested between these offenses and truancy. Truancy is a problem that surfaces in the elementary grades,[10] before the more serious criminal offenses have reached serious proportions. Truancy is a convenient indicator to identify students who have problems coping with the schools' demands that may become reflected later in criminal behavior. Truancy has the familiar weaknesses of other predictive measures, but it seems to have advantages that others do not. As with all other methods used to anticipate later problems committed by a small fraction of the population, there will be many more "misses" than "hits" in prediction.[11] This raises the danger that incorrect labelling of potential problem sources may actually precipitate problems that may otherwise have been avoided.[12] But, in contrast to other prediction schemes based on personal and social background measures or subjective adult impressions, truancy

is itself a clear maladaptive reaction to schools and worthy of attention and treatment in its own right. Responding to it with special programs to meet individual needs and styles in the early grades may allow involvement of parents while they can more easily exert strong influence than in later years. In addition, truancy is a relatively easily maintained indicator for measuring the progress and effectiveness of special treatments.[13]

Now we turn briefly to an overview of five main themes in theories of juvenile delinquency and youth crime.[14] We will examine these ideas especially for their pertinence to offenses of secondary school attacks, thefts, and withdrawals.

2. Five Themes in Theories of Delinquency

Sociologists and psychologists have developed several theories to account for certain widely held generalizations about crimes committed by youth. These generalizations include:

1. Youth crimes are disproportionately committed by male children of economically and educationally disadvantaged families and by the poor from racial and ethnic minorities.[15] However, the vast majority of offspring from disadvantaged homes never become involved in serious offenses.[16] Incidentally, minority members suffer proportionately more as victims of crime, since most serious violence occurs within racial and ethnic groups.[17]

2. A large proportion of serious crime in society is committed by individuals in adolescence[18] and early adulthood. However, the majority of youthful offenders do not continue a life of crime. Whether they receive special treatment from correctional agencies or not, most delinquents in time assume adult responsibilities and do not become repeat criminals.[19] As one research team has suggested, "father time and mother nature" are somehow the most effective cures that we know of for youthful criminal tendencies.[20]

3. A good deal of the vandalism, theft, and attacks committed by delinquents

and youth gangs is not for the direct material gain that might be obtained by these acts. Property is often destroyed or discarded rather than sold or used,[21] and many personal attacks on individuals do not include robbery as part of the crime.

4. There appears to be a significant negative association between the health of the economy or the availability of jobs and the level of youth crime,[22] but the absolute level of poverty is not an adequate explanation for rates of criminality. The United States is the richest country in every stratum of society; yet, it has one of the most serious crime problems in the world, and the crime problem has been growing here especially among the young since World War II, in spite of general improvements throughout society in the standard of living.[23]

We will now briefly describe five main themes in theories of juvenile delinquency and youth crimes intended to account for these generalizations.

Probably the most frequently expressed theme to account for juvenile delinquency, youth gangs and youthful crime is <u>restricted opportunities</u>.[24] According to this view, most young people adopt the American dream of the middle class way of life, but many children from disadvantaged backgrounds find that the legitimate avenues for achieving this life are closed to them. The barriers to achieving the good jobs that bring the desired material possessions may in part be the result of discrimination in the labor market. But even without overt discrimination, the skills and manners required in a competitive selection procedure may effectively exclude children from poor families that cannot provide the learning environment to develop these attributes to a competitive level. Even though many children from very poor families may have enough talents to actually perform the well-paying jobs, they often lose out to others who are over-qualified and exceed them in ranking on entrance exams.

Proponents of this theory view delinquent acts as expressions of frustration directed at the symbols of the competitive structure or discriminatory systems which are excluding the offenders from the success they desire. Schools are the victim of these frustrations because schools are themselves symbols of middle class authority and competitive standards, and since young people are in schools for a large part of their time, they provide handy targets. Because vandalism and attacks often do not result in material gain for the offender, the theory sees the frustration of restricted opportunities to be the underlying drive.[25]

According to this theory, it is not the absolute level of standard of living to be achieved that causes the frustrations, as much as the gap between what society teaches can be expected from being a mainstream American citizen and what is achieved. Rising expectations rather than lower absolute level of living standards are needed to explain increasing rates of crime, because offenses do not exist only at the extremes of the lower economic classes nor do they increase and decrease exactly in line with large fluctuations in historical trends of absolute poverty.

One general empirical problem with this theory is that only a small fraction of individuals who have restricted opportunities because of discrimination or disadvantaged backgrounds actually take out their frustrations in a violent or illegitimate way. Instead, most poor children do not become serious delinquents, and most delinquents do not grow up to be hardened criminals. Most disadvantaged people accommodate to a lower income than they desire, work longer on lower paying jobs to enjoy some extra possessions, and invest their aspirations in their own children's futures. However, the theme of "restricted opportunities" does account for the observation that actual youthful offenders are much more likely to come from backgrounds that are economically and educationally disadvantaged, but the theory in its simplest form predicts that many

more individuals will commit delinquent behaviors than actually do.

One variant of this theory says that some disadvantaged individuals have more opportunities and support for criminal acts than others (less chance of being caught or punished and more encouragement for illegal behavior from close associates). These contrasts in "opportunities for delinquency" and "differential associations" are offered to help explain the variation among the disadvantaged in criminal incidents.[26] Only ambiguous evidence exists to evaluate these hypotheses.[27]

A second theme, one that is related to this last notion of "differential association", is subcultural differences in values and attitudes. We will briefly mention two versions of this theme of subcultural differences. One version assumes that some groups do not aspire to the major goals of the American or middle class dream.[28] This theory states that there are subcultures where other goals -- such as daring, ridiculing authority, or exciting group activities -- are of unusual importance. In contrast to the theme of restricted opportunities, this view does not see an acceptance of middle class goals as the source of delinquent acts of frustration, but instead sees a different value subculture exhibiting its preferred behaviors, part of which are criminal attacks and violations in schools. Although it may be true that behavioral styles differ significantly among major subcultures in this country, there is no sound evidence that the American values of a middle class way of life have failed to take hold in almost all of the citizens of this country. In fact, the urge for the most conspicuous possessions of the middle class seems particularly strong for those segments of the population which have been most disadvantaged.[29]

This brings us to a second version of the "subcultural differences" theme which emphasizes not differences in goals and aspirations, but differences in attitudes about violence and some crimes.[30] The idea here is that some neigh-

borhoods and communities are so ravaged by poverty and crime that a different view of violence develops. Where violence is "a fact of life", the attitudes towards death, injury, stealing, and law enforcement become different and more accepting of violent responses as tolerable behavior. In other words, the ability to be strongly shocked by violent human behavior is weakened by constant exposure, and the psychological barriers to taking such actions oneself are less strong. In accounting for the high level of crime in this country and the recent increase in youth crime throughout all segments of the American social structure, many believe that our own history as well as recent world events and the media emphases have made our entire society a "culture of violence" in the world.[31]

A third main theme takes a broad view of historical changes in our institutions of family, school, and work and points to prolonged adolescent dependence as an underlying cause of malaise in the schools.[32] This theme stresses that modern society has created a new stage in the life cycle between childhood and adulthood -- the approximate period we now call "adolescence" -- when individuals have the talents and energies to assume adult responsibilities but there is little for them to contribute and no way for them to earn their independence from their parents. The desire and capacity for responsibility and antonomy are present but the student role as it is now constituted merely serves as a holding pattern until youth can qualify for adult jobs.

According to this view, when young people cannot fulfill their needs for independence or antonomy by contributing to some needed activity or by supporting themselves through occupational responsibilities some forms of delinquent behavior may result. Individuals may seek to demonstrate their independence by defying the orders of designated adults. Others, with time on their hands may seek illegal activities as a relief from their boredom. And some may illegally obtain money to free themselves from dependence on parents

for some desired possessions. This theme attempts to account for the fact that criminal and violent behavior is concentrated among the young, and that young offenders do not usually continue criminal behavior after they pass the age for assuming adult occupational and family responsibilities.

The first three themes we have discussed are mostly drawn from sociology, and are concerned with reactions to environmental conditions of poverty, neighborhood, and age, that affect different segments of society with particular force. The final two themes we will mention are more psychological, dealing with individual differences in personality structure or self-image of youthful offenders compared to most of the population.

The fourth theme identifies seriously damaged personalities, rather than conditions of the present environment or expectations of the future, as underlying the most serious cases of repeated violent and antisocial behavior. The offenders are viewed as having defective personality structures or major mental and emotional disorders which leave them unable to control their aggressive drives and antisocial impulses. Stated differently, delinquent or criminal behavior is seen to be a symptom or expression of personal maladjustment or character disorder.[33]

Few claim that individuals in these hard core categories comprise more than a small fraction of the youth who commit delinquent acts. The usual estimates are on the order of 5 to 20 percent of the youthful criminal element,[34] although the estimates would vary according to where along a continuum of internal to external factors or distant to proximate causes that the particular theorist sees as the major source of the delinquent or criminal personality.

Experiences in the family that go back to early childhood or have persisted in the home throughout the child rearing years are frequently discussed as major influences in the development of a crime-prone person. Parental abuse, rejection, neglect, and lack of affection toward the child seem to be more

clearly part of the destructive process than any particular style of parental discipline or child rearing practices that are used with consistency and emotional support.[35] The incidence of severe parental rejection and abuse toward their children is thought to be a small fraction of home environments in areas with high crime and delinquency rates.[36] This goes along with the notion that the hard core of severely damaged personalities comprises a minority of youthful delinquents and criminal offenders.

The fifth theme concerns the process of labelling and stereotyping which is assumed to foster a self-image of delinquency. Under this view, an individual comes to see himself as "bad" or as part of the delinquent life style because others communicate these expectations of behavior to the individual. The person internalizes this image and seeks out others in the same category who reinforce the image. The process is seen as an example of the self-fulfilling prophecy, where the predictions of others when they are enforced on the individual set in motion a chain of events that actually bring the expectations about.[37]

This process is usually thought of as an intensifier of the problem rather than as a precipitating condition. The theory deals more with how initial problems can be made worse by overreactions to initial or unusual incidents of offensive behavior, rather than with why the original manifestations of deviant behavior came about in the first place. To be an originating rather than a contributing element for criminality, the stereotyping would have to be based on factors such as ethnic background or personal appearance rather than actual incidents of delinquency, and there is no good evidence that most referrals for delinquency are based on anything but an individual's record of repeated serious offenses.[38]

There is currently considerable controversy among social scientists about the importance of the labelling process in explaining deviant behavior,

including juvenile delinquency and problems in school. Many researchers maintain that most of the variance in serious offenses is explained by other variables and processes, and that stereotyping or labelling is a small part of the creation or growth of deviant actions.[39] On the other hand, mistakes in labelling delinquents -- however rare they may be -- that result in institutionalization or otherwise assigning individuals to programs that are populated largely by delinquent peers, are thought by some to add significantly to the probability of later criminal tendencies in the ones affected.[40]

Most of these five themes suggest that nothing short of a reordering of society's stratification system or a restructuring of the institutions of family, school and work will significantly reduce the rebellious offenses of the young. The theme of "restricted opportunities" has been taken by some to require a redistribution of income and jobs in society, especially by those researchers who believe that schools alone cannot make sizeable average changes in the way academic skills are distributed among children from various social origins.[41] Others have drawn the implication from the theme of "subcultural differences" that a much more complete residential mixing of the poor and well-to-do in this country is needed to change the differences in attitudes and values about violence and deviant behavior, thus producing a less dangerous climate throughout the population.[42] A recent Presidential panel has framed the argument of "prolonged adolescent dependence" to suggest expanding the skills for which training is offered by formal schooling and incorporating the occupational sector into the institutionalization of education.[43] The most frequently cited source of seriously "disturbed personalities" are parents who are personally ill-equipped to provide the stability and affection in the home which are needed for the normal development of the children.[44] Those who believe that the "labelling process" is an important element in the problem are usually more concerned with the correctional and criminal justice agencies

that handle youth rather than with school responses to students.[45]

Because all the theoretical perspectives described above involve societal and family structures, the question remains whether schools are a unique contributor to the problem rather than being simply the setting where the problem appears, and correspondingly, whether there are practical changes in present school operations that are politically feasible which can reduce crime in the short run. We will report some data on whether direct school experiences account for differences in rates of student offenses after social class and family differences are taken into account. We will also review the reported evaluations we could find of the effects of specific changes in the cost, reward and decision-making structures of school operations, including a new examination of school size as a contributing factor.

3. The Unique Role of Schools: Responsiveness

The main themes on juvenile delinquency do not view schools as playing a distinctive role in the problem, but see the schools' difficulties to be derivatives of larger societal factors.[46] According to these views, schools have difficulties either because they enroll individuals with serious personal problems or because schools symbolize or institutionalize the barriers that are posed by larger society for the poor, the minorities, and the young. We agree that most of the variance in rates of youthful criminality will be explained by forces that begin with the larger society, but we question whether the main themes of delinquency theories overlook the independent role that schools play in promoting delinquency.

Schools may directly affect student delinquency through their responsiveness to student behavior. By responsiveness we mean the degree to which schools take specific notice of changes in student behavior by distributing rewards for improvements in desired behaviors, placing costs on misbehavior,

and providing access for students in the schools' decision-making procedures. Because schools can do something practical to alter the costs, rewards, and access they provide, we need to learn whether improvements in these school aspects will be met by decreases -- however small -- in student offenses.

We shall report on some evidence about the effects of the three components of school responsiveness: costs, rewards and political access. We begin by reporting the findings of a recent analysis we conducted to isolate statistically school experiences from non-school factors as a contributor to student offenses.

Responsiveness: Rewards

A school has a responsive reward system to the degree that it pays attention to and shows appreciation for improvements in the behaviors that it desires from students. This will be determined both by the criteria used for evaluating student performance and by the sensitivity and frequency of the procedures used to distribute rewards for student improvement. If either the criteria or procedures are insensitive to actual individual improvement through reasonable effort, then the school will be unresponsive to many individuals.

There are many ways that a school can reward individual students, both informally and formally. These include praise from teachers and other members of the school, as well as marks or grades on tests and report cards. As one important example of the actual reward system used in public schools, we have investigated the responsiveness of the grading system and how it relates to the probability of student offenses. The details of our analysis are presented in the appendix.

First, we find that the present system of marks on report cards can be a very unresponsive practice, because it excludes a large group of students from any real chance of obtaining high rewards for improved school performance. A significant number of individuals continually receive punishments rather than

rewards at report card time. All indications we find show that a large number of students receive poor grades in most of their subjects and for all of their school career.[47] Report cards as they are presently administered in most public schools have created a group of students who are the "perpetual losers," deprived of any taste of the academic honors that are the major official rewards in schools.

This condition did not come about through some insidious intention to punish or discriminate against some classes of individuals, but because a single mark or number was constructed to try to accomplish too many worthy purposes. Besides being part of the incentive system for students, grades are used as a basis for selecting or promoting students for later classes, for college admissions and for employment positions. Grades are also intended to maintain standards of excellence that schools expect from students. To accomplish all of this, schools have usually based grades only on the simplest criteria to measure -- written performance on tests of academic subjects -- and have calculated grades on the basis of a student's relative standing among classmates or agemates on these tests.

While the important purposes of sorting students and establishing minimum standards may be accomplished by this grading system, the use of a single summary number based on one's relative standing on a limited range of academic skills appears to be a terrible choice for encouraging student effort on school work. Under the present system, a sizeable number of individuals learn that they have little chance to obtain these rewards, even given a reasonable amount of extra effort and qualified help. Although most students may put forth real effort and make significant progress in what they have learned during a term, only those who catch up with and pass other students can expect to receive better grades.

The second finding of our analyses is that lack of success in school --

as measured by report card grades -- is correlated with the probability of student disciplinary problems, after statistically holding constant the conventional measures of student background such as ability level, race, sex, parents' education, family wealth and family size. We find this repeatedly in our study of three large secondary school student surveys which included self-report data on suspensions, frequency of office discipline, and experiences with law enforcement officials for misdeeds. Although the relationship was quite small in magnitude, it occurs consistently. That is, we repeatedly find a significant net association between the degree to which a student has received poor marks in school and his probability of individual disciplinary offenses in school.[48] Of the 36 different student subpopulations (defined by age, race, sex, and discipline measures) we find 32 instances of a significant partial association between marks and offenses, after taking into account student and family background factors.

There are the usual problems for these analyses that are associated with all cross-sectional self-report data, which make it impossible either to guarantee that some unmeasured personal characteristic does not truly account for the relationship or to assess the actual causal sequence that creates the association. Nevertheless, two important generalizations are strongly suggested by these results: schools do play a direct role in affecting problems of serious student offenses that is independent of conditions in larger society; and, in particular, schools can have a unique impact on the problem via the responsiveness of their rewards.

This is not to say that factors outside of school are not the major source of the problem: the small percent of variance in delinquency that is explained by our school measures does suggest that most of the causes lie in unmeasured family, occupational and societal factors. Nevertheless, when we statistically control for the major socio-economic conditions of students' background, the

effects of direct school experiences remain as a significant predictor of delinquent behaviors.

Report card grades are only one of the possible rewards that schools may offer to students for appropriate behavior, so our findings based on report card measures can be viewed as evidence that responsiveness of various reward systems in schools can be important for reducing student offenses. Improving the responsiveness of school's rewards for desired behaviors requires that schools tie rewards that are valued by students to behavioral criteria that actually achievable by most of them. We need experiments with grading systems themselves such as expanding the ways in which students can demonstrate their talents and basing some grades on individual progress rather than relative standing in class. But we also need to learn of other ways that schools can be reorganized to effectively offer alternative rewards such as peer approval, and course or occupational returns.[49]

Responsiveness: Costs

On the costs side, we are concerned with how schools respond to student offenders and potential offenders. The practices involved here include those which make it more difficult to commit an offense, increase the probability that an offender will be caught, speed the system of handling accused students, or increase the effectiveness of punishments for students found guilty of illegal acts.

This category includes, as one part, the range of school security measures, including use of security guards, vandalism resistent windows, intrustion detectors, fencing, special lighting, and locks. More data and evaluative reports are needed on the effects of these measures, since we found conflicting summaries of the evidence. A review of the published materials in these areas completed under contract for the U.S. Department of Justice in 1975 listed forty-five strategies for security designs for schools and concluded that

"scant information exists regarding the effectiveness of strategies that are applied."[50] On the other hand, representatives of the school security industry conclude from their own survey of school districts that losses from vandalism can be decreased by more than half due to additional money spent on security measures.[51] Most school systems have decided to invest more in security measures, and the question is only the degree of improvement to be purchased. In considering security precautions, administrators must decide what amount of savings through decreased vandalism and increased safety for students and teachers justifies what level of expenditure. Could the same level of expenditures get better results if spent in other ways?

We also need some basic knowledge about two other fundamental elements of school responsiveness through costs to actual or potential offenders: (1) types of penalties or punishments and (2) codes and procedures for deciding individual cases. We will restrict our attention to actions taken by the public schools themselves rather than the juvenile justice system of the courts and institutional or community correctional programs, for which there have been recent serious proposals for reorganization or reforms.[52] However, in considering school penalties and procedures we will look to the research evidence on the effectiveness of treatments for juvenile delinquents outside of schools.

Little research has focused on the value of different school penalties as deterrents to potential school offenders.[53] It is a real question whether secondary schools command sufficient disciplinary resources to meet the range of offenses with which they have to deal. Penalties in adult society extending from small monetary fines to loss of privileges and confinement, or discipline in the industrial world varying from temporary loss of pay to dismissal, appear to represent true costs for most people over a wide range of severity. On the other hand, schools alone may not have comparable control over resources that

are sufficiently valued by actual or potential student offenders.

The schedules, procedures, and attitudes of the modern school, student, and family seem to have made the minor disciplinary actions that were useful in earlier generations now impractical or weak. The more severe penalties which schools can invoke, such as loss of extracurricular privileges and suspensions from school, may not be important costs for the individuals that schools need to influence. Research to provide a census of school rewards and costs and their saliency to different students[54] could provide a useful basis for judging new disciplinary ideas, such as giving the school real monetary incentives through discretionary control over student employment, parental fines, or student activity funds. For example, one proposal to use monetary incentives as a deterrent to vandalism is to offer savings achieved from previous year's vandalism costs in a school to present support student activities.[55]

The final aspect of school responsiveness through costs that we will discuss involves procedures for deciding disciplinary cases and codes of student conduct. Recent Supreme Court cases and published legal analyses have focused on the requirements of due process for serious penalties such as suspensions, and on the kinds of rules that can be so enforced.[56] Investigations show that there have been various abuses of the schools' power to suspend and discipline students.[57] School systems and professional organizations have specified model codes of rights and responsibilities for school members and outlined procedures to adjudicate individual cases.[58] Recent court cases will undoubtedly accelerate and disseminate these developments in many more localities. A great deal of work also needs to be done to produce coordinated codes that tie specific offenses to specific penalties to achieve a simplified but predictable system for dealing with criminal offenders in schools.[59]

Attention to research on the effectiveness of institutional or community treatment programs for juvenile delinquents is important in this effort, especially concerning the point at which chronic offenders or seriously disturbed students may be removed from the regular schools. This involves possible referrals to alternative schools within the public school system and to outside agencies and institutions. Since the removal of as many trouble makers as possible can be an attractive and simple solution, there is always a danger that removals and referrals will go beyond the core of dangerously disturbed and chronic offenders,[60] although there is no systematic evidence that such mistakes are frequent in the juvenile court system.

The research record of treatments of juvenile delinquents through institutional, probation, or community correctional programs is mostly one that reports no significant average success. Most of the well known studies, sophisticated in their methodology and intensive in their therapeutic approach, have failed to show a positive effect on the rate of later delinquency for those who received the treatments compared to those who did not.[61] There are some occasional and inconsistent suggestions in this work that certain approaches show promise, including group therapy treatments analogous to the programs of Alcoholics Anonymous,[62] institutional reward contingency programs[63] and statewide programs such as those undertaken in California that are closely tied to the communities of their clients.[64] Thus, while removal of the small core of dangerously disturbed and chronic offenders can measureably reduce the exposure of other school members to criminal threats, we do not have good evidence that treatment programs will "cure" or reduce the criminal tendencies of those assigned.

Responsiveness: Access

School can also vary in responsiveness by the way they provide access for students in the school decision-making process. In a large study we con-

ducted a few years ago, we constructed some definitions of how schools can differ in the access they provide for students.[65] There are two general points in the decision-making process at which schools may vary in the extent of student participation. First, students may be involved in the "governing decisions," that is, establishing rules or regulations and defining the specific alternatives available for individuals. These governing decisions concern non-academic matters such as discipline rules or extra-curricular activities as well as academic issues such as course offerings and staff selection. Participation in governing decisions can be called school responsiveness through "political access," and usually involves only a small fraction of students who represent the entire student body.

After the rules and alternatives are set, students can be a part of the decision-making process by participating in the day-to-day administration of the rules and by exercising choice of academic or non-academic assignments. These can be called "consumer decisions" and -- depending upon the number and frequency of choices -- can personally involve all of the students rather than a few selected representatives.

We have some evidence that school responsiveness through access involving either "governing decisions" or "consumer decisions" can increase student commitment to the school and reduce student offenses against the school and staff. Again, the evidence is based on indirect data and the size of the relationships found are very small compared to the magnitude of the problems.

Access to governing decisions: Political scientists have long believed that the legitimacy of any governing authority or set of rules is affected by the degree to which the governed feel they have some say in deciding the rules and leadership. Of any two governing systems that are equally effective in meeting the basic needs of its members, the one which has been able to establish

belief in its legitimacy will be more stable, with fewer revolts and withdrawals, according to this view.[66]

In a study we conducted a few years ago, we analyzed responses from 3450 students in fourteen high schools to determine the relationship of truancy, vandalism and protests with simultaneous measures of "student satisfaction with participation in rulemaking," and "student satisfaction with the existing rules themselves." These analyses involved statistical controls on age, sex, race, family socioeconomic status, and perceived quality of school instruction. We found a small but highly significant relationship for rates of truancy, attitudes toward vandalism, and protests with both main variables: on the average, students who were most satisfied with participation in rule-making and with existing rules reported less truancy, and less propensity toward vandalism or protests. The relationships were stronger for satisfaction with participation than for satisfaction with the rules themselves, and indeed we found that a school with some of the strictest rules but most student participation to be one of the best schools in the sample in terms of few student discipline problems.[67]

Besides the possible direct effects on student offenses, some observers believe that the school's decision-making process can itself be a learning experience to develop attitudes about government and the democratic ideals. According to this view, the "political socialization" an individual experiences in schools can have positive or negative influences on later adult attitudes about government, depending upon the degree to which school processes approach democratic ideals of access and individual rights.[68]

We should not overstate the case however. Our results are based on subjective and self-report data from a limited sample of students, and the relationships account for only a small fraction of the variation in student offenses. Also, we find that student interest in actually participating on

governing bodies is limited, and there is strong agreement among students that professional staff in high schools and colleges should retain their traditional prerogatives regarding academic standards and evaluations.[69]

Access to consumer decisions: In recent years, significant variation has appeared between secondary schools in student access to consumer decisions with the establishment of "open environment" programs and individualized instruction. Many of these newly organized schools provide more student choice among structured academic assignments and also permit a wider range of freedom of action for students in the daily school routines. A recently completed study of 16 middle and high schools strongly suggests that greater student access to such consumer decisions can have a small positive effect on their satisfaction with school, their commitment to classwork, and especially their positive relations with teachers.[70]

In this study of open and individualized schools, professional educators retained their determination of academic content and standards, but there was significant variation in the amount of student choice among class assignments and in the degree of student freedom to choose instructional arrangements. After student background variables were statistically controlled, this variation was related as just described to various aspects of satisfaction with school, and thus by implication to serious problems of student attacks and rebellion. Again, the relationships were small and not always consistent, but they do give reason to believe that improvements in school responsiveness through student access can have a measurable impact on the problem.

Responsiveness: the special case of school size.

We conclude this section with a report of our recent analyses of the relationship between student offenses and school size. School size can affect responsiveness in terms of cost, rewards, and access.

We know from research on school size that it can affect the costs of misbehavior, because all behavior is more visible in smaller schools and naturally subject to greater control.[71] In small schools, where few individuals are anonymous, it is harder to avoid being recognized for possible misdeeds. Higher visibility and closer personal associations in smaller schools also may affect the rewards side of school responsiveness, because the pressures and incentives to become involved in and committed to school activities are greater. A student with greater integration into the life of the school is generally believed to find school more rewarding in terms of informal relations and feelings of self-worth through responsibility. Also, smaller schools may be expected to provide some ease of student access -- the third aspect of responsiveness -- because the bureaucratic structure that can impede responses to student requests need not be as cumbersome as in larger schools. Thus, size provides a rough indicator of general school responsiveness to be used in a final assessment of the unique role of schools in student crime.

We used a 1965 national survey of over 900 principals containing measures of size, student body characteristics and estimated severity of seven types of student offenses against persons and property. The details of these analyses are given in the appendix.[72]

Our analyses found school size to be positively related to principals' reports of the extent and seriousness of a wide range of student offenses. Analyses in grade 12 and grade 9 statistically controlled for the mean ability level, racial composition and socioeconomic status of the student body, and found that on the average principals in small schools report a slightly lower level of student offenses. The same significant relationship was also present when the analyses were restricted to schools in the large urban and suburban sections.

Although a direct interpretation of this relationship would suggest

creating smaller secondary schools or smaller well defined subunits for schools in areas that have actual or potential high levels of crime, we with to emphasize a more general interpretation. We see these results as another indication that schools can play a direct though perhaps small role in meeting the problems of student crime and rebellion, and that changes to increase the responsiveness of rewards, costs, and access for students can have noticeable positive impact. In other words, school factors that may lessen student offenses in small schools may show the direction of reforms we need to make in larger schools.

In our search for evaluations of specific school factors related to student offenses, the amount and quality of research we were able to find and to generate ourselves has severe limitations in both quantity and scientific precision. It is not that researchers and evaluators have found school differences to be unrelated to the problem; it is primarily that little data have been collected and few studies have been conducted in the area.

Summary

We wish to conclude by highlighting two broad generalizations.

The first is an entirely predictable response from researchers: the need for additional serious studies on what schools can do about the violence problem. While this can be said about almost any social problem, the present research record on violence in the schools is almost non-existent. The best that can be said is that our present knowledge is indirect, dealing mostly with forces deeply embedded in American institutions and the social structure outside of the school.

When it comes to practical reforms, especially with regard to school changes, current thinking seems to come more from the on-the-scene responses of practitioners rather than from implications based on research theories and

findings.[73] This is a natural phenomenon; practitioners have an immediate need to deal with the problem and are being forced to do so with no research findings to help. Presently, the most immediately useful aids involve piecemeal tips on actions to be incorporated into the day-to-day routine of the school, rather than broad policies or organized classes of specific reforms based on scientific generalizations.

The source of the ideas does not matter, as long as they are good ideas; ideas that can be proven to actually work in many school settings. This means that the best ideas will be those that are stated in such a way that they have many practical ways of implementation, and that there is solid evidence that they have measureable impact on the problem. To achieve such evidence, specific action programs for school reform should allow for applying the scientific standards of design and measurement that will permit convincing evaluations.[74]

This obvious need has been recognized to some extent in government and in professional groups. The studies now underway in the National Center for Education Statistics, the National Institute of Education, and by professional educational organizations hold real promise. At least we should be able to find much better evidence than is now available to assess and classify the problems and to evaluate the precise role of schools. But, the practical changes that are now being attempted and that will be tried in schools in the near future also provide an opportunity for action research and evaluations that can greatly increase the factual base of useful knowledge.

The second concluding comment we offer is our belief that schools presently play a direct or unique role in the violence problem, independent of the underlying conditions of employment, family, and juvenile law enforcement institutions. While the main source of most serious offenses almost certainly lie in features of the broad society, we feel that schools can aggravate the problem or reduce it according to the way they organize them-

selves to dispense costs, rewards, and access to individual students. Although the evidence is indirect, we point to the relationship between school success and individual student offenses, to the associations between access to political or governing decisions and student attitudes, and to the correlation of school size and various serious problems to support this belief. Our conclusion is that there is reason to hope we can partially meet the student violence problem through practical changes in schools structure that are less drastic than trying to remold human personalities or change basic institutional roles and less simplistic than merely excluding the most serious offenders from schools.

FOOTNOTES

1. There are a few exceptions in the research literature that have concentrated on data relating to schools and delinquency, including Stinchcombe (1964), Polk and Schafer (1972), Walberg (1972), and Silberberg and Silberberg (1971). To be sure, many of the theorists and researchers who have concentrated on the role of social class factors in causing delinquency view the school as a middle class institution which creates serious problems of adjustment for working and lower class children.

According to Werthman (1967, p. 162):

> Recent sociology on gang boys has been very hard on the schools. Cloward and Ohlin suggest that lower class delinquents suffer from unequal "access to educational facilities;" Cohen points to their "failures in the classroom;" and Miller and Kvaraceus argue that a "conflict of culture" between school administrators and lower class students is precipitating delinquent behavior. Although there are many differences between contemporary sociological portraits of the lower class juvenile delinquent, the same model of his educational problem is used by all authors. Regardless of whether the delinquent is ambitious and capable, ambitious and incapable, or unambitious and incapable, the school is sketched as a monolith of middle class personnel against which he fares badly.

2. The portion of the "Safe Schools Study" being conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics includes the following offenses: offenses against persons (rape, robbery, assault, and theft/larceny); offenses against property (burglary, arson, bombings, and disorderly conduct which is defined as "unlawful assembly, not public demonstration, or other peer disturbance"); and other offenses (drug abuse, alcohol abuse, and weapons). The study includes only offenses that were reported to the police between the opening of the 1974-75 school year and January 31, 1975. In this study, data will also be reported on the dollar amount of school-owned property losses.

The part of the "Safe Schools Study" being conducted by the National Institute of Education will probably include (1) incident reports on school crimes, whether or not they have been reported to the police; (2) enumerations of crime prevention measures in schools; and (3) a victimization survey of students and teachers.

In the Equality of Education Opportunity survey (Coleman et al, 1966, p. 663) the list of "problems of discipline" in the Principal Questionnaire included "tension between racial or ethnic groups," along with "destruction of school property," "stealing of a serious nature," "physical violence against teachers," and "using narcotics or stimulants."

The survey of school disruption reported by Bailey (1970) used the following categories in its tabulations: teacher boycotts, student boycotts, arson, property damage, rioting, and student-teacher physical confrontations, among others. The tabulations also included whether there was a racial basis for each type of disruption.

3. See Gordon (1976) for a discussion of the advantages of using precise restricted measures.

4. See, for example, Gottfredson (1975) and Warren (1971). One similarity in these studies to the distinctions presented here is a recurrent suggestion that narcotics use is, for the most part, unrelated to the crimes of personal violence. See, for example, McAuliffe and Gordon and Gordon (1974, Table 9).

5. For a recent evidence supporting this finding on a national sample of 9,000 high school students, see Block (1975). See also appendix to this paper.

6. Cohen (1955, p. 183) cites several studies to support the "nonutilitarian" nature of juvenile theft. However, see our comments provided in footnote??

7. See, for example, Keniston (1968, pp. 314-320) on the "protest-prompting climate," and the "protest-producing historical situation," and Bailey (1970, p. 16) on the "ripple" effect from college protests to high school disruptions.

8. See the works of Keniston (1965, 1968, 1971 and 1973).

9. See U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1967, Vol. 2, Table 6.4, p. 96) for evidence supporting this proposition.

10. See Children's Defense Fund (1974) and Karweit (1973).

11. See Gottfredson (1967) for a treatment of assessment and prediction methods in delinquency, including the "base rate" problem and how it has raised questions concerning the practical effectiveness of well-known instruments and methods such as the Gluecks' (1959, 1960 and 1962), Kvaraceus' (1961), the MMPI (Hathaway and McKinley, 1951) and CPI (Gough, 1960).

12. See the discussion of labelling theory in the next section of this paper.

13. Karweit (1973).

14. For detailed systematic reviews of the theoretical perspectives on the nature and underlying causes of delinquency see Bordua (1962), Hirschi (1969), Yablonsky (1962), Polk and Schafer (1972), Rodman and Grams (1967), and Cohen and Short (1971).

15. There is serious disagreement between "labelling theorists" and "positivists" (Hirschi, 1975) regarding the substantial negative correlation between socioeconomic background and delinquency rates based on official statistics (i.e., police and court records). Gordon (1976, p. 1) cites twenty-three empirical studies documenting the relationship. Both Gordon and Hirschi emphasize that the disagreement may be a consequence of labelling advocates relying on "self-report" literature which, for the most part, shows that juveniles from lower class backgrounds are <u>not</u> more likely to "report" delinquent acts to researchers than those from middle or upper class backgrounds. Labelling advocates attempt to explain the disparity between

official statistics and self-report data with respect to social class differentials as an instance of overt discrimination by public officials against poor and black children. Both Gordon and Hirschi make a persuasive case that labelling theorists are unable to produce any systematic evidence to verify their propositions. Furthermore, Berg (1967, p. 306) notes that "At the very least it is possible to assert with considerable confidence that while crime and delinquency are likely to occur in all income groups, the particular types that preoccupy us as a society are concentrated among males in lower income groups living in urban centers."

16. However, Wolfgang (1968, p. 290) states "In many areas in large cities 70 percent or more of all juveniles under 18 years of age, at one time or another, may have been delinq ent" (italics addes). Furthermore, Wolfgang et al's study of a birth cohort of approximately 10,000 males born in 1945 who lived in Philadelphis continuously at least from their tenth to their eighteenth birthdays, revealed that 50 percent of the nonwhite males had been taken into custody by policy at least once.

17. Wolfgang (1958), Pokorny (1970), Pittman and Hardy (1970), and National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (1969, Chapter 11).

18. Federal Bureau of Investigation (1974). During 1973, 22.2 percent of total arrests for violent crimes and 48.1 percent of total arrests for property crimes were individuals aged 11-17, which is the usual period for enrollment in junior and senior high schools. Yet, only approximately 14.0 percent of the U.S. population is in this age range.

19. As Hirschi notes (1975, p. 198), "The main finding [of research on the treatment of delinquents] appears to be that 'spontaneous remission' occurs in the bulk of cases."

20. Glueck and Glueck (1968, p. 166). Cites in Hirschi (1975, p. 195).

21. See Cohen (1955, p. 183). Nevertheless, Rodman and Grams (1967, pp. 191-192) note that the non-utilitarian nature of gang delinquency is a topic of controversy among sociological researchers.

22. See Berg (1967). In a systematic analysis of U. S. Crime rates for the period 1933-67, Ehrlich (1970) shows that murder and assault are significantly and inversely related to unemployment rates, whereas the crimes of burgulary, robbery, and auto theft are positively associated with unemployment. Furthermore, Cook (n.d., p. 20) cites several studies which indicate that "...juvenile arrest rates tend to be positively correlated with unemployment rates both over time and across population groups.

23. See Graham (1969) for a detailed analysis of crime trends in the United States.

24. The most frequently cited theorists in this tradition are Merton (1957), Cohen (1955), and Cloward and Ohlin (1960). Some empirical examinations of this theme in the school setting are by Stinchcombe (1964) and Polk and Schafer (1972).

25. As Merton (1959, p. 178) notes, "...it [the theory] centers on the acute pressures created by the discrepancy between culturally induced goals and socially structured opportunities. The responses to these pressures with the consequent strain upon individuals subject to them may involve a considerable degree of frustration and of nonrational or irrational behavior. 'Destructiveness' has often been psychologically identified as one form of response to continued frustration."

26. Sutherland and Cressey (1974, pp. 75-93) have developed the perspective of "differential association" which Cloward and Ohlin (1960) combine with the Mertonian thesis (1957) of deviance under their framework of "differential opportunities."

27. Some tests of hypotheses derived from differential association are presented in Jensen (1972), Liska (1974), and Short (1960).

28. See especially Miller (1958) and Fannin and Clinard (1965).

29. This holds for both material possessions and for educational aspirations. See for example Coleman, et al, (1966).

30. Wolfgang (1958, 1968, 1970, 1972 and 1973) provides the definitive statements and research on the subculture of violence.

31. See, for example, Etzioni (1971, p. 718-721).

32. See the report Youth: Transition to Adulthood (Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee, 1973) and Wolfgang (1967, pp. 147-148) for elaborations of this theme.

33. See Haskell and Yablonsky (1974), Chapter 8), Rodman and Grams (1967), Feldman (1969), and Quay (1965). Feldman (1969) outlines five different psychoanalytic conceptions of crime: (1) neurotic acting-out of need for punishment for oedipal reasons, (2) anti-social character suffering from defective socialization, (3) substitute behavior for needs ordinarily met by the family, (4) anti-social character resulting from family ambivalence towards norms prohibiting criminality, and (5) a psychoanalytic conception of anomie.

34. Haskell and Yablonsky (1974, p. 226), Reiss (1952), and Rodman and Grams (1967, p. 204).

35. Peterson and Becker (1965) and Rodman and Grams (1967) systematically review the literature on family interaction and delinquency.

36. Peterson and Becker (1965, p. 76). See also Lystad (1974). However, Robert A. Gordon, in a personal communication, states that his work in progress shows that 80 percent of his samples of white and black male delinquents experienced physical punishment in excess of the amount falling one white middle class standard deviation above the white middle class mean.

37. Some of the more influential proponents of this approach are Becker (1963), Wheeler and Cottrell (1966, pp. 22-27), and Schur (1971).

38. Berg (1967, pp. 305-306).

39. See Hirschi (1975) for a critical evaluation of labelling theory.

40. See, for example, Haskell and Yablonsky (1974, p. 540) and Morris and Hawkins (1970).

41. See especially Jencks (1972).

42. Wolfgang (1968, p. 304, 1970, p. 54).

43. Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee (1973).

44. Rodman and Grams (1967) and Haskell and Yablonsky (1974).

45. Polk and Schafer (1972) make use of the labelling theme in their analysis of the contributions of schools to delinquency. Kelley (1971, 1975) has analyzed track placement of students from an analogous position, while Hirschi (1975) provides one of the most trenchant critcisms of the labelling perspective in the delinquency literature.

46. In addition, the interpretations from three recent large-scale studies are that, for the most part, school disorders and violence are microcosmic reflections of the political and social climate of the larger society and that they stem from social forces external to the school (Bailey, 1970; Meyer, Chase-Dunn and Inverantz, 1971; and Ritterband and Silberstein, 1973).

47. Research which reports a high correlation over time for student grades, and a high correlation between concurrent grades in different subjects includes Coleman, et al (1966) and Summers and Wolfe (1975a and 1975b).

48. The delinquency literature is replete with references to a strong negative correlation between school performance and law violations among adolescents (Kvaraceus, 1945; Stinchcombe, 1964; Haskell and Yablonsky, 1974), including some claims that location and labelling in the reward structure of the school is an equally or more important determinant of nonconformity than are family background characteristics (Schafer and Polk, 1967). However, previous researchers, so far as we can determine, have not examined whether school success has a unique effect over and above social background and academic ability. Furthermore, there are those who would not be convinced by a unique relationship of school success and delinquency. For example, Gordon (1976, pp. 266-267): "Because the school is the first extrafamilial institution in the life cycle that is intensively studied, and because intellectual and behavioral difficulties are likely to appear there first simply because of timing, some persons may be overly hasty in assigning educational difficulties a primary role in the causation of delinquency."

49. This should include studies of the diversity of human talents, to identify the non-academic skills which society needs and rewards that schools might take direct notice of in their programs. See Berg (1971, Chapter 3), Wolfle (1969) and Holland and Richards (1967) on nonacademic accomplishments.

50. Tien, Reppetto, and Hanes (1975, pp. 154-162).

51. Tien and Reppetto (1975, p. 179) quote a report from School Product News, Vol. 12, Nov. 6, 1973, which they describe as "a product-oriented professional advertising journal directed at school administrators and school department purchasing agents." See also statements from school security officer representatives reported in Education Daily, Nov. 6, 1975, p. 6.

52. See, for example, article by Chambers (1975) New York Times, Nov. 30, 1975, "Radical Changes Urged in Dealing With Youth Crime", and discussion of the juvenile justice system in Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967, Chapter 1).

53. Comments on school response to behavior problems may be found in Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967, pp. 51-52, 249-256).

54. We are indebted to James Fennessey of Johns Hopkins University for proposing research involving a census of school rewards and for working papers that use the framework of school responsiveness.

55. For evidence relating to the effectiveness of monetary incentives as a deterrent to vandalism (i.e. a "vandalism depletion allowance") in the South San Francisco Unified School District, see National School Public Relations Association (1975, p. 67). The "secret witness" program is also discussed in National School Public Relations Association.

56. In Gross vs. Lopez (419 U.S. 565, 1975), the Supreme Court ruled that students in public schools cannot be suspended or expelled without due process of law. Testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to investigate Juvenile Delinquency (Phay, 1975) has emphasized this issue and recommended a written student misconduct code for all boards of education. See also Buss (1974).

57. See, for example, Children's Defense Fund (1975) and the Center for Law and Education (1975).

58. See, for example, National Education Association (1971), American Civil Liberties Union (1968), and National School Public Relations Association (1973).

59. Wilson (1975) is a major spokesman for analogous reforms for adult crime.

60. Some sympathetic observers of the best financed and operated juvenile justice systems, who also recognize the existence of a hard core of offenders have concluded: "To cope with this problem [of youth crime] it is necessary to develop mechanisms to divert troublesome youth from the juvenile justice system" (Haskell and Yablonsky, 1974, p. 540).

61. McCord and McCord (1959), Miller (1962), Meyer, Borgotta, and Jones (1965), and Haskell and Yablonsky (1974, Chapter Fourteen).

62. Empey and Rabow (1961). However, recent studies have not shown consistently positive effects (Empey and Lubeck, 1971a, and Empey and Erickson, 1972).

63. Cohen (1972).

64. Haskell and Yablonsky (1974, Chapter 17).

65. McPartland et al (1971). See also Alexander and Farrell (1973), Anderson (1973) and Strauss (1974a, 1974b).

66. For example, Lipset (1963).

67. McPartland and McDill (1974).

68. See, for example, Westin (1970), Dreeben (1967), and American Civil Liberties Union (1968).

69. McPartland et al (1971 Pp. 30-34, 115-117). See also Golden and Rosen (1966).

70. Epstein and McPartland (1975).

71. Barker and Gump (1964).

72. Meyer and Chase-Dunn (1971) also worked with these data, using different analytic methods and an estimate of size based on principal responses. Because there were serious errors from principals incorrectly gridding their answers on machine readable forms, we used an estimate based on the actual count of students who took tests at each schools as part of the same survey.

73. The published materials on practical aids to meet the discipline problems within the routine operation of public schools include American School Board (1975), Armstrong (1972), Burger (1974), Clement (1975) Coppock (1973), Coursen (1975), Edgar (1974), Grealy (1973), McGowan (1973), National Education Association (1974, 1975a, 1975b), National School Public Relations Association (no date), National Committee for Citizens in Education (1975), Reagan (1973), Panel on School Safety, Academy for Educational Development (1975), and United Federation of Teachers (1974).

74. See Rossi (1972) on important considerations in conducting successful action research.

APPENDIX

The analyses conducted for this paper are based on several data sources and methods, and the discussions of results in the text are based on findings presented below.

Sources of Data and Measurement

The following four data sets and measures are used:

I. Twenty High School Sample. These data were collected in 1964 and 1965 for the study of educational climates reported in McDill and Ribsby (1973). Survey data were obtained from 20,345 high school students in twenty public coeducational high schools from seven geographical areas and eight states which were selected to reflect variability in demographic, socioeconomic, and community characteristics. Only 0.2 percent of the students were black.

The measures of student background (back) used in the present analyses are:

1. Ability level, as measured by a standardized test of abstract reasoning from the Project TALENT battery.
2. Father's education--reported in the student questionnaire by each individual.
3. Mother's education--reported in the student questionnaire.
4. Father's occupation, an eight-category census classification which was developed from student questionnaire responses.
5. Family size, based on each student's report in the questionnaire of number of brothers and sisters.

The measures of school experience (SCH) are:

1. Grade point average, which was self-reported by each student on the questionnaire.
2. English grades, which were obtained from official school files for each student.

The measure of student offenses is a scale based on the following five student self-reported behaviors while in high school.

1. been arrested
2. sent to juvenile court
3. cut school
4. destroyed or defaced school property
5. ran around with kids who got into trouble with the law

II. Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, D.C. High School Sample.

These data were obtained in December, 1969, and January, 1970, for a study reported in McPartland et al (1971). Survey data were collected from a representative one-fourth sample of students in the eleventh and twelfth grades of each of fourteen schools in two large urban school systems. The sample consisted of 3450 students, of which 58 percent were black.

The measures of student background (BACK) used in the present analysis are:

1. Father's education, as reported by each student.
2. Mother's education, as reported by each student.
3. Material wealth of the home--a scale based on student responses to a check-list of ten possible family possessions (e.g. color TV, air conditioner, electric dishwasher).
4. Family size--the number of brothers and sisters reported by each student.

The measures of school experiences (SCH) are:

1. Mathematics grade for the previous year, as reported by each student.
2. English grade for the previous year, as reported by each student.
3. Grade point average for the previous year, as reported by each student.

There are three measures of student offenses that are used in separate analyses.

1. Been suspended from present school (No or Yes), as reported by each student.

2. Been sent to the principal's office for breaking school rules (No; Yes, once or twice; Yes, several times), as self-reported by each student.

3. Student protest scale, which is a combination of student responses to three questionnaire items.

   a. Do you approve of most student protests and demonstrations in high schools and colleges? (Definitely yes; Yes; No; Definitely no).

   b. Have you taken part in any protests or demonstrations in this school (six answers ranging from "I helped to plan, organize or lead the protest" to "I openly opposed the goals of the protestors.")

   c. "Students can only get really important changes here by having a protest or demonstration to force the change." (Strongly agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly disagree.)

III. Six High and Ten Middle Schools from a Suburban School System in Maryland.

The sample included all elementary and secondary schools in a system selected for the variation in school organization as required by the study reported in Epstein and McPartland (1975). The student survey data were collected in Spring, 1974, from 7361 students in grades 5, 6, 7, 9 and 12. Students in grades 7, 9 and 12 are analyzed here because academic tests score data were also available. The sample is approximately 12 percent black and 88 percent white.

The measures of student background (BACK) used in the present analyses are:

1. Comprehensive Achievement Scores on Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Available in grades 7 and 9, but not 12).

2. Mathematics Achievement Score on Iowa Test of Basic Skills (in 7 and 9, not 12).

3. a. Language Achievement Score on Iowa Test of Basic Skills (in 7 and 9, not 12).

   b. Reading Comprehension Test score on Iowa Test of Basic Skills (used in grade 12 only).

4. Race

5. Parents' education--a combined score based on each student's report of mother's and father's education.

6. Material wealth of the home--a scale based on student responses to a check-list of twenty-three possible family possessions.

7. Family size--the number of brothers and sisters reported by each student.

The measures of school experience (SCH) are:

1. English grade for previous year, as reported by each student.

2. Mathematics grade for last year, as reported by each student.

The two measures of student offenses are the same as the first two described above for Sample II:

1. Suspension from School

2. Frequency of Office Discipline

IV. National Sample of Schools with Principals' Reports of Student Offenses.

Data were analyzed which were collected in 1965 for the Equality of Educational Opportunity survey (Coleman et al, 1966). This included information from principals in all areas of the country and involved 938 schools having a ninth grade and 792 schools having a twelfth grade. The unit of analysis for the data set is the school, while that for the other three data sets is the individual student.

The measure of school size is the number of students in grade 9 or grade 12 who responded to self-administered questionnaires.

Measures of the five control variables consist of the average (i.e., mean) of each school for students' scores on the following items:

1. Verbal ability, as obtained from the 60 item test used in the survey.
2. Percent non-white students, as obtained from student self-reports.
3. Family size, as obtained from student self-reports.
4. Father's education, as reported by students.
5. Mother's education, as reported by students.

The school delinquency scale is a combination for each school of the principal's estimate of the severity of the problem in seven areas (on a four-category rating of severity):

1. Destruction of school property
2. Impertinence to teachers
3. Tension between racial or ethnic groups
4. Stealing of a serious nature
5. Physical violence against teachers
6. Use of narcotics or stimulants
7. Drinking intoxicants on school property

Methods

Multiple regression analysis is used to estimate the relative importance of school factors and background factors in accounting for school delinquency.

The accompanying tables present estimates of effects, all of which are expressed in terms of "percent of variance explained" (or the squared multiple correlation coefficient).

1. Uncontrolled relationships: the percent of variance accounted for in a regression equation using only the background measures as the independent variables, or only the school measures as the independent variables.

2. Partial relationships: These components of variance explained are designated:

   a. "unique" for background or controls, which is equal to the difference between the squared multiple correlation from the regression that includes both background and school measures as independent variables and the squared multiple correlation from the regression using only school measures.

   b. "unique" for school, which is equal to the difference between the squared multiple correlation from the regression that includes both background and school variables and the squared multiple correlation from the regression that includes only background variables.

   c. "joint" for background and school, which is equal to the difference between the squared multiple correlation from the regression that includes both background and school variables and the sum of the two "unique" components.

   d. "total" percent of variance explained, which is the squared multiple correlation coefficient from the regression equation that includes all measures of school and background as independent variables.

   e. F-statistic for gain in R^2 due to Background, which is the test statistic used to determine the statistical significance of the "unique" partial relationship of the background variables. This test statistic is described in Cohen (1968) and Kerlinger and Pehazur (1973).

   f. F-statistics for gain in R^2 due to School, which is the test statistic used to determine the statistical significance of the "unique" partial relationship of the school variables.

In these analyses there is an interesting case of a "supressor variable" that produces a negative estimate of the "joint" variance accounted for by Background and School, especially the results involving school size. A suppressor variable is possible when there are two

independent variables (or two clusters of independent variables) and a mixture of positive and negative correlations between the two independent variables and between each independent variable and the dependent variable. In the case of a suppressor variable, the predictive power of one independent variable is taken into account. In the example given in Table 4, school size is positively correlated with both the socio-economic composition of the student body is negatively related to delinquency. In this example, we actually underestimate the importance of school size in relationship to student offenses if we fail to control on important background factors of the student body. This is reflected in Table 4 by the negative joint component or by the fact that the partial relationships are larger than the uncontrolled relationships.

Results

Three different questions are addressed with the findings given in Tables 1 - 4: (1) the unique role of schools in accounting for student offenses; (2) the relationship of school size to problems of student offenses, given student background factors; and (3) the internal and external relationships for different types of student offenses.

1. The Unique Role of Schools

There are 36 different sets of regression analyses reported in Tables 1 and 2, depending upon the sample, age, race, sex, and dependent variable being considered. Table 1 reports results from Samples I, II and III, where the Scale of Student Offenses is the dependent variable for Sample I, and School Suspension is the dependent variable for Samples II and III. Table 2 presents analyses for Samples II and III using the Frequency of Office Discipline as the dependent variable.

As indicated by the test statistics, 32 of the 36 estimates for unique school effects are statistically significant. This provides the basis for concluding that school has an independent or direct association with the probability of student offenses.

The background variables in these tables frequently do not have a statistically significant relationship with the measures of student offenses, which is contrary to our expectations that socioeconomic variables would be significantly (and negatively) related to delinquency. However, an inspection of the signs of the regression coefficients for the total equations (not given here) shows the various components of student background to be consistently in the predicted direction, although the individual coefficients are usually not statistically significant. That is, the regression coefficients are in the direction indicating disadvantaged students to be more prone to student offenses. Gordon (1976, p. 272) discusses how self-reported data on offenses, such as the information being used in Tables 1 and 2, can create incorrectly small relationships for socioeconomic measures. In an earlier publication, Gordon (1967) shows how the distribution of variables and cutting-points used in measurement can effect estimated relationships such as these.

2. The Relationship of School Size to Student Offenses.

Table 4 describes the relationship between school size and the Principal's Scale of Student Offenses for four different subsets of Sample IV.

The subsets are (1) 939 schools throughout the U.S. having grade nine; (2) 358 of the 939 schools that are located in the areas of largest central cities and their surrounding suburbs (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas identified by the U.S. Census); (3) 792 schools throughout the U.S. having grade twelve; and (4) 245 of the 792 schools located in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

In each of the four regression analyses, school size is a statistically significant correlate of the severity of student offenses, after important student body background factors are taken into account.

3. Internal and External Consistencies of Specific Student Offenses.

A tentative classification of student offenses can be obtained from some differences in relationships found as a byproduct of our analyses for the above two questions.

The difference between most disciplinary offenses and student protests or demonstrations is suggested by a comparison of Table 3 with Tables 1 and 2. For Sample II, measures are available of suspensions, office discipline, and student protests. A comparison of the tables presented here indicates that school variables have a smaller importance relative to family characteristics for protests than for suspensions or office discipline. Inspection of the direction of the relationships indicated by sign of the regression coefficients (not shown here) suggests that protest-proneness is more a phenomenon of advantaged students, while other student offenses are more characteristic of disadvantaged individuals.

The possibility that drug abuse may be a somewhat independent type of student offense is suggested by some interesting correlations obtained from Sample IV. There is one subsample of schools (N = 42) in central city areas where school size was correlated negatively with all types of student problems except use of drugs and alcohol. The correlation coefficients (following the same order of offenses as listed in the description of Sample IV above) are: -.16 -.07 -.36 -.22 -.06 +.04 +.10. Also, the following intercorrelation matrix from Sample IV suggests that drugs and alcohol may cluster together apart from other offenses:

1	2	4	5	6	7
1.00	.46	.30	.24	.13	.24
	1.00	.37	.28	.16	.27
		1.00	.33	.29	.26
			1.00	.24	.36
				1.00	.40
					1.00

TABLE 1

PERCENT VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR IN STUDENT OFFENSES
BY STUDENT BACKGROUND (BACK) AND SCHOOL (SCH)

Data Source, Sex, Grade, Race (Sample Size)	Uncontrolled Relationships		Partial Relationships			Percent of Total Variance Explained	F-statistic Gain in R^2 due to:	
	BACK	SCH	Unique BACK	Unique SCH	Joint B & S		BACK	SCH
I Male 9 (889)	1.1	6.1	0.3	5.2	0.8	6.4	0.6	24.7***
I M 10 (3411)	1.4	4.2	0.4	3.2	1.0	4.6	2.6*	56.3***
I M 11 (3430)	0.7	5.9	0.3	5.5	0.4	6.2	2.1	99.2***
I M 12 (2612)	0.5	4.6	0.2	4.4	0.2	4.9	1.2	60.2***
I Female 9 (825)	3.1	5.3	1.3	3.5	1.4	6.7	2.4*	15.4***
I F 10 (3433)	6.0	2.1	4.2	0.2	1.9	6.3	30.5***	4.7**
I F 11 (3166)	0.7	4.3	0.2	3.9	0.4	4.5	1.7	64.0***
I F 12 (2576)	0.8	2.6	0.5	2.3	0.3	3.1	2.6*	30.1***
II M 12 White (370)	0.1	7.6	0.4	7.9	-0.3	8.0	0.7	10.8***
II M 12 Black (381)	1.6	6.9	1.1	6.5	0.4	8.1	1.1	8.8***
II M 11 W (449)	1.8	5.2	1.5	4.9	0.3	6.7	1.8	7.8***
II M 11 B (496)	0.5	4.6	0.6	4.7	-0.1	5.2	0.7	8.1***
II F 12 W (277)	1.5	5.8	0.9	5.2	0.5	6.7	0.7	5.0**
II F 12 B (545)	2.4	2.5	1.7	1.8	0.7	4.2	2.4	3.4*
II F 11 W (277)	0.7	2.6	1.2	3.2	-0.5	3.9	0.9	3.0*
II F 11 B (540)	1.0	3.4	1.4	3.7	-0.3	4.8	1.9	7.0***
III M 12 (286)	2.9	0.3	3.8	1.2	-1.0	4.1	2.2*	1.8
III M 9 (651)	5.3	10.1	1.6	6.4	3.7	11.7	6.0***	1.4
III M 7 (772)	7.4	0.3	7.2	0.1	0.3	7.4	7.5***	14.0***
III F 12 (370)	7.1	1.1	6.7	0.7	0.4	7.8	8.4***	0.3
III F 9 (692)	3.2	2.6	2.2	1.6	1.0	4.7	2.2*	5.6***
III F 7 (744)	9.4	6.5	6.3	3.3	3.2	12.8	1.6	23.2***

*** = $p < .001$
** = $p < .005$
* = $p < .05$

TABLE 2

PERCENT VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR IN FREQUENCY OF OFFICE DISCIPLINE
BY STUDENT BACKGROUND (BACK) AND SCHOOL (SCH)

Data Source, Sex, Grade, Race (Sample Size)	Uncontrolled Relationships		Partial Relationships			Percent of Total Variance Explained	F-statistic Gain in R^2 due to:	
	BACK	SCH	Unique BACK	Unique SCH	Joint B & S		BACK	SCH
II M 12 White (370)	1.4	9.1	0.4	8.0	1.0	9.5	0.4	10.7***
II M 12 Black (381)	0.5	3.1	0.7	3.3	-0.2	3.8	0.7	4.3**
II M 11 W (449)	0.8	5.8	0.4	5.4	0.4	6.2	0.4	8.5***
II M 11 B (496)	0.8	3.0	0.8	3.0	0.0	3.8	1.0	5.1**
II F 12 W (277)	0.3	8.5	0.4	8.6	-0.1	8.9	0.3	8.5***
II F 12 B (545)	1.4	2.7	1.1	2.4	0.3	3.8	1.5	4.4**
II F 11 W (277)	1.0	0.9	1.6	1.5	-0.6	2.5	1.1	1.4
II F 11 B (540)	0.3	2.9	0.4	3.0	-0.1	3.3	0.6	5.6***
III M 12 (286)	8.0	7.3	4.4	3.7	3.6	11.7	2.8*	5.8*
III M 9 (651)	12.6	8.8	8.6	4.7	4.0	17.4	9.5***	18.4***
III M 7 (772)	9.6	4.8	6.8	2.1	2.8	11.9	8.4***	8.9***
III F 12 (370)	5.2	7.4	2.3	4.6	2.8	9.7	1.9	9.1***
III F 9 (692)	9.2	7.3	3.9	2.0	5.3	11.2	4.3***	7.7***
III F 7 (744)	10.5	8.0	5.4	2.9	5.1	13.4	6.5***	12.5***

*** = $p < .001$

** = $p < .005$

* = $p < .05$

TABLE 3

PERCENT VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR IN STUDENT PROTEST SCALE
BY STUDENT BACKGROUND (BACK) AND SCHOOL (SCH)

Data Source, Sex, Grade, Race (Sample Size)	Uncontrolled Relationships		Partial Relationships			Percent of Total Variance Explained	F-statistic Gain in R^2 due to:	
	BACK	SCH	Unique BACK	Unique SCH	Joint B & S		BACK	SCH
II M 12 White (370)	4.4	0.5	4.2	0.3	0.2	4.7	4.0**	0.4
II M 12 Black (381)	1.3	0.3	1.5	0.6	-0.2	1.8	1.5	0.7
II M 11 W (449)	2.5	1.1	3.6	1.1	-1.0	3.7	2.9*	1.7
II M 11 B (496)	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.0	-0.1	4.0	2.7*	3.4*
II F 12 W (277)	0.9	1.4	1.3	1.7	-0.4	2.6	0.9	1.6
II F 12 B (545)	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.8
II F 11 W (277)	4.2	1.9	4.2	1.9	0.0	6.1	3.0*	1.8
II F 11 B (540)	1.4	0.5	1.6	0.7	-0.2	2.1	2.1*	1.3

** = $p < .005$
* = $p < .05$

TABLE 4

PERCENT VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR IN SCHOOL DELINQUENCY[1]
BY SCHOOL SIZE AND FIVE CONTROLS[2]

Sample of Schools	Uncontrolled Relationships		Partial Relationships			Percent of Total Variance Explained
	Size	Controls	Unique:[3] Size	Unique: Controls	Joint: S & C	
Grade 9, Nation (N=938)	3.9	0.9	5.2	2.1	-1.2	6.1
Grade 9, SMSA (N=358)	2.4	6.3	4.5	8.4	-2.1	10.8
Grade 12, Nation (N=792)	2.4	4.4	2.1	4.1	0.3	6.5
Grade 12, SMSA (N=245)	2.5	3.9	6.3	7.7	-3.8	10.2

1/ School Delinquency is a scale based on the School Principals' estimate of the severity of the problem in seven areas: destruction of school property, impertinence to teachers, tension between racial or ethnic groups, stealing of a serious nature, physical violence against teachers, use of narcotics or stimulants, and drinking intoxicants on school property.

2/ The five control variables are each an average for the student body at the particular grade: Average Verbal Ability, Percent Non-White Students, Average Family Size, Average Father's Education, Average Mother's Education.

3/ The F statistic for the values in this column are 43.7, 15.9, 14.9, 15.2 all of which are significant with a probability of error less than .001.

References

Ahlstrom, W. M. and R. J. Havighurst.
1971 Four Hundred Losers: Delinquent Boys in High School. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Alexander, W. E. and J. P. Farrell.
1973 A Study of Student Participation in Decision-Making in Ontario Secondary Schools. Ontario, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

American Civil Liberties Union.
1968 Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools. Washington: American Civil Liberties Union.

American School Board.
1975 "Violence in the schools: Now some solutions." American School Board Journal 162:27-37.

Anderson, B. D.
1973 "School bureaucratization and alienation from high school." Sociology of Education 46:315-344.

Armstrong, Ronald.
1972 Student Involvement. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Bailey, Stephen K.
1970 Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools. Washington: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Barker, Roger G. and Paul V. Gump.
1964 Big School, Small School: High School Size and Student Behavior. Stanford California: Stanford University Press.

Bayh, Birch.
1975 Our Nation's Schools-A Report Card: "A" in School Violence and Vandalism. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Becker, Howard.
1963 Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: The Free Press.

Berg, Ivar.
1967 "Economic factors in delinquency". Pp. 305-316 in President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1971 Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery. Boston: Beacon Press.

Block, J. Richard.
1975 "Behavioral and demographic correlates of drug use among students in grades 7-12." Pp. 263-276 in Lettari, Dan J. (Ed.) Predicting

Adolescent Drug Abuse: A Review of Issues, Methods and Correlates. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Bordua, David J.
1962 "Some comments on theories of group delinquency." Sociological Inquiry 32:

Brodsky, Stanley L. and Richard D. Knudten.
1973 Strategies for Delinquency Prevention in the Schools. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama.

Burger, Michael.
1974 Violence in the Schools: Causes and Remedies. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Buss, William G.
1971 Legal Aspects of Crime Investigations in the Public Schools. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Cavan, R. S.
1969 Juvenile Delinquency: Development, Treatment, Control, 2nd Ed. Phila.: Lippencott.

Center for Law and Education.
1975 "Discipline and student rights" Inequality in Education 22, 1-82.

Chesler, M. A. and P. Graham.
Alternative Responses to School Crisis and Experiements in Police-School Relations. Ann Arbor: Michigan University.

Children's Defense Fund.
1975 School Suspensions, Are They Helping Children? Cambridge, Massachusetts: Children's Defense Fund.
1974 Children Out of School in America. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Children's Defense Fund.

Clement, Stanley L.
1975 School Vandalism: causes and cures. NASSP Bulletin, 59.

Cloward, Richard A. and Lloyd E. Ohlin.
1960 Delinquency and Opportunity. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, Albert K. and James F. Short, Jr.
1971 "Crime and juvenile delinquency." Pp. 89-146 in Merton, Robert K. and Robert Nisbet (Eds.) Contemporary Social Problems. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovick.

Cohen, H. L.
1972 "Behavior modification and socially deviant youth." In C. E. Thoreson (ed.) Behavior Modification in Education: I. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Cohen, Jacob.
1968 "Multiple regression as a general data-analytic system." Psychological Bulletin 70:426-443.

Coleman, James S., Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederick D. Weinfeld, and Robert L. York.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Cook, Philip.
The Effect of Legitimate Opportunities on the Probability of Parolee Recidivism. Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs. Duke University.

Coppock, Nan.
1973 "School security." Educational Management Review Series, No. 23. Eugene Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. University of Oregon.

Coursen, David.
1975 "Vandalism prevention." School Leadership Digest, Second Series, Number One. Arlington, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Dreeben, Robert.
1967 "The contribution of schooling to the learning of norms." Harvard Educational Review 37:211-237.

Douglas, Jack D.
1970 Youth in Turmoil: America's Changing Youth Cultures and Student Protest Movements. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office: Public Health Services Publication No. 2058.

Durkheim, E.
1950 Rules of Sociological Method, Eighth Edition. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Edgar, James M. and Robert King.
1974 NCJRS Bibliography: Crime and School Security. Prepared for the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Ehrlich, I.
1970 Participation in Illegitimate Activities: An Economic Activities. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Columbia University.

Elliott, D. S. and H. L. Voss.
1974 Delinquency and Dropout. Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books.

Empey, La Mar T. and Jerome Rabow.
1961 "The Provo Experiment in delinquency rehabilitation." American Sociological Review 26:679-694.

Empey, La Mar T. and Steven G. Lubeck.
1971a The Silverlake Experiment. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
1971b Explaining Delinquency: Construction, Test, and Reformulations of a Sociological Theory. Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books.

Empey, La Mar T. and Maynard L. Erickson.
1972 The Provo Experiment. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.

Epstein, Joyce L. and James M. McPartland.
1975 "The effects of open school organization on student outcomes." Report No. 194. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University.

Erickson, Maynard L.
1973 "Group violations, socioeconomic status and official delinquency." Social Forces 52:41-52.

Etzioni, Amitai.
1971 "Violence." Pp. 709-741 in Merton, Robert K. and Robert Nisbet (Eds.) Contemporary Social Problems. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Fannin, Leon F. and Marshall B. Clinard.
1965 "Differences in the conception of self as a male among lower and middle class delinquents." Social Problems 13:205-215.

Federal Bureau of Investigation.
1973 Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1973. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Feierabend, I. K., R. L. Feierabend and B. A. Nesvold.
1969 "Social change and political: Cross-national patterns." Pp. 606-667 in H. R. Graham and T. G. Gurr (Eds.) Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives. New York: Signet Books.

Feldman, David.
1969 "Psychoanalysis and crime." Pp. 433-442 in Cressey, Donald R. and David A. Ward (Eds.) Delinquency, Crime, and Social Process. New York: Harper and Row.

Frease, Dean E.
1973 "Delinquency, social class, and the schools." Sociology and Social Research 57:443-459.

Gibbons, Don C.
1972 "Observations on the study of crime causation." American Journal of Sociology 77:263.

Glueck, E.T.
1960 "Efforts to identify delinquency." Federal Probation. 24: June, 49-56.
1962 "Toward improving the identification of delinquents." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 53:164-170.

Glueck, S. and E. T. Glueck.
1950 Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
1959 Predicting Delinquency and Crime. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
1968 Delinquents and Nondelinquents in Perspective. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Golden, M. Patricia and Ned A. Rosen.
1966 "Student attitudes toward participation in University administration: An empirical study related to managerial prerogatives." Journal of College Student Personnel, 323-330.

Goldmeier, Harold.
1974 "Vandalism: The effects of unmanageable confrontations." Adolescence 9:49-56.

Gordon, Robert A.
1967 "Issues in the ecological study of delinquency." American Sociological Review 32:927-944.
1976 "Prevalence: The rare datum in delinquency measurement and its implications for the theory of delinquency." Pp. 201-284 in Malcolm W. Klein (Ed.), The Juvenile Justice System, Vol. 5. Sage Criminal Justice System Annual. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Gottfredson, Don M.
1967 "Assessment and prediction methods in crime and delinquency." Pp. 171-187 In the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Gottfredson, Gary D.
1975 "Organizing crime: a classificatory scheme based on offense transitions." Journal of Criminal Justice.

Gough, H. G.
1960 "Theory and measurement of socialization." Journal of Consulting Psychology 24:23-30.

Gove, Walter R.
1970 "Societal reaction as an explanation of mental illness: an evaluation." American Sociological Review 35:873-884.

Graham, Fred P.
1969 "A contemporary history of American crime." Pp. 460-478 in Hugh D. Graham and Ted R. Gurr (Eds.), Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives. New York: The New American Library.

Graecen, J.

Grealy, Joseph L.
1973 "Safety and security in the school environment." School Management. November/December.
1974 "Criminal activity in the schools: What's being done about it?" NAASP Bulletin 58:73-78.

Greenberg, Bernard.
1969 School Vandalism: A National Dilemma. Final Report. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute.

Gurr, T. R.
1969 "A comparative study of civil strife." Pp. 544-605 in H. R. Graham and T. G. Gurr (Eds.), Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives. New York: Signet Books.

Gwagney, William.
1956 "Do our schools prevent or promote delinquency?" Journal of Educational Research, 50:215-219.

Haskell, Martin R. and Lewis Yablonsky.
1974 Juvenile Delinquency. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Hathaway, S. R. and McKinley, J. C.
1951 The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Manual (Revised). New York: Psychological Corp.

Hindelang, Michael J.
1971 "Age, sex and the versatility of delinquent involvements." Social Problems 18:522-535.

Hirschi, Travis.
1969 Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
1975 "Labelling theory and juvenile delinquency: An assessment of the evidence." Pp. 181-203 in W. R. Gove, (Ed.), The Labelling of Deviance: Evaluating a Perspective. New York: Halsted/Sage.

Holland, John L.
1966 "The prediction of academic and nonacademic accomplishment." In Educational Testing Service, Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, 1966. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.
1967 "The many faces of talent." Journal of Educational Psychology 58:205-209.

Hunt, Jane.
1969 "Principals' report on student protest." American Education: 4-5.

Jeffery, C. Ray.
1971 Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Jencks, Christopher.
1972 Inequality. New York: Basic Books.

Jensen, Gary F.
1972 "Parents, peers and delinquent action: A test of the differential association perspective." American Journal of Sociology 78:562-575.

Karweit, Nancy L.
1973 "Rainy days and Mondays: An analysis of factors related to absence from school." Report No. 162. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University.

Kelly, Delos H.
1971 "School failure, academic self-evaluation and school avoidance and deviant behavior." Youth and Society 2:489-503. "Track position and delinquent involvement: a preliminary analysis." Sociology and Social Research :381-386.
1975 Status origins, track position, and delinquent involvement: A self-report analysis. The Sociological Quarterly 16:264-271.

Keniston, Kenneth.
1965 The Uncommitted. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
1968 Young Radicals. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
1971 Youth and Dissent. The Rise of a New Opposition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
1973 Radicals and Militants: An Annotated Bibliography of Empirical Research on Campus Unrest. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Kerlinger, Fred N. and Elazer J. Pehazur.
1973 Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kitsuse, John I. and David C. Dietrick.
1959 "Delinquent boys: a critique." American Sociological Review 24: 208-215.

Kvaraceus, William C.
1945 Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools. Yonkers, New York: World Book Company.
1961 "Forecasting juvenile delinquency: a three year experiment." Experimental Children 18:429-435.

Leggett, Stanton, et al.
1970 "The case for a small high school." Education Digest 36:15-18.

Lipset, S. M.
1963 Political Man: The Social Basis of Politics. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Liska, Allen.
1974 "Comments on Jensen's 'Parents, peers, and delinquent action'." American Journal of Sociology 74:999-1002.

Lystad, Mary (Ed.).
1974 Violence at Home: An Annotated Bibliography. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

McAuliffe, William E. and Robert A. Gordon.
1974 "A test of Lindesmith's theory of addiction: The frequency of euphoria among long-term addicts." American Journal of Sociology 795-840.

McCord, Joan and William McCord.
1959 "A follow-up report on the Cambridge-Somerville youth study." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 322:89-98.

McDill, Edward L. and Leo C. Rigsby.
1973 Structure and Process in Secondary Schools: The Academic Impact of Educational Climates. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

McGowan, William N.
"Crime control in public schools: space age solutions." NASSP Bulletin 57, 1973.

McPartland, James M. and Edward L. McDill.
1974 High school rules and decision-making procedures as sources of school stability." Report No. 169. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University.

McPartland, James, Edward L. McDill, Colin Lacey, Rubie J. Harris, and Lawrence B. Novey.
1971 "Student participation in high school decisions." Report No. 95. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University.

Merton, Robert K.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Meyer, Henry I., Borgotta, Edgar F., and Jones, Wyatt C.
1965 Girls at Vocational High. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Meyer, John W., Chase-Dunn, Chris and Inveranty, James.
1971 The Expansion of the Autonomy of Youth: Responses of the Secondary School to Problems of Order in the 1960's. Stanford Research and Development Center Technical Report #41.

Miller, Walter B.
1958 "Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency." Journal of Social Issues 14:5-19.
1962 "The impact of a 'total-community' delinquency control project." Social Problems 10:168-191.

Monahon, Thomas P.
1957 "Family status and the delinquent child." Social Forces 35:250-258.

Mood, A. M.
1971 "Partitioning variance in multiple regression analyses as a tool for developing learning models." American Educational Research Journal 8:191-202.

Morris, Norval and Gordon Hawkins.
1970 The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime Control. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

National Association of Secondary School Principals.
1974 "School vandalism--causes and cures." National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin 387:17-21.

National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.
1969 Crimes of Violence, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office.

National Committee for Citizens in Education.
1975 Violence in our Schools: What to Know About It, What to Do About It. Columbia, Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

National Education Association of the United States.
1971 Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Washington: National Education Association.
1974 References on Vandalism and Security Systems in Public Schools.
1974 Discipline in the Classroom. Revised Edition. Washington: National Education Association.
1975a Report and Working Papers, Thirteenth National Conference on Civil and Human Rights. Washington: National Educational Association.
1975b "Danger-School ahead: Violence in the Public Schools." Pp. 1-12 in Project 1975: Educational Neglect, On-Site and Research Reports. Washington: National Education Association.

National School Boards Association.
1971 School Board Policies on Student Discipline: Educational Policies Development Kit. Waterford, Conn.: National School Boards Association.

National School Public Relations Association.
no date Discipline Crisis in Schools-The Problems, Causes and Search for Solutions. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association.

National School Public Relations Association.
1975 Violence and Vandalism: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association.

National School Public Relations Association.
1973 Discipline Crisis in Schools. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association.
1975 Violence and Vandalism: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association.

National Urban League.
1971 The Problem of Discipline/Control and Security in Our Schools. New York: National Urban League.

Newman, O.
197 Defensible Space.

Noylis, Helen.
1975 Drugs Demystified. Paris: The Unesco Press.

Palmore, Edman and Phillip Hammond.
1964 "Interacting factors in juvenile delinquency." American Sociological Review 29:848-854.

Panel on School Safety, Academy for Educational Development.
1975 A Safer Environment for Learning. New York: Academy for Educational Development.

Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee.
1973 Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Peters, E.L.
1969 "Public school attitudes toward juvenile delinquents." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 6:56-62.

Peterson, Donald R. and Wesley C. Becker.
1965 "Family interaction and delinquency." Pp. 63-99 in Quay, Herbert C. (Ed.) Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Van Nostrand.

Phay, Robert E.
1975 Written Student Conduct Codes: An Essential Ingredient in Reducing and Controlling Student Misconduct. Statement Before the Senate Judiciary Subcommitte to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, September 17, 1975.

Phillips, L.
1972 "Crime, youth and the labor market." Journal of Political Economy 80:491-504.

Pittman, David J. and William Handy.
1970 "Patterns in criminal aggravated assault." Pp. 90-99 in Bruce J. Cohen (Ed.) Crime in America. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers.

Polk, Kenneth and Walter E. Schafer.
1972 Schools and Delinquency. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Pokorny, Alex D.
"A Comparison of homicides in two cities." Pp. 60-69 in Bruce J. Cohen (Ed.), Crime in America. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers.

Prescott, James W.
1971 "Early somatosensory deprivation as an ontogenetic process in the abnormal development of the brain and behavior." Pp. 1-20 in I. E. Goldsmith and J. Moor-Jankowski (Eds.), Medical Prematology. New York: S. Karger, Basel.
1975 "Body pleasure and the origins of violence." The Futurist, April:64-74.

Prentice, N. M. and Kelly, F. J.
1963 "Intelligence and delinquency: a reconsideration." The Journal of Social Psychology 60:327-337.

Pucinski, Roman C.
1970 "Results of survey on student unrest in the nation's high schools." Congressional Record: E1178-E1180.

Quay, Herbert C.
1965 "Personality and delinquency." Pp. 139-169 in Quay, Herbert C. (Ed.), Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Van Nostrand.

Reagan, Michael V.
1973 School Security: Nobody Here But Us People To Provide It. Miami, Florida: National Institute on School Tension and Disruptions (National Conference of Christians and Jews).

Research for Better Schools
1976 Planning Assistance Programs to Reduce School Violence and Disruption. Washington: National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice.

Reiss, Albert J., Jr.
1952 "Social correlates of psychological types of delinquency." American Sociological Review 17:710-718.

Reiss, A. J., Jr. and A. L. Rhodes.
1961 "The distribution of juvenile delinquency in the social class structure." American Sociological Review 26:720-732.

Ritterband, Paul and Richard Silberstein.
1973 "Group disorders in the public schools." American Sociological Review 38:461-467.

Rodman, Hyman and Paul Grams.
1967 Juvenile delinquency and the family: a review and discussion. Pp. 188-221 in Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Rossi, Peter H. and Walter Williams (Eds.).
1970 Evaluating Social Programs. New York: Seminar Press.

Schafer, Walter E. and Kenneth Polk.
1967 "Delinquency and the schools." Pp. 222-277 in Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

School Stability Resource Team.
1971 Stability and Disruption in the Public Schools of New York City. New York: Board of Education.

Schur, Edwin M.
1970 "Reactions to deviance: A critical assessment." American Journal of Sociology 75:309-322.
1971 Labelling Deviant Behavior. New York: Harper and Row.

Scott, Joseph W. and Mohamed El-Assal.
1969 "Multiversity, university size, university quality and student protest." American Sociological Review 34:702-709.

Silberberg, Norman E. and Margaret C. Silberberg.
1971 School achievement and delinquency. Review of Educational Research 41:17-31.

Spilerman, Seymour.
1970 "The causes of racial disturbance: a comparison of alternative explanations." American Sociological Review 35:627-649.
1971 "The causes of racial disturbance: tests of an explanation." American Sociological Review 36:427-442.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L.
1964 Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Strauss, George H.
1974a "School as power structure: Student attitudes toward high school policies, student power position, and student rights movement." Education and Urban Society 7:3-27.
1974b "Two perspectives on high school student politics: political objects versus political actors." Youth and Society 5:360-376.

Sullivan, Robert R.
1972 School Disruption: A Survey of the Literature

Summers, Anita A. and Barbara L. Wolfe.
1975a Equality of Educational Opportunity Quantified: A Production Function Approach. Philadelphia: Department of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.
1975b Intradistrict Distribution of School Resources to the Disadvantaged: Evidence for the Courts. Philadelphia: Department of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey.
1974 Principles of Criminology, 7th ed. rev. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, Presidents' Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.
1967 Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime; The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Tennent, T. G.
1971 "School non-attendance and delinquency." Educational Research 13: 185-190.

Tien, J. M. and Reppetto, T. A.
1975 Crime/Environment Targets. Arlington, Virginia: Westinghouse Electric Corporation.

Tien, J. M., Reppetto, T. A. and Hanes, L. F.
1975 Elements of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Arlington, Virginia: Westinghouse Electric Corporation.

Tygart, Clarence E. and Norman Holt.
1972 "Examining the Weinberg and Wolker typology of student activists." American Journal of Sociology 77:957-966.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.
1967 Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Volume 2. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United Federation of Teachers.
1974 Security in the Schools -- Tips for Guarding the Safety of Teachers and Students. New York: United Federation of Teachers.

Walberg, Herbert J.
1972 "Urban schooling and delinquency: toward an integrative theory." American Educational Research Journal 9:285-300.

Ward, Colin (Ed.).
1973 Vandalism. London: The Architectural Press.

Wenk, Ernest A.
1975 "Juvenile justice and the public schools: Mutual benefit through educational reform." Juvenile Justice, August:7-14.

Yudof, Mark G.
1975 "Suspension and expulsion of black students from the public schools: Academic capital punishment and the constitution." Law and Contemporary Problems 39:374-411.