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Many researchers have sought to identify the antecedents of deviant behavior. The purpose of this study was to explore whether family rituals might contribute to social control, and thereby reduce deviant behavior. Walter Reckless’ containment theory provided the theoretical framework for the study. This theory suggests that both inner and outer containment variables control social behavior. It was proposed that meaningful family rituals would contribute to the development of inner and outer containment, and therefore, reduce the number of deviant behaviors committed by the respondents. In this study, the inner containment variable was self-esteem, and the outer containment variables were participation in conforming activities with family members both inside and outside the home, and participation in extracurricular activities.

Two hundred and seven incarcerated respondents and 217 college students responded to three survey instruments, the Family Rituals Questionnaire, the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory, and a Family Information Inventory. Findings indicated that the college students reported experiencing more meaningful family rituals than the incarcerated respondents. Results indicate that the two groups differed significantly on all of the major variables. However, meaningful family rituals had little association with self-esteem, and self-esteem had no relationship with deviant behavior. Meaningful family rituals did account for some variation in participation in conforming activities with family members inside and outside the home and for participation in extracurricular
activities. However, the variables that were most significant for explaining deviant behavior were the risk factors of age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, neighborhood crime, and parents’s deviance. Future research should explore the role of risk factors in explaining deviant behavior and study the role of meaningful family rituals and the role they might play in creating a qualitative difference in family life.
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CHAPTER I

WHY STUDY FAMILY RITUALS?

Statement of the Problem

Many troubling trends in adolescent behavior have occurred in recent years (Dryfoos, 1990; Pipher, 1996; Resnick, Bearman, Blum, Bauman, Harris, Jones, Tabor, Beuhring, Sieving, Shew, Ireland, Bearinger, Udry, 1997). There is substantial evidence that families play an important role in influencing this behavior (Pipher, 1994). A number of researchers have begun to explore precisely what families do to protect their children from potential risk factors (Reiss, 1981; Garbarino & Abromowitz, 1992; Sameroff & Fiese, 1992). One particular mechanism that may protect children is family rituals (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Fiese, 1992a; Fiese, 1993). This study examined family rituals and their contribution to social control of behavior for family members. Specifically, this research explored the role of family rituals in the childhoods of young incarcerated individuals (prison inmates) and college students. Under study was whether family rituals promoted higher levels of self-esteem and higher levels of participation in conforming activities during childhood. The premise was that positive experiences with family rituals would lead to less involvement by juveniles in deviant activities.

Through most rituals, families have the opportunity to influence the behavior of its members in positive ways. Family researchers have found that family rituals can smooth the interactions that take place among family members (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). They may also contribute to family members' shared
consensus about values and behavior (Fiese, 1992a). In addition, through family rituals, individual family members gain a sense of belonging and identity (Curran, 1983; Wolin and Bennett, 1984; Fiese, 1992a). Finally, family rituals may regulate individual member’s behavior through the designation of roles and the meaning associated with family interactions (Sameroff & Fiese, 1992).

The regulation of behavior within the family contributes to social control within and outside the family (Reiss, 1981). Berger (1963) contends that the family may play a more important role as an agent of social control in society than any other institution. Clearly, the role of the family and its contribution to social control merits attention.

One way that family rituals may contribute to social control within the family is through their contribution to the family’s social organization (Wolin & Bennett, 1984). Some sociologists suggest that stable patterns of social interaction lead to stability in social organization, which contributes to social order both within and outside the organization (Landis, 1998). These stable patterns of behavior are often called rituals (Kanagy & Kraybill, 1999). Rituals blend social structure and culture together to create orderly, repetitive, and meaningful social interaction (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Fiese, 1992a).

One of the major functions of the family is to transmit culture to the next generation (Williams, 1990). Some family researchers believe that the family's successful transmission of culture to its children contributes to social order, both within the family and in society at large (Reiss, 1981; Pipher, 1996). Some sociologists believe that if this transmission doesn't take place, or if individuals do not internalize culture, deviant
behavior may result (Ritzer, 1992; Stark, 1996). Not everyone learns all of their culture or incorporates it into their own way of thinking and acting (Stark, 1996; Kanagy & Kraybill, 1999). As a result, social groups, no matter whether they are large or small, develop their own unique culture (Thompson & Hickey, 1999). The implications for a family having its own unique culture is that it is not just a passive recipient of culture from the larger society, but it also actively contributes to social culture through the processes that take place within the family (Reiss, 1981; Sameroff & Fiese, 1992).

According to family researchers, several different factors contribute to a family's culture (Williams, 1990; Seward, 1991). Some of these factors include the family's composition, its social class, its race/ethnicity status, and the type of community in which the family lives. Family culture also depends on the actual performance of roles within the family. It is assumed in this study that family ritual behavior provides one of the mechanisms through which culture is transmitted to family members, the mechanisms through which the family creates its own unique culture, and the mechanisms through which family members learn to perform expected behaviors (Sameroff & Fiese, 1992). Aspects of the last assumption are tested in this study.

One theory of social control that incorporates the family as an important agent for contributing to conforming behavior is Walter Reckless' (1973b) containment theory. According to Shoemaker (1996), Reckless' basic premise is that psychological and social factors work together to contribute to conforming behavior. Families contribute to the development of these factors in both direct and indirect ways. Families contribute directly to social control through the opportunities they provide for conforming activities both
within and outside the family. Families contribute indirectly through their impact on the psychological factors that shape children's self-concept and self-esteem.

Research has established the important role that families play in the lives of their children (Barber, 1992; Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992). The purpose of this study is to examine some of the specific behaviors that take place within a family when a child is growing up and to explore how these behaviors influence their adult behavior. To facilitate an understanding of the overall focus of this study, the remainder of this chapter presents the details on the major components of the research. The first section identifies and discusses important research terms and concepts. The second section discusses the theoretical foundation used for this study. Research objectives and a causal model are presented in the third section. The fourth section focuses on the research process, and the final sections provide a discussion on the significance of this research.

Major Terms and Concepts

Family Rituals

Family researchers have found rituals to be one aspect of family life that contributes significantly to the overall functioning of the family and its members (Wolin and Bennett, 1984; Imber-Black and Roberts, 1992). For example, significant associations have been found between family rituals and healthy family practices (Curran, 1983; Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992), higher adolescent satisfaction with family life (Fiese, 1992a), and marital satisfaction (Fiese, Hooker, Kotary & Schwangler, 1993). Family rituals appear to serve a protective function as well, especially for the psychosocial development of children of alcoholic parents (Wolin, Bennett, & Noonan,
family rituals have been associated with health-related anxiety symptoms in adolescents (Fiese, 1993). Extreme ritual disruption has been found to correspond with greater intergenerational recurrence of alcoholism (Bennett, Wolin, Reiss, Teitelbaum, 1987).

Bossard and Boll (1950) were among the first family researchers to describe family rituals as being the essence and core of family culture. Subsequent studies have found that family rituals express what families believe to be true and what they value (Fiese, 1992a; Fiese, Hooker, Kotary, & Schwangler, 1993). Pipher (1996) suggests that families organize their behavior through family rituals, and through their enactment they convey what is important to the family. Wolin and Bennett (1984) suggest that if patterns of social interaction within a family become disorganized, social order within the family is disrupted. The disruption of social order within families could be troublesome for families, and as a result, family therapists often prescribe family rituals to help families whose home life has become disorganized and unworkable (Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992; Pipher, 1996).

Fiese (1992a) suggested that family rituals become significant through the meaning and affect associated with them. She identifies two dimensions of family rituals: a meaning dimension and a routine dimension. The meaning dimension reflects whether family rituals are meaningful to individual participants. The routine dimension represents the roles and actual behaviors that take place during family rituals. Fiese's (1992a, 1993) studies revealed that the meaning dimension plays a more important role in how family members perceive family rituals than the routine dimension. In addition, the meaning of
family rituals can have both a positive or negative value. For example, some family members may enjoy having dinner with extended family members every Sunday while others may perceive it as a negative experience (Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). What is most important is the individual's perception of family rituals. In this study, it was assumed that a positive perception of family rituals would contribute to what Walter Reckless (1973b) called containment.

**Containment**

Walter Reckless (1973b) developed a theory of social control called containment theory. This theory stressed that there were both internal and external pushes and pulls toward delinquent and conforming behavior. He called the internal pushes and pulls inner containment and the external push and pulls outer containment. Reckless suggested that inner containment was the result of successful socialization and the internalization of society’s rules. Outer containment was described as those aspects of an individual's social environment that helped to ensure that delinquent behavior did not occur. He viewed these types of pressures and containments as layers of control emanating from the self (Shoemaker, 1996).

Walter Reckless (1973b) proposed a reciprocal relationship between inner and outer containment. Through their reinforcing aspects, nonconforming behavior was constrained. Therefore, Reckless saw social control as being both personal and social. However, he felt that inner containment was more influential as a mechanism of social control. As a result, his theory has often been referred to as a social-psychological theory (Shoemaker, 1996).
Inner Containment

According to containment theory, a good self-concept is considered to be the primary deterrent to deviant behavior (Reckless, 1973b; Shoemaker, 1996). Reckless (1973b) characterized individuals with strong inner containment as having a good self-concept, self-control, ego strength, a well-developed superego, and a high tolerance for frustration. He suggested that external factors contributed to the development of inner containment, with the family playing a very important role in providing many of these factors. These factors included the presentation of a consistent moral front, the existence of a reasonable set of social expectations, effective supervision and discipline of children, and a provision for a reasonable scope of activities. In addition, opportunities for acceptance, outlets for the expression of tension and frustration, and feelings of identity and belonging contributed to inner containment. In this study, self-esteem was used to evaluate the inner containment of the respondents.

Outer containment

According to Reckless (1973a), outer containment variables were viewed as being important reinforcement for inner containment. He divided outer containment into two categories: the factors that contributed to external containment and to environmental pressures or pulls (Shoemaker, 1996). Characteristics of external containment were identified as effective family life, interest in the activities of the community, membership in organizations, and good companions. The family played a direct role in some of these and an indirect role in others. Environmental pressures or pulls included poverty or deprivation, conflict, external restraint, minority-group status, limited access to an
opportunity structure, distractions, attractions, temptations, patterns of deviancy and advertising (Reckless, 1973b). Participation in conforming activities, both within and outside the family, provided the measurement mechanism for outer containment in this research.

Deviant and Delinquent Behavior

Deviant behavior has been defined in different ways in different societies (Durkheim, 1893/1964; Palmer & Humphrey, 1990), ranging from the violation of folkways to the violation of laws (Territo, Halsted, & Bromley, 1995). Conceptually, both a normative and a reactive approach have been used to explain deviance (Meier, 1989). With the normative approach, deviance is viewed as a violation of social norms (Merton, 1958). The reactive approach is based on societal reactions to a behavior that has been given a deviant label (Becker, 1963). In this study, the normative approach to deviance is used.

In addition to the normative and reactive explanations of deviance, there are both macro and micro perspectives on deviance (Tittle, 1995). Macro explanations have focused on structural variables as explanations for deviant behavior. Micro explanations have incorporated a social psychological perspective (Meier, 1989). Reckless' (1973b) containment theory attempted to account for both macro and micro level influences on deviant behavior. However, like all grand theories, one level is sometimes emphasized over another. In Reckless’ containment theory, it was the micro level or social psychological processes that were the primary focus of attention (Shoemaker, 1996). In this study, the intention was to broaden the scope of containment to include both macro
and micro level influences on deviant behavior.

In this research, deviant behavior was operationalized through self-reported delinquent behavior. Delinquent behavior has been defined as the violation of the law or the commitment of a status offense by a person under age eighteen (Reid, 1997). Delinquency is usually divided into the following categories: violent crimes, property crimes, and status offenses (Territo, Halsted, & Bromley, 1995; Conklin, 1998). Violent crimes, property crimes, and delinquent offenses are generally the same crimes that are committed by adults (Reid, 1997). Status offenses include those acts that violate statutes that are only applicable to minors (Conklin, 1998). In this study, the incarcerated respondents and the college students responded to a self-report instrument on delinquent behavior that included violent crimes, property crimes, delinquent offenses, and status offenses.

Risk Factors Associated With Deviance

Researchers want to learn what makes some young people more vulnerable than others to commit deviant acts. In addition to the social control variables of inner and outer containment, studies have identified several social and demographic characteristics that have been classified as risk factors for deviant behavior (Breaking New Ground for Youth at Risk, 1990; Dryfoos, 1990; Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992). Some of these same factors were classified by Reckless' as environmental pressures (1973b). The risk factors included and assessed in this study were age, gender, race/ethnicity status, educational experiences, family structure, socioeconomic status, the type of neighborhood in which one grew up, and parents' deviance.
Many studies have found an association between these variables and deviant behavior. For example, researchers have found that young people are more likely to engage in criminal activity than older persons (Mooney, Knox, Schachter, 1997). Arrest rates are highest for youth between the ages of 16-19, followed by young people between the ages of 20-24 (Stark, 1996). In addition, criminal offenders are overwhelmingly male. Researchers have found that in all categories of crime, men are more likely to be the offenders (South & Messner, 1987). A disproportionate number of minority youth have been involved in the criminal justice system. African-Americans make-up one twelfth of the U.S. population but comprise one-fourth of the prison population (Mooney, Knox, Schachter, 1997). Negative school experiences have also been associated with delinquency. Hirshci (1969) found that a positive attachment to school was associated with lower rates of delinquency. Family structure has been associated with a variety of consequences for family members. Being reared in a single-parent household has been linked with lower status attainment (Li & Wojtkiewicz, 1992; Biblarz & Raftery, 1993), poor educational success (McLanahan, 1985; Krein & Beller, 1988), delinquency (Shoemaker, 1996), and teenage pregnancy (Hogan & Kitagawa, 1985). Although the majority of poor people have not committed criminal acts, a disproportionate number of individuals in the lower class have been associated with the criminal justice system (Reid, 1997; Conklin, 1998). In addition, the majority of criminals have been reared in high poverty areas (Shoemaker, 1996). Finally, higher rates of deviance have been found to correspond with criminality in the family (Geismar & Wood, 1986; Stark, 1996).

Research has shown that children can often effectively cope with one or two risk
factors, but when confronted with multiple factors, they fare less well (Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992). Experiencing more than two major risk factors can jeopardize children's development and lead to problem behaviors such as early pregnancy, drug use, and delinquent behavior (Resnick, et al, 1997). The cumulative effect of factors such as living in poverty and poor neighborhoods, lacking supervision and discipline, and receiving insufficient social support have been related to deviant behavior (Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992). On the other hand, most children seem to be able to cope with multiple risk factors if compensatory forces exist in their lives, including strong primary social and psychological resources (Garbarino & Long, 1992). In this study, all the risk factors identified above will be evaluated for their effect on delinquent behavior.

Theoretical Frame of Reference

Several theories were used to help formulate the research problem under study. In particular, concepts and propositions were drawn from structural functional theory, family systems theory, symbolic interaction theory, and social control theory. Each theoretical perspective provided a different view of the problem, and together, they provided a more comprehensive explanation of how family rituals might contribute to an individual’s conforming behavior (Alexander, 1987). Structural functional theory helps explain how culture and status-roles contribute to the social organization and social order of a society. This theory emphasizes the importance of the socialization process for transmitting the normative structure of a society to its members (Ritzer, 1992). According to Reckless (1973b), successful socialization of a society's rules regarding acceptable behavior is a prerequisite for the development of inner containment. Family systems
theory offered specific explanations for the processes that take place within families when they socialize their children. In particular, it provides explanations for how family members’ interaction with each other contributes to social organization and social order, and how culture is transmitted within the family (Broderick, 1993; Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993). Symbolic interaction theory helps explain how individuals react to family rituals, how normative structures are internalized, and how self-esteem develops. Specifically, through social interaction, including family rituals, individuals gain a sense of self, and this influences how they perceive and interact with others in their social environment (Ritzer, 1992). The theoretical frame of reference that provides the foundation for understanding delinquent behavior is social control theory, in particular, Walter Reckless' (1973b) containment theory. His theory proposed that delinquent behavior was more likely to be attributed to the lack of personal and social controls than to criminal intent. He proposed that if an individual's control systems were flawed, the internalization of social norms and the display of appropriate behavior would be affected, which could lead to delinquent behavior.

Research Objectives

A thorough research of available literature suggested several research objectives for this study. The first objective was to determine if differences existed among incarcerated individuals and college students in their family rituals and self-reported delinquent behavior. The second objective explored if individuals who reported family rituals with higher levels of positive meaning would report higher levels of self-esteem. A third research objective examined the relationship between reported family rituals and
individual family members' interaction with each other and with the outside world. The fourth research objective attempted to determine if a positive correlation existed between self-esteem and conforming behaviors. The final research objective examined the role of the respondents’ social and demographic characteristics or risk factors in their delinquent behavior, regardless of reported levels of family ritual life.

Based on these research objectives, a causal model was developed. This model reflects the proposition that positive experiences with family rituals contribute to both inner and outer containment, which should lead to fewer deviant behaviors. In addition, the model displays the reciprocal nature of inner and outer containment. This model is designed to reflect a coherent relationship between family rituals, self-esteem, participation in conforming activities, and fewer deviant behaviors. Finally, the risk factors are presented as control variables for this study. The following model provides the framework for this study.

Causal Model

Figure 1. The role of family rituals in contributing to inner and outer containment and their influence on deviant behavior.
Design of the Research

Sample

The respondents in this study were young people between the ages of eighteen and twenty-three. Two subsamples were gathered. One was from the prison population in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice system. The second one was from the Texas college population. The original intent was to obtain the college sample only from Texas community colleges. However, in order to obtain a more diverse sample, students from one university were also included. The college population was selected in a way that matched the prison sample as closely as possible in terms of age, gender, and race/ethnicity status. A total of 576 individuals participated in the study. Five hundred and thirteen respondents fell between the ages of 18 and 23. All respondents were asked to complete the same questionnaires. They were asked to refer to the period in their lives before the age of 18 when responding to the questionnaires.

Techniques of Data Collection
The variables in this study were operationalized through three survey instruments. Family rituals were identified through responses to the Family Rituals Questionnaire ([FRQ] Fiese & Kline, 1993; See Appendix A). Self-esteem was evaluated through the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory ([CFSEI] Battle, 1992; See Appendix B). Conforming activities, self-reported levels of delinquent behavior, and the risk factors were reported on the Family Information Inventory ([FII] Short & Nye, 1958; Siegel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988; Sweet, Bumpass, & Call, 1988; see Appendix C). All three were self-administered questionnaires. The questionnaires were read orally to the incarcerated respondents in case some of them had difficulty with reading.

Techniques of Analysis

The initial step in the analysis was to generate descriptive statistics. The initial viewing of the data indicated that there were some differences between the subsamples. After the descriptive statistics were explored, a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted for the responses to the Family Rituals Questionnaire (Fiese & Kline, 1993). Previous research using the FRQ has determined that it has both a meaning and a routine component (Fiese, 1992a, 1993). These same two dimensions also surfaced in this sample. The meaning dimension of the FRQ was used as the major independent variable in the data analysis. The next step was to generate t-tests among all of the major variables and the risk factors for both the incarcerated respondents and the college students. The results indicated that there were some significant differences
between the subsamples. In order to determine if these differences could account for differences in deviant behavior, regression analyses were generated. The final step in the data analysis was to generate a power analysis for the major independent variables to determine their effect on deviant behavior.

Significance of the Study

This study gathered detailed information about the existence of family rituals, explored the role these rituals played in contributing to self-esteem and to participation in family activities both inside and outside the home, participation in conforming activities, and their influence on social control within families. The results of this research should contribute to our knowledge and understanding about family processes and their influence on the behavior of individual family members. This knowledge could help family researchers, family educators, and family therapists by identifying some of the behaviors that contribute to the development and maintenance of patterns of behavior in functional families.

Major Divisions of the Research Report

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the research problem. Chapter 2 will examine the theoretical framework for this study. The third chapter provides a literature review of the major concepts and terms that are a part of this study and establishes the hypotheses. Methodological considerations and a description of the sample are described in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 contains the results of the data analysis, including those obtained from t-test analyses, regression analyses, and power analyses. The final chapter discusses the results of the data as they relate to the stated hypotheses, describes the contributions
of this study towards the understanding of family rituals and their links to social control, identifies the limitations of the study, and suggests areas of further research.
CHAPTER II
DEVELOPING A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
TO STUDY FAMILY RITUALS

Sociology is an empirical social science with much of its fact-finding being theory driven. Sociologists have developed a number of theories in their attempts to understand society and how it functions (Turner, 1991). Currently, no one theory is capable of providing a complete explanation for social behavior. Therefore, researchers have often used concepts from different theories in order to explain social phenomena (Alexander, 1987). In this study, four theories were used to help explain how family rituals contribute to conforming behavior. The theories that provided the framework for this research include structural functional theory, family systems theory, symbolic interaction theory, and social control theory. The relevance of these theories and some of the concepts that were used in this study will be discussed in the second half of this chapter. The first half of the chapter begins with a general discussion on the functions of theories and the presuppositions of theories based on the work of Jeffrey Alexander (1987). This information provided the justification for selecting the theories that were used in this study.

The Presuppositions of Theories

According to Arthur Stinchcombe (1968), theories are the heart of science and lead to the generation of logical empirical statements that can be tested by facts. Theories
are built in part by the results of empirical analysis. However, facts alone cannot generate theories. Theories are built by a combination of nonfactual theoretical evidence and empirical facts (Alexander, 1987). Nonfactual theoretical evidence is based on presuppositions about social life. These presuppositions include the nature of action and the problem of order. Action can be rational or nonrational, and order individualistic or collectivist. Alexander (1987) stated that "presuppositions about action and order were the 'tracks' upon which sociology runs" (p. 15).

Alexander (1987) suggested that both theories and empirical works have an a priori assumption about social action. Actors are oriented towards either rational or nonrational action. Rational actors are described as being externally referenced, often referring to outside sources as guides for their behavior. Their actions are often characterized as being self-serving, purely instrumental, and based on maximum efficiency. Nonrational actors are characterized as having their own internal guide to direct their behavior, and they are less constrained by their social environment. Nonrational action has been described as idealistic, normative and moral, and governed by emotions. The rational/nonrational action gauge is not necessarily mutually exclusive, and one action can include both rational and nonrational elements. Talcott Parsons reinforced this idea when he proposed that rational and nonrational actions were analytic dimensions of every act, not two different acts (Alexander, 1987).

The second presupposition of theories and empirical works is based on the notion of social order (Alexander, 1987). Sociologists have agreed that there are patterns of social order. They disagreed on how this social order was produced and maintained.
Alexander (1987) suggested that social order could be viewed from both individualistic and collectivist approaches. The individualistic position suggests that social patterns are the result of individual negotiation, that individual social actors produce social structures, and that individuals had the freedom to rebel against and change the social order. The collectivist position proposes that although individuals have an element of freedom in their decision-making, their actions are often pushed into the direction of preexisting social structures. Collectivist theory proposed that social controls exist prior to any individual act and that these extra-individual controls directly influence social behavior. Sociologists have often made these external social controls the subject of empirical analysis (Durkheim, 1895/1964).

Based on these ideas about action and order, Alexander (1987) developed a typology of presuppositions. He identified them as rational-collectivist, nonrational-collectivist, rational-individualist, and nonrational individualist. Rational-collectivist theory presupposes that collective structures provide external control upon actors and that individual action is constrained and controlled by social forces outside the actor. According to Karl Marx (1967), the exploitive nature of capitalism alienated men and women from their nonrational feelings, which contributed to their rational orientation. Karl Marx's conflict theory is an example of this type of presupposition (Alexander, 1987). Nonrational-collectivist theory proposes that collective structures provide control upon actors in society, but that actors have more freedom to act because motivation comes from within the actors due to the internalization of external social structures. According to Emile Durkheim (1893/1964), when cultural and social realms were of
solidarity and they were internalized by individuals, then the nonrational feelings and ideals of individuals were constrained and tended to be congruent with their social environments. Durkheim's functional theory is an example of this approach (Alexander, 1987). Rational-individualistic presuppositions portray the actor as being unrestrained by external forces and driven by purely instrumental motives (Ritzer, 1992). This presupposition is represented by exchange theory (Alexander, 1987). The nonrational-individualistic perspective acknowledges the existence of extra-individual structures but it assumes that these patterns are the result of individual negotiation (Ritzer, 1992). Therefore, this perspective views the social environment as having less influence over the individual, from the actor’s social behavior that is motivated from within. An example of this presupposition is symbolic interaction theory (Alexander, 1987).

According to Alexander (1987), each type of presupposition provides unique explanations for social behavior, while simultaneously closing off alternative explanations. Consequently, presuppositions involve tradeoffs; some doors are opened while others are closed. Alexander (1987) called the closed off explanations "residual categories" (p. 17). As researchers narrow the actual phenomena being measured, the explanations also narrow. Alexander concurs with Stinchcombe (1968), who suggested that the goal of most research is to eliminate alternate theories through empirical support. The result is that no one theory is capable of providing a total explanation for all social phenomena (Turner, 1991). Therefore, researchers often used elements of different theories or more than one theory to develop their explanations (Alexander, 1987; Cheal, 1991).
In this study, two different presuppositions were used to provide the framework for the research. Based on the research objectives, nonrational-collectivist and nonrational-individualistic presuppositions were the most appropriate for explaining how family rituals contribute to conforming behavior. The major concepts analyzed include social organization and social order, rituals, self-esteem, conforming behaviors, and deviant behaviors. The following section describes the different theories that were used and the relevance of their use in this research.

Theories

Structural Functional Theory

According to Alexander (1987), structural functional theory is classified as a collectivist-nonrational presupposition. This theory assumes that social actions are guided by pre-existing social structures and that social order is consensus driven (Kanagy & Kraybill, 1999). With this theory, it is assumed that members voluntarily conform to society's norms, values, and expected role behavior as a result of successful socialization. Inherent in this theoretical perspective is the assumption that there must be a consensus among the members of society about the basic organization of everyday life. As a result, this theory has often been referred to as a consensus theory (Ritzer, 1992). Structural functional theory is in direct contrast to conflict theory, which suggests that social order is maintained through the dominance of one group over another. In the present research, social order is viewed from a consensus perspective.

Structural functional theorists suggest that society is a system that should be viewed as a functioning whole, comprised of mutually interdependent parts that attempt
to maintain a balanced state of equilibrium (Turner, 1991). With this theoretical perspective, the focus is on system stability rather than social change (Broderick, 1993). Structural functional theorists have identified several functional prerequisites that contribute to the establishment and maintenance of system stability. They are: (a) a society must be held together by the consensus of its members, (b) there must be a differentiation of roles, (c) society must share a cultural system, including a shared value system, (d) there must be a communication system based on shared symbols, through which culture can be transmitted, (e) the members of a society should share the same goals, and this should include a normative system to regulate the means for achieving these goals, and (f) societies must regulate affective emotion (Turner, 1991; Ritzer, 1992).

In addition, there must be a socialization process through which relevant aspects of these prerequisites are transmitted to the members of the society and some form of social control that ensures their enforcement (Landis, 1998). If this process is successful, social order will be maintained.

The functional prerequisites described above contribute to the social organization of a society. Social organization is defined as the organized patterns of interaction that takes place in a society (Landis, 1998). According to structural functional theory, social organization in a society is based on its cultural system and its status-roles. The norms, values, and beliefs of a society are often referred to as culture (Stark, 1996). Status-roles are based on the social positions in a society and the expected behavior for these positions. According to Landis (1998), the integration of a society's norms, values,
beliefs, and expected roles make up the social fabric of a society. In addition, he proposed that a reciprocal relationship exists between culture and status-roles; culture shapes the statuses and roles in society, and statuses and roles shape culture. According to structural functional theorists, a breakdown in the customary norms and roles in a society can lead to social disorganization (Stark, 1996; Landis, 1998). Some of the consequences for social disorganization are social change, chaos, anomie, apathy, conflict, and deviant behavior (Durkheim 1893/1964; Ritzer, 1992; Landis, 1998).

Structural functional theorists have been particularly concerned with social organization and how it contributes to social order (Landis, 1998). In this study, several concepts and themes related to structural functional theory were used to explain how family rituals contribute to social order. It was proposed that social organization contributes to the stability of society and that in order to maintain this stability, the family, as the primary agent of socialization, had to transmit culture and expectations for status-roles to its children. Family rituals provide one of the means through which society’s normative order and mechanisms for conforming behavior are transmitted to its members. Thus, it is inferred that the family, through the socialization process, has the potential to play a very important role as an agent of social control.

Two classic structural functional theorists, Emile Durkheim and Talcott Parsons, were both concerned with the issues of social organization and social control. The following paragraphs describe their perspectives on how societies organized themselves and how social order is maintained. Their views also provide some explanations for how ritual behavior contributes to this process. The views on ritual behavior of a more
contemporary structural functional theorist, Robert Merton, are also presented.

Emile Durkheim

Emile Durkheim's functional theory is concerned with social order, the mechanisms through which it is maintained, and how it influences social action (Ritzer, 1992). His theoretical perspective laid the foundation for structural functional theory. He suggested that social order is maintained through the constraining influence of its normative structure. This normative structure evolves in response to a society's needs (Kinloch, 1977), and manifests itself through the "collective conscious" of the members of society (Martindale, 1981). It was Durkheim's (1893/1964) contention that through the process of socialization, extra-individual normative structures become internal to the self. The negotiation for this takes place between the social self and the social world. Therefore, the normative structure of society is the result of social interaction and can be explained by social facts and not psychological ones (Ritzer, 1992).

Durkheim's unit of analysis for studying the normative order in a society was "social facts" (cited in Ritzer, 1992, p. 78). He defined "social facts" as a category of facts which presented very special characteristics consisting of manners of acting, thinking, and feeling external to the individual, which were invested with a coercive power by virtue of which they exercised control over him (Durkheim, 1895/1964, p. 52). Durkheim (1895/1964) argued that social facts could be treated as things and could be studied empirically. He divided social facts into two categories: material and nonmaterial. Examples of material facts were architecture and the law. Norms and values represented the nonmaterial social facts of a society (Ritzer, 1992). It was the role of nonmaterial
social facts in society, especially their influence on social order, that were Durkheim's (1895/1964) primary interest.

Durkheim (1895/1964) proposed that social order was maintained through nonmaterial social facts. One major nonmaterial social fact that he studied was religion. In *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (1912/1965), he explored the role that the "collective conscious" played in religion. He studied the roots of religion by examining the beliefs and practices of a primitive Australian tribe, the Arunta. His purpose for studying a primitive tribe was to find the source of modern religion (Ritzer, 1992). His hypothesis was that understanding the fundamental basis for religion could lead to a better understanding of the manifestations of religion in more sophisticated societies (Durkheim, 1912/1965).

As a result of his studies, Durkheim (1912/1965) concluded that society was the ultimate source of religion. He suggested that members of a society differentiate social reality into the sacred and the profane. Profane elements are the everyday activities that take place among the members of the group. The sacred elements of a society are religious beliefs, rites, and the Church (Ritzer, 1992). It is the collective beliefs of the members of a society that are the source of religion, according to Durkheim. Through ritual actions, the bonds between believers and their god and believers and the other members of society are strengthened (Durkheim, 1912/1965). In addition, a reciprocal relationship exists between ritual behavior and religious beliefs. Durkheim suggested that religious beliefs influence ritual behavior and that ritual behavior influence religious beliefs. Durkheim concluded that rituals are one mechanism through which social order is
Another well-known and influential structural functional theorist was Talcott Parsons (Ritzer, 1992). Like Durkheim, he was also interested in the issues of social action and order (Alexander, 1987). In The Structure of Social Action (1937/1968), Parsons attempted to develop a general theory of social action. He was interested in both individual action and the normative social structures that guided this action. Like Durkheim, Parsons examined how individuals internalize norms. In subsequent works, he introduced a model outlining three levels of social action (Parsons, 1951). The three levels were personality, society, and culture. Parsons suggested that it is necessary for personality, society, and culture to correspond and interact with each other. He suggested that role sequencing must be coordinated at all three levels of society. Roles become institutionalized when personality, the social system, and culture are complementary (Ritzer, 1992). It was Parson's belief that the social system should be conceptualized in terms of a series of social roles (Alexander, 1987). Socialization is the process through which individual actors internalize social roles, and it is important that social roles be coordinated with the development of need dispositions in the personality if individuals are to exhibit conforming behavior (Turner, 1991). Parsons suggested that this process would be more likely to take place if there are shared values in a culture. If culture is not shared, individual role-playing will not correspond with the objective conditions of the culture. If this occurs, deviance can result.

Parsons identified two mechanisms that integrate the personality into the social
system (Turner, 1991). They are socialization and social control. Through socialization, cultural patterns become internalized. Cultural patterns consist of the values, beliefs, language, and other symbols of a society. Socialization also provides stability and security to interpersonal ties. Social control can be maintained through the manner in which status-roles are organized in a social system. One of the control mechanisms he identified was ritual activities (Ritzer, 1992). According to Parsons, rituals provide common symbols, communication, and behaviors for acting out sources of strain. This contributes to social order because it provides a common viewpoint for the actors, which allows them to operate with shared orientations. Rituals also reinforce the group's dominant cultural norms.

Parsons did not originally relate his theoretical perspective to the family. This relationship evolved as he attempted to develop an empirical basis for his theory. Together with Robert Bales, he co-authored *Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process* (1955). According to Parsons and Bales (1959), the family's two major functions are the socialization of children and heterosexual socialization. They suggested that these two functions provide the basis for a stable adult personality.

A more contemporary structural functional theorist whose ideas have special relevance for the discussion of social organization and social order is Robert Merton. Merton's premise was that societies develop consensus based goals and legitimate means for achieving these goals (Shoemaker, 1996). Individuals respond by accepting or rejecting these cultural goals and means (Palmer, 1970). These responses could take five different forms, one of which he called ritualism (Landis, 1998). Ritualism was
characterized as an over conforming, compulsive behavior that is performed in almost perfect compliance with one's status-role, even when this behavior does not bring about the desired results (Palmer, 1970). The consequences for the individual can be feelings of frustration and tension, both with the environment and with self. This view of ritual behavior provides evidence that all ritual behavior does not result in a positive experience for individuals (Landis, 1998). If ritual behavior is meaningless or coercive, is associated with negative emotions, or connected with abuse, such behavior could lose the potential for influencing social interaction in a positive way (Browne, 1980).

The influence of functionalism, in particular Parsonian functionalism, began to decline in the late 1960s (Cheal, 1991). There were a couple of major reasons for this. First, functionalism was criticized for neglecting the role that individuals play in shaping their own social environments (Alexander, 1987). Second, functionalism was criticized for ignoring the conflict and diversity that exists in society, which was being brought to the forefront by conflict and feminist theory (Cheal, 1991). This perceived lack of attention to the individual level of analysis and to the conflict and diversity that existed in society contributed to the residual category for functional theory (Alexander, 1987).

In summary, structural functional theory suggests that social organization contributes to social order in a society. Social organization is influenced both by a society's culture and its status-roles. Through the socialization process, individuals internalize the norms, values, and expected role behaviors created by the members of society. Inherent in this theory, is the idea that there is a consensus-based culture. Both Durkheim and Parsons suggested that rituals were one mechanism through which social
norms and values were transmitted to members in a society.

Family Systems Theory

Just as structural functional theory was declining in its influence, general systems theory was beginning to emerge as an important theoretical perspective (Broderick, 1993). Family systems theory evolved from general systems theory, incorporating many of its core assumptions (Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993). General systems theory, structural functional theory, and family systems theory share some common assumptions, including their emphasis on viewing a system as a functioning whole, with integrated parts that work to maintain a state of equilibrium (Broderick, 1993). Even though family systems theory and structural functional theory share some common themes, family systems theory was used in this study to describe family processes because it includes concepts and terms that have particular relevance for understanding family processes.

Family systems theory has several core assumptions: (a) a system must be understood as a whole instead of by its component parts (Bradshaw, 1988); (b) systems are multilevel and can be applied to all levels of the social world (Ritzer, 1992); (c) systems are self-reflexive (Cheal, 1991); and (d) systems are inherently integrative (Ritzer, 1992). In addition, all open, ongoing systems consist of patterned, interactive processes with emergent properties. The regularities of these processes have rules that are hierarchically structured with guidelines for regulating the relationships among the elements of the system and between the system and its environment (Broderick, 1993).

Congruent with structural functional and general systems theory, family systems theory views the family as a whole, with the primary focus being on the interaction
among family members (Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993). Family systems are composed of roles and relational ties, with patterns of relating developing as family members interact with each other over time (Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993). These patterns are reciprocal and repetitive, and once these patterns are established the system works to maintain a state of equilibrium (Cheal, 1991). Events that occur in a family are not viewed as being random, but rather a result of the interconnected system and its functioning (McGoldrick & Gerson, 1985).

According to family systems theory, the goal of a family system is to maintain equilibrium (Cheal, 1991). This equilibrium could be maintained through feedback loops, boundaries, family rules, and family rituals and traditions (Bradshaw, 1988). Feedback loops provide information to the family system. This system could incorporate outside information and respond to it, or it could ignore or reject the information (Kitchens, 1991). Researchers have found that families who are receptive to outside information while continuing to maintain their boundaries will continue to evolve and adjust to changes in the environment (Cheal, 1991). Those families, who close themselves off from this information flow or those who have no boundaries at all, could lose their ability to meet the needs of individual family members (McGoldrick & Gerson, 1985). Consequently, family processes are described as being ongoing and dynamic, subject to both internal and external influences (Broderick, 1993).

Families create boundaries, both among family members and between family members and the outside social environment (Broderick, 1993). The concept of boundary is usually assessed by examining the degree of involvement and the degree of emotional
connection among family members (Whitchurch and Constantine, 1993). Researchers have suggested that family rituals provide one mechanism through which family boundaries are established and maintained (Broderick, 1993; Pipher, 1996). Family rituals have the potential to bind family members to each other and to connect the family to the outside social environment (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Bradshaw, 1988). Cheal (1991) suggests that family rituals provide a communication mechanism through which families express their feelings about one another.

From a family systems perspective, individual problems are attributed to family dysfunction (McGoldrick & Gerson, 1985; Bradshaw, 1988). Many family systems theorists believe that dysfunctional transactional patterns among family members contribute to individual problems, such as alcoholism or violence (Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993). For example, researchers who have studied families with an alcoholic member, found that patterns of family interaction often center on the intoxicated family member. They explore the transactional patterns in alcoholic families and identified some of the consequences for family members. They have found, for example, that children who grow up in alcoholic families have an increased risk of becoming alcoholics themselves, have a propensity to marry alcoholics, and have higher risks of developing emotional and psychological disorders (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Bradshaw, 1988; Kitchens, 1991). Also, when an alcoholic family member becomes sober, the family has to begin to regenerate new patterns of interaction that represent the current status of the family. Family therapists often prescribe the development and incorporation of new family rituals in these recovering families (Imber-Black & Roberts,
Family systems theory has not been without its critics, especially from feminist theorists (Cheal, 1991). Feminist theorists suggest that the inherent assumption of family systems theory, that there is equal status among all the members of the family, is not consistent with the notion that families are usually patriarchal, with an unequal distribution of power and resources among women and children. They challenge the view that all family members contribute equally to a dysfunctional system. This could not be true if the elements of the system did not have equal status (Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993). Finally, like structural functional theory, family systems theory neglects the individual actor and their unique characteristics and experiences in the system. This, along with the feminist criticisms of family systems theory, comprises the residual category for this theory (Alexander, 1987).

**Symbolic-Interaction Theory**

Collectivist-nonrational theories have been criticized for not giving individuals enough credit for actively shaping their own social environments. The major theoretical perspective that attempts to address this residual category is symbolic interaction theory (Alexander, 1987). This approach focuses on how individuals contribute to their own experiences. Alexander (1987) considered this an individualistic-nonrational presupposition. In this approach, the actor was seen as playing a deliberate role in shaping their social environment. Through social interaction, individuals shape their own social experiences. Symbolic interaction theorists also suggest that through social interaction a sense of self emerges.
In this study, it was proposed that positive family ritual experiences contribute to self-esteem and conforming activities, both with and independent of the family. The previous discussion of structural functional and family systems theory suggests that families are systems, that members interact with each other, and that family members attempt to maintain equilibrium in the system. In addition, through family rituals, family members internalize the social norms, values and expected role behaviors of their culture (Broderick, 1993; Whitchurch and Constantine, 1993). However, these theories do not identify the precise mechanisms through which this process takes place in individuals. Symbolic interaction theory attempts to provide an explanation for how norms, values, and expected role behavior are internalized and how this contributes to the development of a sense of self and self-esteem. In this section, the following is discussed: the importance of developing a sense of self, the basic tenets of symbolic interaction theory, how self-esteem develops, and the contributions of some major symbolic interactionist theorists to these developments, including Charles Horton Cooley, George Herbert Mead, and Erving Goffman.

Many sociologists have suggested that a sense of self develops through social interaction. Having a sense of self has several implications for the individual. They are:

1. A sense of self implies that individuals can interact with themselves. They can make changes and modify their own behavior.
2. A sense of self makes possible a mental life. Thus, the mind emerges.
3. Once an individual has a sense of self, they are able to direct and control personal behavior (Meltzer, 1994).
Symbolic interaction theorists agree that a sense of self emerges as a result of social interaction (Turner, 1991). The following describes the basic tenets of symbolic interaction theory and the process through which a sense of self develops:

1. Humans act toward things on the basis of the meanings the things have for them.
2. Meaning arise during interaction between people.
3. Meanings are modified through an interpretive process.
4. Individuals are not born with a sense of self but develop self-concepts through social interaction.
5. Self-concepts provide an important motivation for behavior.
6. Individual and small groups are influenced by larger cultural and societal processes.
7. It is through social interaction in everyday situations that individuals work out the details of social structure (Boss, Doherty, LaRossa, Schumm, Steinmetz, 1993).

One mechanism through which social interaction takes place is through family rituals (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Pipher, 1996). It is proposed that if family members perceive their involvement with these rituals as a positive experience, they will be motivated to continue to engage in this behavior. Repeated positive experiences in which individuals feel like they belong and are accepted by group members, contribute to positive feelings of self-worth (Gergen, 1971; Garbarino & Kostelny, 1992; Cooley, 1994).

Self has been identified as one of the primary variables of symbolic interaction theory (Spitzer, Couch, & Stratton, 1994). Symbolic interaction theorists have offered a
variety of explanations for how a sense of self develops (Mead, 1934/1970; Goffman, 1959; Cooley, 1994). Charles Horton Cooley's (1994) concept, the looking glass self, proposes that an individual's sense of self emerges from the reaction of others during social interaction. In his social psychological theory, primary groups are especially influential in the development of a positive or negative sense of self.

George Herbert Mead (1934/1970) defined self as the ability to take oneself as an object. According to Mead, social activity and social relationships lead to the development of self. Self evolves as individuals develop the ability to view themselves as others view them. Mead called this taking the role of the other. This process evolves through stages until individuals incorporate the view of "the generalized other" (p. 154). Mead stated that the generalized other represents the attitudes of the community and gives individuals their unity of self. Individuals are then able to view and make evaluations about themselves from the perspectives of society. The self-directed individuals learn to conform to group expectations, and these expectations contribute to social control. According to Mead, this leads to conforming behavior and to a more cohesive society. Nonconformity occurred because each individual self is different and there are multiple generalized others (Turner, 1991).

Another influential and more contemporary symbolic interaction theorist, Erving Goffman (1959), used the metaphor of theatrical performance to describe self-identity formation. He suggested that as individuals perform their scripts (displayed particular roles), the audience (the people with whom they interact) react to their performance. As part of this process, the actor attempts to manipulate the audience's impression of the
performance. There were two reasons for impression management (Sabini, 1995). The first reason is to get people to have a favorable impression of the actor. The second reason is to get individuals to share a conception of the identities of the individuals involved in a social encounter. This contributes to a shared impression of the social interaction. When impression management is not successful, embarrassment and a loss of esteem sometimes occur (Goffman, 1959).

Goffman (1959) proposed that actors are proactive in shaping their own identity formation. In Interaction Rituals (1967), he suggested that being committed to a certain standard of conduct shapes the image one has of oneself. Goffman stated that when individuals establish a particular way of treating people and a particular way of responding to people, they must make sure that it is possible for them to act this way and to be this kind of person. When a rule of conduct is broken, self-image is threatened. This results in what Goffman called "role distance" (cited in Turner, 1991, p. 458). According to Turner (1991), Goffman was suggesting that when one assumes a role, it is connected to the self-image projected by the actors during their performance. The self that one reveals in a situation is dependent upon the responses of others, which confirms or disconfirms that person's self in a situation. On the other hand, the performance on stage is greatly circumscribed by self.

In his later works, Goffman attempted to combat the criticism of randomness that had been directed toward symbolic interaction theory. This theoretical perspective has been criticized for neglecting the influence of the social context in which social interaction takes place. Goffman responded by suggesting that individuals use
idealization and rituals to provide a collective reference for social behavior (Alexander, 1987). Through idealization, actors use their performances "to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society" (Alexander, 1987, p. 235). This leads to ceremonial behavior, or what Goffman (1967) refers to as ritual behavior.

According to symbolic interaction theorists, individuals interacted in their social environments based on the meaning that situations have for them (Boss, Doherty, LaRossa, Shcumm, Steinmetz, 1993). This implies an emotional investment on the part of the individuals during these interactions. Thus, these experiences have the potential to shape their sense of self in both positive and negative ways. Cooley (1994) suggested that self-esteem is influenced by the judgments of others towards the person. He stated that individuals could be moved to pride or shame, joy or despair, depending on the reactions of others.

Symbolic interactionism views individuals as creative, active agents in their social environment. However, there are two major criticisms leveled at this theoretical perspective. The first came from feminist theorists who criticized interactionist theorists for ignoring the asymmetry in relations between men and women (Cheal, 1991). The second criticism comes from other social theorists who pointed to the constant struggle on the part of interaction theorists to avoid presenting social interaction as being a random phenomenon (Alexander, 1987). These criticisms contributed to the residual category of symbolic interaction theory.

The discussion in the previous sections describes ritual behavior and how it can contribute to a consensus-based social organization in the social environment, how the
norms and values of this social environment can be internalized by individuals during social interaction, and how this contributes to the development of a sense of self. The premise is that if the consensus-based norms and values of the culture are internalized, individuals will be more likely to exhibit conforming behavior. The following is a discussion on one theory of social control that attempts to explain why some individuals are more likely to exhibit conforming behavior than others.

**Social Control Theory**

Multiple theories and explanations for deviant behavior have been developed and no one theory or explanation accounts for all deviant behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). In this study, social control theory is used. Theories of social control have focused on the strategies and techniques that contribute to conforming behavior (Hirschi, 1969; Reckless, 1973b). An a priori assumption of social control theories is that all individuals have a predisposition for deviant behavior. The question that social control theorists have often asked is "why don't people become deviant?", especially when opportunities exist and there is peer pressure to commit deviant acts (Shoemaker, 1996). Social control theorists examine the norms, values, and beliefs of individuals as well as the influences of family and community and how they contribute to conforming behavior (Dryfoos, 1990; Palmer & Humphrey, 1990). They proposed that the more involved and committed an individual is to conventional activities and the greater the attachment to others, such as family and friends, the less likely the person is to violate the norms of a society (Hirschi, 1969; Shoemaker, 1996). In addition, social control theory was viewed from two levels. The first was the macro-level, which focused on the control of groups, especially through
formal social structures (Ritzer, 1992). The second was the micro-level, which focused on the individual and the less formal aspects of social control (Hirschi, 1969; Palmer & Humphrey, 1990).

Several basic assumptions of control theory have been identified (Shoemaker, 1996). First, social control theory assumes that all humans have the propensity to be deviant. Second, if deviance is normal, then some controls are necessary to hold it in check. Third, delinquency or deviance assumes the absence of some sort of control mechanism(s). Finally, it is assumed that there is a societal consensus about expected norms and values. Therefore, the essence of control theories is that during socialization, there are weak personal or weak social control factors that contribute to delinquency.

Peter Berger (1963) used a multi-layered model to describe the influence of social control, moving from macro to micro levels of influence. In his model, the individual was viewed as standing in the center of a set of concentric circles, with each representing a different system of social control. The outer circles are composed of legal and political systems. Systems of morality, custom and manners, and one's occupational system comprise the middle layers of the circle. The system closest to the individual is composed of human groups such as family and friends. These inner groups exert informal control upon the individual. Berger thought that familial social control was less formal than other institutions in society, but not necessarily less influential. He suggested that individuals have their most important social ties with members of their primary group, therefore, they were far more sensitive to the disapproval, loss of prestige, ridicule, or contempt of the members of this group than from members of secondary groups.
Walter Reckless' control theory also proposes that there are levels of influence on conforming behavior, with inner containment having more influence than outer containment (1973a). Reckless (1973b) called his theory a middle-range theory and thought that it could account for two-thirds to three-quarters of both official crime statistics and unreported cases of crime. His theory excluded those offenders on the periphery, including those who committed crimes because of some organic brain dysfunction, psychological disorders, or whose deviant behavior was part of the social norm for their group.

Containment theory attempts to explain conforming behavior as well as delinquency (Reckless, 1973b). According to Reckless, there are two dimensions of containment: inner containment and outer containment. Gordan Waldo, in his analysis of containment theory, asserted that the focal point of inner containment is self-concept, and the focal point for outer containment is the various social institutions with which individuals come in contact (Reckless, 1973a). Although the two dimensions are separated by definition, they are very much interrelated. Reckless (1973a) stated:

We are interested in the influence of certain institutions (outer containment) but only as the individual's attitudes and perceptions toward these institutions are incorporated into the individual's attitudes toward self (inner containment). In other words, an individual's self-concept is in part made up of his perceptions of the environment and institutional structures therein (p. 195).

With control theory the following is emphasized: deviant behavior is more attributable to the lack of social constraints than to criminal motivation. Defective control
systems affect the learning of social norms in terms of appropriate behavior. Deviance is more likely to occur if the groups that an individual depends on for normative structure and guidance are disorganized (Fox, 1985).

When elements of social control theory are compared with structural theories of delinquency, researchers have found that social control variables are at least as powerful as structural variables in providing explanations of deviant behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). Both Reckless and Hirschi have received much empirical support for their theories of social control. However, this perspective has its critics. Agnew (1985) found there was less empirical support for social control theory when a longitudinal analysis of delinquent behavior was conducted. During the first phase of his study, he found a strong correlation between the social control variables of parental attachment, grades, school attachment and activities, peer attachment, commitment to future goals, and beliefs about the importance of being honest and not cheating. However, during the second phase of his study, the explanatory value of these variables diminished significantly. Agnew suggested that cross-sectional studies greatly exaggerated the relevance of social control theory. His suggestion was that social control theory might better explain deviance in middle adolescence than among older adolescents. He concluded that researchers should view delinquency as an age-related phenomenon and should consider different predictor variables for different stages of development.

Social control theorists have also been criticized because of their emphasis on self-concept as a deterrent to deviant behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). There have been mixed findings on the role of self-esteem in deviant behavior (Jang & Thornberry, 1998),
and conflict theorists have argued that this is because the influence of social inequalities that exist in the social environment are often ignored when examining the relationship between self-esteem and deviant behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). This criticism, along with the concern about cross-sectional data analysis, contributes to the residual category of social control theory (Alexander, 1987).

Risk Factors

Finally, in order to account for the residual categories left by the previous theories, some of the variables that represent the social and demographic characteristics of the respondents are included in the model in Chapter 1 to see if they influence deviant behavior, independent of family rituals (Alexander, 1987). These variables were also included in an attempt to account for some of Reckless' (1973b) outer containment variables, and to compensate for the residual categories left by the other two presuppositions. For example, conflict theorists have proposed that deviant behavior may be influenced by the social inequalities that exist in society (Shoemaker, 1996). In order to account for the insights gained through conflict theory, control variables such as socioeconomic status, ethnic minority status, and the type of neighborhood in which one was reared were included in this study. The rationale for doing this was to acknowledge the validity of the conflict perspective in its explanatory role, while knowing that a comprehensive theory for all social phenomena does not yet exist (Alexander, 1987).

Conclusion

In this study, different theories were used to explain how family rituals might contribute to conforming behavior. Structural functional theory proposes that societies,
through their social organization, have a normative order that is internalized by its members through the socialization process. As family members interact with each other through patterned interactions, social organization is established and social order is maintained. Family systems theory provides the explanation for how family rituals contribute to social organization within the family, and how members of the family influence each other’s behavior. Through this process, individual family members gain a sense of self and a quality of self-esteem. These processes are explained using symbolic interaction theory. Conforming and deviant behavior are explained using social control theory, which suggests that deviance is a result of poor control mechanisms.
CHAPTER III
LITERATURE REVIEW ON
SOCIAL ORDER, RITUALS, AND DEVIANCE

This chapter provides a review of the literature on the important concepts in this study. The first section focuses on social organization, social disorganization, and social order. A section on rituals follows this, with discussions on primitive rituals, secular rituals, contemporary rituals, and family rituals. An attempt was made to show that there are consistent themes of ritual behaviors, no matter what type of rituals are being described. The third section focuses on inner containment, especially self-esteem. The outer containment variable of conforming activities is discussed in the fourth section. The fifth section deals with deviant behavior, in particular, delinquent behavior. The model that is presented in chapter one provides the framework for the following discussion.

Social Organization and Disorganization

The insights gained from the study of social organization can be applicable to the study of the family. Kantor and Lehr (1975) found that some of the most dysfunctional families are those characterized by a chaotic, disorganized structure. The purpose of this study is to examine how family rituals contribute to family organization and order, and ultimately, to conforming behavior. The following discussion explores social organization/disorganization and their consequences for the social environment.

Social life has been considered a dynamic process with many uncertainties. Yet,
sociologists have proposed that it is possible for order and predictability to exist in social behavior. According to Olsen (1968), social order emerged as a result of ongoing relationships becoming interwoven into relatively stable and predictable arrangements. These predictable arrangements, or patterns of social organization, have developed qualities that transcend individual characteristics. Many sociologists agree that patterns of social organization have a reality of their own, and their existence can be supported through empirical investigation (Alexander, 1987). In addition, social order can both limit and provide opportunities for social behavior. Olsen, like many other sociologists, was influenced by Durkheim's ideas on social organization and social order. According to Durkheim:

A whole is not identical with the sum of its parts.

It is something different, and its properties differ from those of its component parts.... By reason of this principle, society is not a mere sum of individuals. Rather, the system formed by their association represents a specific reality, which has its own characteristics.... We must seek the explanation of social life in the nature of society itself

(Cited in Olsen, 1968, p. 41).

For a long time, sociologists have been interested in studying the consequences of social organization versus social disorganization (Durkheim, 1893/1964). The processes that form stable institutions, and the subsequent consequences for social order, have been of particular interest (Ritzer, 1992). Many sociologists believe that stable patterns of social organization contribute to social order (Durkheim, 1893/1964; Alexander, 1987).
Conversely, they believe that social disorganization can lead to anomie and deviance (Ritzer, 1992). According to Palmer and Humphrey (1990), the norms and roles that guide interaction among the members of a society contribute to a society's system of social organization. Norms provide standards of behavior and roles are the expected behaviors for a particular status. Norms and role behavior reflect the culture of the society, and some sociologists believe that deviance is more likely to occur when there is noncompliance with expected norms and roles (Ritzer, 1992). This has often been referred to as the normative approach to deviance (Palmer & Humphrey, 1990).

An alternative explanation for understanding deviance has been developed. This has been referred to as the societal reaction to deviance (Palmer & Humphrey, 1990). This approach suggested that people defined deviance differently in a society, and those who had more power and resources had more influence over the labeling of deviant behavior. This contributed to different sanctions for deviant behavior, depending on who was committing the deviant acts. This approach reflected a conflict perspective on deviance. Dahrendorf (Ritzer, 1992) suggested that society had two faces: conflict and consensus. He stated that conflict theorists examined the conflicts and stresses that occurred among the different members of a society while consensus theorists focused on social integration and order. It seemed to be true that all societies had both conflict and consensus, but sociologists have not been able to successfully consolidate these two approaches into one theory. Therefore, researchers usually chose one perspective over the other. In this study, the normative approach to understanding deviance was used.

The normative approach to deviance suggested that to maintain social order, there
must be enough structure in social interaction to provide stability and continuity. Too little structure could lead to chaos, or anomie. On the other hand, too much structure could lead to meaningless ritualistic behavior (Merton, 1958). Durkheim (1893/1964) found that meaningful ritual behavior contributed to social organization. Through ritual behavior, individuals interacted with each other and organized their behavior. Over time, these patterned interactions contributed to the stability of social relationships. Stability in social relationships led to continuity in social structures and institutions. Researchers have found that this contributed to the confidence among group members concerning appropriate behavior and the connection between present conforming behavior and future rewards (Shoemaker, 1996). Thus, the effectiveness of social structures and institutions as controls of conforming behavior was reinforced.

According to Robert Merton, social disorganization occurred when members of a society were unable to act in accordance with the normative values of a culture (Turner, 1991). This contributed to a lack of integration among the members of a society. At the macro level, rapid social change, migration, and lack of resources contributed to social disorganization among society’s members. At the micro level, social disorganization could be caused by poverty, lack of integration into the community, and rapid social change. Some of the responses to social disorganization were social change, reorganization, or deviance. Social disorganization potentially contributed to instability in social structures and institutions. The result could lead to uncertainty and confusion among group members regarding appropriate behavior and the connection between present conforming behavior and future rewards (Reckless, 1973b). Thus, the
effectiveness of social structures and institutions as controls of deviant behavior might decline. Those who challenged this view of social organization and disorganization asked how institutional structures could influence individual behavior, or in other words, how could external social structures become internalized? This study attempted to explain this process. It was proposed that through the development and performance of family rituals, individual family members internalized the norms, values, and beliefs of their family and their culture. This contributed to higher self-esteem and conforming behavior, which in turn, led to a reduction in deviant behavior.

Rituals

Properties of Rituals

Ritual behaviors have been described as predictable patterns of interaction (Browne, 1980). Rituals contributed to the regulation of social behavior because people knew what to expect in social encounters and they knew what their own responses should be (Kanagy & Kraybill, 1999). Several properties of rituals have been identified. They included structure, stabilization, similarity, transformation, and communication (Browne, 1980; Wolin & Bennett, 1984). These properties interacted with each other to shape, affirm, and maintain the identity of the group. The following describes some of the characteristics of these ritual properties.

Structure is the first property. Rituals provided structure to social interaction by establishing roles and mechanisms for relating to family members (Fiese, Hooker, Kotary, Schwangler, 1993). Bossard and Boll (1950) suggested that through family rituals, the position of family members became crystallized. In particular, statuses, roles,
and dominant relationships were clearly and repeatedly defined. Kanagy and Kraybill (1999) suggested that structured patterns of interaction among the members of a group contributed to social organization within the group. Group members depended on these roles to guide their behavior in both formal and informal social situations. Rituals also provided the mechanism for transitioning from one social status to another (Browne, 1980; Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). For example, weddings represented the transformation in social relations from single to married status.

The second and third properties, stabilization and similarity, were the result of repeated acts of rituals. The stability of relationships occurred when there were repeated patterns of behavior over time, many of which became rituals (Wolin & Bennett, 1984). These repeated patterns of behavior were similar, but not always identical across occurrences (Browne, 1980). Patterns of stable and similar behaviors linked individuals and groups to one another. One result could be order and continuity in social interaction, which could contribute to the stabilization of social relationships (Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). In addition, over time, rituals provided both intragenerational and intergenerational continuity (Bossard & Boll, 1950; Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). Pipher (1996) suggested that these repeated patterns of interaction, or routines, provided stability and predictability for families because members did not have to renegotiate each social encounter. She suggested that children seem to respond favorably to family routines because they provided them with a sense of security.

The fourth property, transformation, included the preparatory events that preceded rituals and the actual time during which rituals were enacted (Wolin & Bennett, 1984).
This transformational period often required planning and preparation, which represented a deliberate effort on the part of the participants to engage in these activities (Fiese, Hooker, Kotary, & Schwangler, 1993). Ritual behaviors set aside periods of special time. This required a collective representation of the activities in the minds of the participants. Researchers have found this to be true for both everyday events and special occasions (Pipher, 1996). For example, according to Pipher (1996), parents often created a routine for their children to prepare them for bedtime before the actual ritual of reading a bedtime story took place. Pipher (1996) suggested that rituals protected time by setting it aside for certain activities. This protected time became important to the individuals involved, and she concluded that important time is a series of conscious moments, not a continuous process.

The final property of rituals was communication. Through communication, ideas, beliefs, and feelings about the social world were transmitted. Communication through rituals took two forms; the symbolic and the affective (Wolin & Bennett, 1984). Symbols were objects, actions, or language that were used to represent something. They often provided the cues for ritual interaction by marking certain practices and objects as significant or sacred (Obrien, 1999). For example, Durkheim (1912/1965) suggested that symbols provided a rallying point for the clan. Inanimate objects, such as totems, served as symbols of the group. These symbols were imbued with emotions and could arouse feelings and responses among clan members. Contemporary researchers have found that symbols have the ability to stimulate cognitive reactions and feelings, often triggering ritual responses (Browne, 1980; Obrien, 1999).
Sociologists have suggested that symbols were not merely confined to inanimate objects. Both language (Mead 1934/1970) and behavior (Wolin & Bennett, 1984) had the potential to stimulate ritual behavior. For example, Mead (1934/1970) contended that verbal communication was an important symbol for social interaction. According to Mead, communication through language required organized responses from the participants. These organized responses symbolized group values and beliefs and would eventually be internalized by the individuals involved in the interactions (Mead, 1934/1970).

The second component of communication involved affect, or the emotional arousal that results from participation in rituals. Symbols that led to ritual interaction or that represented ritual interaction often aroused emotional responses (Malinowski, 1954). Researchers have found that rituals were laden with meaning, both positive and negative (Kanagy & Kraybill, 1999). Rituals that produced a positive affect were generally perceived as something worth repeating by the members of the group.

It should be noted that not all ritual behavior leads to a positive experience. For example, Browne (1980) distinguished between rituals and ritualism, stating that rituals had intrinsic value while ritualism included habitual actions that were empty and meaningless. Extreme ritualism has sometimes been associated with abusive behavior, including murder that involves ritualized sexual violence (Hazelwood & Michaud, 2001). Thus, it would not be rituals themselves that had influence on behaviors and attitudes, but the meaning that was attributed to ritual behavior. Therefore, the emotional consequences of ritual behavior depend on the situation and the individual's perception of the ritual
interaction (Reiss, 1981).

**Primitive Rituals**

Sociologists and anthropologists have contributed to our understanding of ritual behavior through their studies of rituals in primitive cultures (Durkheim, 1912/1965; Malinowski, 1954). Early researchers attempted to explain the sociological function of these customs and the part they played in the maintenance and development of societies. According to Malinowski (1954), rituals were invaluable to the group because they created mental habits and a basis for social interaction. He found that in primitive societies, traditions were of supreme value for the maintenance of the community. Both he and Durkheim (1912/1965) found that rituals were one mechanism for maintaining and passing on traditions, values, and beliefs that were important to the society. The following provides a discussion on Durkheim's (1912/1965) study of the primitive rituals of the Arunta and Malinowski's study of the Melanesians (1954). Many of the ritual properties that were mentioned above can be identified in these primitive ritual behaviors.

In *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Durkheim (1912/1965) studied a primitive tribe, the Arunta of Australia. For this clan, the major function of ritual performance was the maintenance of magical belief systems and the perpetuation of religious symbolism. The subsequent effects were both social and moral. Members of the clan observed rites that were passed down from their ancestors; this linked the present with the past and provided stability to social life. Ritual mentality served to awaken ideas and sentiments and attachments from one generation to the next and from the individual to the group. Rituals also served to sustain the vitality of the beliefs of the group, to
"revivify the most essential elements of the collective consciousness" (420). Rites provided rules of conduct for how the members of the clan were to conduct themselves in the presence of sacred objects and provided a sense of moral well-being. The subject of Durkheim's (1912/1965) research was the clan, which was viewed as a family unit. Therefore, his study of the role of rituals among the clan members has relevance for the study of the family.

Malinowski (1954), an anthropologist, studied the ritual life of the Melanesians. He found that they had a rich and meaningful ritual life, consisting of many feasts and ceremonies. These were often performed in conjunction with annual series of rites over their gardens. The Melanesians also had totems in their gardens, which symbolized the connection between the Melanesians and the subjects of their rites. Rituals evolved to meet the Melanesians desire to control the abundance of a particular species, for both plants and animals. Magic was also part of the ritual proceedings, with rituals providing the mechanisms through which spells were cast. During all of the Melanesian’s ritual performances, the expression of emotion was the focus. Malinowski contended that rituals were primarily expressions of emotion, and that ritual acts were meaningless without these expressions. Thus, through rituals, the Melanesians communicated their feelings about the world around them.

Part of the ritual life of the Melanesians included the use of rites of passage to mark transitions through different stages of development. They called these rites initiation ceremonies. According to Malinowski (1954), the functions of initiation
ceremonies were: (a) to preserve the value of tradition; (b) to express power and to impress this power on the minds of each new generation; (c) to provide an efficient means of transmitting tribal lore, insure continuity in tradition and maintaining tribal cohesion; and (d) to help group members make social transitions. Under primitive conditions, conformity and conservatism of the members were of great importance to the tribe. As a result, traditions and rituals were of supreme value for the community.

**Functions of secular rituals**

Much of the early research on rituals focused on religious ceremonies. Through the study of secular rituals, the functions of rituals have been given broader application, with topics ranging from television viewing to sporting rituals (Browne, 1980). Many of the same properties of religious rituals were evident in secular rituals. For example, Moore and Myerhoff (Wolin & Bennett, 1984) proposed that secular rituals affirmed the group's ideology and incorporated the symbols of the group. Ritual acts acknowledged the group's shared heritage, educated its members, and regulated their behavior. They also acted as a mechanism for sharing beliefs and for perpetuating those beliefs over time. Finally, they offered its members an opportunity to share their identity as a group.

**Contemporary Rituals**

Erving Goffman (1967) and Randall Collins (1975) are two contemporary sociologists who have studied ritual behavior. In *Interaction Rituals* (1967), Goffman suggested that rituals were essential for; (a) mobilizing individuals to participate in interaction, (b) making individuals cognizant of the relevant rules of irrelevance, transformation, resource use, and talk, (c) guiding individuals during the course of the
interaction, and (d) helping individuals correct for breaches and incidents. He proposed that the most relevant rituals were those related to deference and demeanor.

Randall Collins was influenced by both Durkheim and Goffman (Collins, 1975). He used rituals as the basis for his exchange conflict theory (Turner, 1991). According to Collins (1975), micro-level interactions provided the initial building blocks of social interaction. The cumulative summary of these encounters into social structure was an ongoing process. Collins proposed that organizational structure was the result of repeated social encounters. He described social structure as "chains of interaction rituals" (Turner, 1991; 231). Rituals were patterns of behavior that evolved from repetitive actions. As interactions were repeated over time and more individuals were linked together, macro-level social structures developed. According to Collins (Turner, 1991), rituals required, (a) the physical assembly of the individuals involved in the encounters, (b) a common focus of attention, and mutual awareness of each other's attention, (c) a common emotional mood among co-present individuals, and (d) a symbolic representation of this common focus and mood with objects, persons, gestures, words, and ideas among interacting individuals. According to Collins (1975), rituals produced emotional energy and a sense of morality. Rituals were natural and unintended, or institutionalized and intentional. The conditions that shaped the form and consequence of rituals were inequality, social density, and the social diversity among co-present individuals.

In reference to Collins work, Turner (1991) stated that social structure not only revolved around formal ceremonies but also around the interaction rituals encountered on a daily basis. These encounters were essential for providing stability across social
encounters and for providing individuals with psychological security. Social structure resulted from repeated interaction rituals that connected social encounters together. These connections provided individuals with psychological security and a sense of belonging to the larger social order.

After examining the properties of rituals, the primitive study of rituals, secular rituals, and the contemporary study of rituals, several themes emerged. First, rituals involved structure and stabilization, which resulted from repeated interactions, with roles and relational ties being established among group members (Fiese, Hooker, Kotary, & Schwangler, 1993). Second, rituals provided stability and continuity among relationships (Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). Third, rituals involved the use of symbols (Durkheim, 1912/1965; Malinowski, 1954). Fourth, rituals had an emotional component, which could be either positive or negative, depending on the situation and the individual's perception of the situation (Bossard and Boll, 1950; Malinowski, 1954; Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). Fifth, rituals contributed to feelings of belonging and group cohesion (Durkheim, 1912/1965; Pipher, 1996). Finally, rituals provided continuity, both among group members and from one generation to the next (Durkheim, 1912/1965; Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992).

Family Rituals

Family rituals have many of the same properties as primitive and secular rituals. Bossard and Boll (1950) described family rituals as being the core of family culture. In their book Ritual and Family Living (1950), Bossard and Boll described three generations of family rituals for four hundred families. Their study covered a period of approximately
eighty years. According to Bossard and Boll (1950), the interaction of family members over time led to patterns of observable regularity among its members. They found that family rituals were an integral part of family life, were frequently and repetitiously observed, were social and interactional in style, and had an emotional impact on family members. Family rituals also contributed to family identity and led to a sense of family pride. However, they also found that sometimes rituals could create antagonism among family members, especially if members felt coerced into participating in family rituals.

Reiss (1981), in his study of family behavior, found that family rituals led to the development of a central theme or paradigm of family life. He defined the family paradigm as being the central organizer of the family’s shared beliefs, expectations, and fantasies about the social world. According to Reiss, family paradigms were maintained through two mechanisms: ceremonials and pattern regulators. Ceremonials were characterized as being charged with feeling, involving the participation of all family members, having a symbolic component, and being episodic. Reiss identified two types of ceremonials: consecration ceremonials and degradation ceremonials. He referred to consecration ceremonials as family rituals. Consecration ceremonials usually serve a positive function for the family. Degradation ceremonials are ritual behaviors with negative meaning. According to Reiss, degradation ceremonials occur in almost all families on occasion, and in a few families on a regular basis. Reiss predicted that a high incidence of degradation ceremonials in a family could lead to troublesome relationships between family members.

In addition to ceremonials, Reiss (1981) identified a second mechanism that
contributed to the family paradigm, pattern regulators. Pattern regulators are peripheral behaviors that made up daily routine activities. They are characterized as being routine, having no symbolism, being continuous, and being delegatable.

Reiss (1981) found that ceremonials and pattern regulators contribute in several ways to the family paradigm. First, they modulate the flow of information from the environment to the family. This flow of information varies for each family and there are consequences when too little or too much information is allowed into the family. For example, restricted information flow sometimes leads to the amplification of interactions between family members. Second, ceremonials and pattern regulators help families store information over time. Reiss found that families often use the same problem-solving strategies in different circumstances. Finally, the family objectifies its beliefs about itself through family rituals. These beliefs provide family members with a framework for their behavior in the outside world. According to Reiss, rituals are the primary mechanism through which a family conserves its paradigm.

**Typologies of Family Rituals**

In addition to Reiss’s categorization of family rituals, other family researchers have developed their own typologies (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). For example, Wolin and Bennett (1984) divided family rituals into three groups: family celebrations, family traditions, and patterned family interactions. Imber-Black and Roberts (1992) described four types of family rituals: daily rituals, family traditions, holiday celebrations, and life-cycle rituals. These different typologies suggest that different types of rituals serve different functions for family members. For instance, day-
to-day interactions among family members are centered on daily activities. They include mealtimes, bedtimes, comings and goings, and leisure activities. These interactions provide routine for family members so that they know what to expect from each other without having to renegotiate their interactions on a daily basis. According to Bossard and Boll (1950), rituals centered on simple household rules and facilitated discipline and the smooth functioning of home life. Family traditions and life-cycle rituals often marked transitions in the life of the family and contributed to family identity (Williams, 1990). The celebration of wedding anniversaries is a good example. Finally, family celebrations often center on cultural holidays (Cox, 1998). The celebration of these holidays provides a link between the family and the larger culture. In this research, the study of family rituals includes the full range of family interactions, from daily routines to family celebrations.

**Dimensions of Family Rituals**

Bossard and Boll (1950) suggest that family rituals express the beliefs and values of a family. They argue that family rituals are one way that families organize their behavior and they convey family pride. According to Fiese (1992a), family rituals become significant through the meaning and affect associated with them. She identifies two dimensions of family rituals: a symbolic dimension and a routine dimension. From their research, Fiese and Kline (1993) developed a typology of the interaction between the routine and symbolic components of family rituals. The routine dimension is composed of the roles that family members played when enacting family rituals. The symbolic dimension is the measurement of how individuals feel about their family rituals.
Fiese and Kline suggest that family rituals could be high in routine and high in symbolic meaning, low in routine and high in symbolic meaning, high in routine and low in symbolic meaning, and low in routine and low in symbolic meaning. Fiese (1992a) found in one study that the routine dimension of family rituals was positively related to anxiety in adolescence. In the same study, she found a negative correlation between positive meaning attributed to family rituals and anxiety symptoms in adolescence. Fiese concluded that it was the meaning and not the routine of family rituals that indicate whether they serve a positive or negative function for adolescents.

**Ritual Styles**

In addition to the dimensions of family rituals, families also exhibited different styles in their ritual behaviors. Imber-Black and Roberts (1992) suggest that ritual styles are often representative of the dynamics that are occurring within the family. They found that a number of life events such as divorce, remarriage, the entrance and exits of siblings, death, alcoholism, and unemployment influence family ritual styles. They characterized family rituals as being minimized, interrupted, rigid, obligatory, imbalanced and flexible. The first five styles were often indicative of problems within the family. For example, a minimized ritual style could signal that one or more family members were attempting to avoid reminders of painful events in the life of the family. Interrupted family rituals often occur when there is a divorce or some other family crisis, often adding to the stress that a family is already encountering. Obligatory rituals are examples of hollow rituals. Family members have to go through the perfunctory motions of ritual behavior but there is little positive meaning attached. Imbalanced ritual styles
indicate that one family member had more power in the relationship than others. Rigid ritual styles imply that the family is not open to change, and might be stagnant. For example, most families find that as children grow into adolescence, family rituals need to be modified. Rigid families often fail to make these adjustments.

The meaning associated with the previously mentioned ritual styles is usually negative. Positive meanings are more likely to be associated with flexible ritual styles. Flexible family rituals indicate that the family accepts growth and change while continuing to provide continuity and connectedness for its members.

**Functions of Family Rituals**

According to some family researchers, family rituals provide a window through which family systems can be viewed and evaluated (Wolin, Bennett, & Jacobs, 1988). They consider family rituals to encompass several key components of family systems. The following describes some of these components. First, family members come to share the same view of reality through family rituals (Broderick 1993). Second, family belief systems are acted out through family rituals (Fiese, 1992a; Imber-Black and Roberts, 1992). Third, family rituals lead to a shared sense of family and a sense of identity and belonging (Curran, 1983; Wolin and Bennett, 1984; Imber-Black and Roberts, 1992; Fiese, 1992a). Fourth, rituals link family members to the past, present, and future (Curran, 1983; Williams, 1990). This linkage from one generation to the next leads to feelings of stability, hope and renewal (Fiese, 1992a; Pipher, 1996). Fifth, family rituals help mark transitions from one stage of life to another (Williams, 1990; Imber-Black and Roberts, 1993). Finally, through ritual interactions, roles, boundaries and rules are
established, clarified and maintained (Bossard & Boll, 1950; Wolin and Bennett, 1984; Williams, 1990). Family rituals portray how family members relate to each other through the shaping, expressing and maintaining of important relationships (Williams, 1990; Imber-Black and Roberts, 1992; Cox, 1998).

The previous discussion of family rituals indicates that they have the potential to serve very important functions for the family. Family researchers have suggested that without them, there might be problems for family members (Bennett, Wolin, Reiss, Teitelbaum, 1987). This study proposes that those individuals who report positive experiences with family rituals are more likely to exhibit conforming behavior, both within and outside the family. Those individuals who exhibit more conforming behaviors are less likely to commit deviant behaviors. The next section describes how conforming behavior develops, specifically, through Walter Reckless’ containment theory.

**Containment**

Walter Reckless' containment theory has been described as a social-psychological explanation for conforming behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). His goal was to explain why some young people were able to resist acting in a deviant manner even when they lived in high-crime neighborhoods (Sacco and Kennedy, 1995). Reckless proposed that both inner and outer containment variables insulate some youth from delinquency by constraining nonconformist behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). He conceded that his theory could not explain all deviance, especially those deviant behaviors that were the result of organic brain dysfunctions or organized crime, but he felt thought that his theory could account for the majority of deviance.
Reckless (1973b) thought that containment theory offers a better explanation of delinquency than other theories for several reasons. First, it can be applied to particular individuals. Second, the various external and internal constraints can be observed and measured, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Third, this theory explains both delinquency and conformity. Fourth, it explains a wide variety of criminal and delinquent activity. Finally, it is a possible basis for treatment and prevention of delinquency (Shoemaker, 1996; 161).

Reckless' (1973b) containment theory proposes that there are both psychological and social factors that contribute to conforming and deviant behaviors. He called the psychological factors inner containment and the social factors outer containment. In this study, it was proposed that family rituals are one aspect of family life that have the potential to contribute to both inner and outer containment by providing individuals with a sense of identity and belonging and opportunities for conforming activities (Reiss, 1981; Fiese, 1992a).

**Inner Containment**

Reckless’ concept of inner containment focuses primarily on psychological factors (Shoemaker, 1996). The characteristics of individuals that contribute to inner containment are a good self-concept, self-control, goal orientation, and ego-strength (Reckless, 1973b). Recent research has established the relationship between low self-control and criminal activity (Longshore, 1998). In addition, individuals with inner control mechanisms have a high resistance to diversions, a high sense of responsibility, goal orientation, an ability to find substitute satisfactions, and tension-reducing
rationalizations (Reckless, 1973b). Alternatively, Reckless (1973b) suggests that there are characteristics of individuals that push them to become deviant. These include tensions, frustrations, and the need for immediate gratification.

Reckless placed a great deal of emphasis on the concept of self as a predictor of delinquent behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). He considered a positive self-concept to be a buffer against the pulls of delinquency. For the purpose of this study, self-concept was defined as the acknowledgment of the existence of self (Gergen, 1971). Once a sense of self has been established, individuals make judgments about themselves. This evaluation of self has often been called self-esteem (Branden, 1992). In this study, measures of self-esteem were the primary mechanism through which inner containment was evaluated. The following discussion describes how self-concept developed and how this process contributes to self-esteem.

Some sociologists have suggested that self-concept evolved as a result of social interaction (Mead, 1934/1970; Berger and Luckman, 1966; Cooley, 1994). In fact, the reality of everyday life is based on interactions and communications with others (Berger & Luckman, 1966). According to Berger and Luckman (1966), it is through this interaction that reality was constructed and a sense of self developed. As a result of this interaction, individuals develop a sense of self through their identification with significant others (Mead, 1934/1970). Based on the reaction of others, individuals develop feelings about themselves (Cooley, 1994). Self-evaluation is often called self-esteem (Jang and Thornberry, 1998). For the remainder of this study, self-esteem is the term used to describe the product of self-evaluation.

The process of developing self-esteem is both cognitive and emotional (Gergen, 1971). It is cognitive because individuals develop concepts to sort and classify events. This allows individuals to make sense of and negotiate the social world. Through social interaction, individuals develop concepts of themselves. Once a concept of self is established, it remains fairly constant over the life course (Battle, 1992), although social experiences can cause it to fluctuate. For example, cognitive dissonance theory suggests that when social situations challenge self-esteem, individuals attempt to reconcile and restore their self-concepts (Gergen, 1971; Sabini, 1995). The process of developing self-esteem is also emotional. When people act in certain ways toward an individual, the individual starts to adapt these orientations toward themselves (Gergen, 1971). This process involves identification with the roles and attitudes of specific individuals and situations with society's roles and expectations (Mead, 1934/1970).
The process for developing self-esteem begins in early childhood (Battle, 1992). During infancy, caregivers satisfy basic physical needs. This leads to physical satisfaction and feelings of being cared for and valued. When these experiences are repeated, these feelings are reinforced (Gergen, 1971). Researchers suggest that if children's needs are not met, they can build up a set of negative assumptions about themselves. If social interactions continue to be unfulfilling for the child, the child might retain negative impressions of self. In addition, these negative assumptions about self contribute to anxious or insecure attachments between parents and children (Karen, 1994). Researchers have found that attachments between parents and their children are not automatic (LaGrange & White, 1985; Broderick, 1993). They require deliberate effort on the part of parents in expressing parental love for their children (Karen, 1994). Broderick (1993) suggests that emotional attachment between parents and children provides the foundation for the development of positive self-esteem.

Hirschi (1969) found emotional attachment between parents and children to be an important predictor of delinquent behavior. He also found that nondelinquents were more likely to report feelings of attachment to their parents than delinquents and that attachment to parents when a child is considering committing a deviant act appears to have both a direct and indirect effect on delinquency. The direct effect is the actual time spent with parents interacting in some positive way, which meant less time available for delinquent activities. The indirect effect is the psychological influence of the parents on their child’s behavior.

According to Branden (1992), like attachment, self-esteem is not automatic; it is
acquired. Gergen (1971) suggests that individuals seek out social interactions that reinforce their esteem. Therefore, individuals play an active role in the development of their own self-esteem. Some researchers found poor self-esteem to be correlated with delinquent behavior (Hirschi, 1969, Reckless, 1973b; Shoemaker, 1996), and this relationship could be very complex (Owens, 1994). For example, Broderick (1993) viewed self-esteem as an intervening variable and suggested that parental behaviors influence self-esteem, which then contributes to conforming behavior.

Owens (1994) studied the relationship between self-esteem and problems in adolescence using three measures of self-esteem: global self-esteem, positive feelings of self-worth, and self-deprecation. He proposed that self-esteem is recursive, with positive self-esteem leading to prosocial behavior, which contributes to increased feelings of self-worth. Based on these ideas, he hypothesized: (a) a negative relationship between self-deprecation and school grades; (b) a positive relationship between positive self-worth and school grades; (c) a positive relationship between self-deprecation and depression; and (d) a positive and negative relationship between feelings of self-worth and delinquency. For example, he proposed that positive self-worth would be negatively correlated with delinquency and that delinquency would be positively correlated with increasing self-deprecation.

In 1994, Owens tested his hypotheses with a sample composed of both white and African-American adolescents. He found that for white adolescents there was a negative relationship between self-deprecation and school grades. For African-American adolescents, positive self-esteem did not significantly relate to grades but getting good
grades contributed to positive feelings of self-worth. Owens concluded that poor grades contribute to feelings of self-deprecation. In addition, adolescent African-Americans were more sensitive than whites to the evaluations of teachers. Owens found that negative reactions from teachers rather than poor grades had a more negative impact on African-American students than white students. This response contributed to higher levels of self-deprecation in African-Americans. For both African-American and white adolescents, self-deprecation was positively correlated with depression. Adolescents who reported high levels of depression also reported higher levels of self-deprecation. Finally, high levels of self-deprecation were positively correlated with self-reported measures of delinquent behaviors. In conclusion, self-esteem was correlated with adolescent problems. In addition, Owens concluded that experiences that contributed to positive self-worth and experiences that lead to self-deprecation should be distinguished. These consequences were the result of different experiences and Owens suggested that appropriate steps should be taken to provide opportunities for enhancement of self-esteem while reducing situations that contribute to self-deprecation.

Some research has contradicted the notion of a correlation between low self-esteem and deviant behavior (Dryfoos, 1990). For example, in a recent study Jang and Thornberry (1998) found that delinquent acts actually contribute to self-enhancement in some adolescents. This self-enhancement was treated as the result of positive feedback provided by the adolescents’ peers when they committed delinquent acts. These results should be a cautionary note that the correlation between self-esteem and deviant behavior may vary depending on how self-esteem was operationalized and measured (Shoemaker,
Outer Containment

Reckless (1973b) treated social factors as the outer containment variable. He characterized these factors as the social experiences of individuals, including family interactions, peer groups, memberships in organizations, participation in community life, and the influence of the mass media. Reckless (1973b) considered outer containment variables to be buffers between the individual and the social environment. These variables control internal urges and contain behavior. Outer containment was seen as primarily the result of social ties that link young people to families, schools, peers, and communities (Sacco and Kennedy, 1995). According to Reckless, the most important variables in outer containment are the primary groups, including the family and the community (Shoemaker, 1996). In addition, Reckless felt that the structure of roles and expectations in society and the sense of acceptance and belonging relative to a group in society were very important in contributing to conforming behavior. He also suggested that young people encounter pulls in their social environment, consisting of factors such as neighborhood environment, poverty, unemployment and minority-group status. Reckless (1973b) thought that peer relationships could serve a dual role with good companions contributed to external control while bad companions are an environmental pull.

Hirschi (1969), another social control theorist, proposed some of the same ideas as Reckless. He identified four elements of the social bond that reduce a predisposition for deviant behavior: attachments, commitments, involvements, and beliefs. Hirschi's
(1969) element of involvement in conventional activity was similar to Reckless' outer containment variable of membership in organizations. Hirschi suggested that involvement in conventional activities deterred delinquency because less time and energy was available for delinquent activities. He examined the relationship between young people’s involvement in conventional organizations and deviant behavior, including involvement in school. Hirschi (1969) found that less time spent on homework and lower grade point averages were associated with more delinquent acts. He also found that a positive attachment to school was associated with lower rates of delinquency. A more recent study by Kruttschnitt, Heath, & Ward, (1986) suggests that involvement in team sports and club activities have weak but significant effects on violent criminal behavior. For example, they found club membership to have a mediating effect on the influence of media violence on violent criminal behavior.

**Inner and Outer Containment**

Reckless (Shoemaker, 1996) suggested a reciprocal relationship between inner and outer containment. First, he proposed that the individual's perception of outer containment variables is more important than the actual existence of these variables. Second, inner containment shapes the perception of outer containment and outer containment experiences shape inner containment (Reckless, 1973b). Third, individuals with high inner containment are less susceptible to social influences while those with low inner containment require stronger external controls. Reckless (1973b) felt that inner containment was more important than outer containment in an urban society because group life is less cohesive than in smaller communities. Specifically, in this theoretical
approach, weak inner containment contributes to poor decision making if social controls are not in place. It was through the socialization process that both inner and outer containment were developed, and it was the family that played a very important role in helping children with this development (Geismar & Wood, 1986; Shoemaker, 1996).

Pipher (1996) also proposed that there was a reciprocal relationship between the inner containment variable of self-esteem and the outer containment variables of conforming activities. She suggested that self-esteem resulted from good works and accomplishments rather than vice-versa. Through family rituals, family members have opportunities for good works and accomplishments. Family rituals provide a linking mechanism between family members and the larger community (Reiss, 1981). For example, if the family is part of a religious organization, rituals connected individual family members to each other and to the religious community, while simultaneously differentiating the family from the larger non-religious community (Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). Pipher (1996) concluded that these opportunities contribute to higher self-esteem.

The basic premise of control theories is that deviance occurs because the mechanisms that control deviant behavior are either weak or nonexistent (Shoemaker, 1996). Some sociologists believe that social control mechanisms are both formal and informal, and primarily the result of social ties that link young people to families, schools, peers and communities (Berger, 1963; Sacco and Kennedy, 1995). Attachment to parents is the first line in social control (LaGrange & White, 1985). If children and parents are positively attached, they are more likely to exhibit conforming behavior. Lack
of attachment to parents had been associated with violent criminal behavior in adulthood (Kruttschnitt, Heath, & Ward, 1986). This study proposed that family rituals provide the mechanisms through which families conveyed their feelings for each other and offer opportunities for conforming activities. These variables are mechanisms for social control, which should lead to less deviant behavior.

Deviant Behavior

Deviant behavior has been widely studied by many researchers (Shoemaker, 1996). It has been defined as any behavior that the majority of a given group finds unacceptable or that evokes a collective negative response (Tittle, 1995). Deviance has been identified through both formal and informal means. The formal labeling of deviance has been called crime. Formal measures of criminal behavior for adults in the United States come from the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) (Reid, 1997). The Uniform Crime Report is based on crimes reported to law enforcement agencies. The National Crime Victimization Survey measures individuals reporting their own crime victimization, regardless of whether or not it was reported to law enforcement officials. An additional and less formal way to gain information about criminal behavior has been to survey people about their own criminal activity (Tittle, 1995). Researchers have developed self-report measures of deviance to explore deviant acts that may never have been revealed. Much self reported crime indicates that a large percentage of deviant acts go unreported. As a result, some researchers think that self-report measures of criminal activity may provide additional information about criminal behavior (Reid, 1997). In this study, both official and self-
report measures of criminal behavior were used to identify deviant behavior.

Paternoster and Triplett (1988) suggest that self-reported delinquent behavior would be better understood if it were divided into two categories: prevalence data and incidence data. Prevalence data represents which and how many offenses have been committed, and incidence data represent the frequency with which offenses are committed. As a result of this distinction, Paternoster and Triplett (1988) propose that different theories of delinquency offer different explanations for the prevalence and incidence of delinquency. For example, in their research they found that both social control and differential theory were significantly related to the prevalence and incidence of marijuana use. The social control variables of attachment to parents, living with one or more stepparents, and participation in social activities were associated with less marijuana use. On the other hand, they found that the most consistent factor associated with deviant behavior was the influence of peers. This finding has been substantiated by other researchers who have found differential association to be more influential than control variables when attempting to explain delinquent behavior (Matsueda & Heimer 1987).

Many researchers have increased the scope of their concern to include additional variables to account for deviant behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). The next section in this paper examines variables such as ethnic minority status, social class, and type of neighborhood in which the respondents grew up to determine if they played a role in the manifestation of deviant behavior, regardless of their family rituals.

Risk Factors
As previously mentioned, studies have identified several social and demographic characteristics that have been classified as risk factors for potential deviant behavior (Breaking New Ground for Youth at Risk, 1990; Garbarino & Abramowitz; 1992; Shoemaker, 1996; Bartollas & Miller, 2001). These factors were age, gender, ethnic minority status, educational experiences, family structure, socioeconomic status, type of neighborhood in which one grew up, and parents' deviance. Reckless (1973b) included ethnic minority status, family structure, socioeconomic status, and type of neighborhood as outer containment variables. In the present work these variables serve a twofold purpose; they provide measures of both outer containment variables and risk factors. The following describe the association between these risk factors and deviant behavior.

Researchers have found that young people are more likely to engage in criminal activity than older persons (Mooney, Knox, Schacht, 1996; Shoemaker, 1996). Forty-five percent of the 14.6 million arrests reported in the 1994 UCR were of persons under the age of twenty-five (Reid, 1997). Also, the proportion of violent crimes for juveniles was disproportionately high for their share of the population. LaGrange and White (1985) suggest that more attention should be paid to the age-delinquency relationship, cautioning against viewing adolescence as a unitary period. They found that middle adolescence (around ages 15-16) was the period at which delinquent behavior peaked, and then gradually declined. They found a significant negative correlation with school performance, commitment to education, attachment to parents, parental love, delinquent associates and delinquent behavior during middle adolescence. These correlations diminished as the teens grew older. They concluded that attachment to parents,
attachment to school, and participation in conforming activities might serve as explanatory variables in middle adolescence but would lose their relevance during late adolescence.

Researchers have found that men were more likely than women to commit crimes (Reid, 1997). Recent research indicates that men account for 83% of violent crimes and 72% of property crimes (Bartollas & Miller, 2001). This has been found to be true for drug abuse as well (Paternoster and Triplett, 1998). However, the rate of offenses by women has increased in almost all categories of index crimes except for murder and non-negligent manslaughter (Reid, 1997).

Minorities have been disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system (Reid, 1997; Bartollas & Miller, 2001). The different experiences for ethnic minority youth with the criminal justice system could be attributed to differences in the social experiences of whites and nonwhites. For example, minority youth have been found to be much more likely to live in poverty than nonminority youth (Egebeen & Lichter, 1991). In a study on adult violent criminal offenders, researchers found differences in the predictive variables for white and nonwhite offenders for two variables; school experience and family attachment (Kruttschnitt, Heath, & Ward, 1986). For nonwhites, the predictor variables were school experiences, being exposed to parental violence, having committed a serious initial law violation, and receiving minor sanctions for this law violation. School experience was the only variable that was consistent for both whites and nonwhites. The authors concluded that race-based experiences should be considered when attempting to explain deviant behavior.
Researchers have found that a positive attachment to school, higher academic achievement, and involvement in school activities is associated with lower rates of delinquency (Hirschi, 1969; Empey & Lubek, 1979). School failure (Phillips & Kelly, 1979) and less commitment to school are associated with delinquent behavior (LaGrange & White, 1985; Free, 1994). Kruttschnitt, Heath & Owens (1986) found that poor performance in school and little attachment to school were significantly associated with violent crime in adulthood. In a study by Owens (1994), positive self-worth was associated with higher grades, which led to prosocial behavior for white adolescents. He found that for black adolescents, positive self-esteem was not significantly related to grades, but good grades contributed to positive feelings of self-worth, which contributed to prosocial behavior.

The association between family structure and child outcomes has been widely studied. Research has found that men who grow up in non-intact families enter lower status occupations than men who grow up in intact families, and there is less intergenerational inheritance in non-intact families (Biblarz & Raftery, 1993). Astone and McLanahan (1991) found that children who live with single parents and stepparents when growing up report that their parents had lower educational expectations of them, provided less monitoring of school work, and less supervision of social activities than children who grew up in intact families. Matsueda and Heimer (1987) found that non-intact homes were more highly correlated with delinquency for blacks than non-blacks. The intervening variable in this relationship was the larger number of definitions favorable to delinquency that occurred in non-intact versus intact homes. The higher number of blacks
in non-intact homes accounted for the greater effect of non-intact homes on delinquency in blacks.

Family researchers, who study the link between family structure and its impact on family life, have turned to family process variables to look for explanations for these problems. For example, Simons (1996) and his colleagues found that divorced fathers and mothers were twice as likely as married parents to provide less monitoring, less consistent discipline and to place fewer demands on their children. Matsueda & Heimer (1987) found that for both blacks and nonblacks, nonintact homes had less supervision, which increased exposure to delinquent companions and pre-delinquent activities.

Much of the empirical research on family structure has been problem-focused. However, recent research has been challenging this view (Vandewater & Lansford, 1998; Rankin & Kern, 1994). For example, one study found that high interparental family conflict was a better predictor of child well being than family structure (Vandewater & Lansford, 1998). A second study found that delinquency was not associated with single-parent homes when the child reported that they were attached to the parent (Rankin & Kern, 1994). Finally, researchers have suggested that focusing on African-American single-parent households as a deficit for youth might be misleading (Salem, Zimmerman, & Notaro, 1998). They found that for African-American adolescents, nonresident fathers were still influential role models in their lives. Viewing single-parent households as a source of difficulty for African-American youth might be inappropriate. They suggest that the definition for family may need to be broadened to include nonresident fathers.

Income level is one of the most significant variables associated with family
structure (McClanahan, 1985). The 1997 median family income for two-parent families was $41,224 and $21,348 for female-headed households (Olson & DeFrain, 2000). Fifty-four percent of poor families were headed by females (Macionis, 1999). The incidence of poverty increases for African-American and Hispanic households (Olson & DeFrain, 2000). On the other hand, McLanahan (1985) found that when income was controlled for in single-parent families, some of the negative consequences of nonintact family structure disappeared.

Socioeconomic status appears to influence family functioning in different ways. McLeod & Shanahan (1993) found that poverty can contribute to higher rates of psychological distress in children. The findings of a subsequent study indicate that low hourly wages in low-income families added to family stress and this was associated with lower levels of self-regulation among adolescents (Brody, Stoneman, & Flor, 1996). Another study found that economic pressures contribute to increased levels of conflict between parents and between parents and their children, which contributed to adolescent emotional and behavioral problems (Conger, Conger, Elder, Lorenz, Simons, & Whitbeck, 1992). Cernkovich (1978) found an indirect link between low income and delinquent behavior. In his model, low socioeconomic status led to a perception of limited opportunities, which determined the degree of commitment to conventional values. He found that attachment to conventional values led to conforming behaviors that inhibited delinquent activities.

The neighborhood in which one spends their formative years provides the physical, social, and economic context in which attitudes and behaviors are formed.
Disorganized neighborhoods are characterized by high dropout rates, high rates of population turnover, high unemployment, little potential for employment, and high crime rates (Simcha-Fagan & Schwartz, 1986). As a result, there is often institutional instability that could contribute to weak socialization. Research has found that neighborhood quality influences the impact of family on delinquency (Matsueda & Heimer, 1987). For example, Matsueda and Heimer (1987) found that blacks from broken homes who lived in troubled neighborhoods were more likely to become delinquent than blacks from broken homes who lived in less troubled neighborhoods. Thus, families who live in disorganized neighborhoods may have a difficult time shielding their children from the negative influences of the surrounding social environment.

The relationship between parental deviance and juvenile delinquency has been established (Reid, 1997; Geismar & Wood, 1986). The association between parental deviance and juvenile deviance is even stronger when both parents are involved in criminal behavior (Robins, West, & Herjanic, 1975). A national survey of institutionalized juveniles revealed that twenty-five percent of them had fathers who had been incarcerated; nine percent had mothers who had gone to jail; twenty-five percent had a sibling who had served time; and thirteen percent had extended family members who had been in jail. Over fifty percent of the juveniles reported that they have had family members who have been or are currently incarcerated. A later study revealed that a third of the adult prisoners had family members who had been incarcerated (Stark, 1996). Parental involvement with the criminal justice systems affects children in different
ways. First, an incarcerated parent is not available for supervision and for the socialization of children. Second, a deviant parent's definition of deviance may be different from the social norm. Finally, these parents provide a different role model for children's behavior.

Research has suggested that the impact of high crime areas on individual youth may be modified by social control variables, especially the family (Matsueda & Heimer, 1987). However, when children have experienced the cumulative effect of factors such as low-income, lack of supervision and discipline, poor neighborhoods, and lack of social support, they are more likely to exhibit deviant behavior (Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992). Research has shown that children can effectively cope with one or two risk factors but when confronted with multiple factors they fare less well. Garbarino and Abramowitz found that most children could cope with multiple risk factors if there were compensatory forces in their lives. However, experiencing more than two major risk factors could jeopardize children's development and lead to problem behaviors such as early pregnancy, drug use, and delinquent behavior.

Research Objectives

The first research objective of this study was to learn if there was a difference in the family ritual life of individuals who were officially labeled deviant versus those who were not. If rituals serve the function of creating both inner and outer containment, then those individuals who reported a family ritual life positive in meaning should report less deviant behavior. Second, family rituals with positive meaning should correspond with the development of higher self-esteem. Therefore, another research objective was to
determine if there is a relationship between family rituals and the inner containment variable of self-esteem.

The third research objective proposed that a family's paradigm shapes the type of interactions that take place within families and the types of links family members form with the outside world (Reiss, 1981). Family rituals shape family paradigms by providing rules and boundaries, activities within the family, and social support for family members' activities outside the family. Therefore, another objective of this study was to explore the relationship between family rituals and their influence on family members' interactions with each other and with the outside world. The fourth research objective attempted to determine if there was a positive relationship between self-esteem and participation in conforming activities, both within and outside the family. The final research objective of this study examined the social and demographic characteristics of the respondents to see if they negated the role of positive family rituals in deterring deviant behavior.

Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical foundation, the literature review, and the research objectives, the following hypotheses were developed to test the key relationships that have been discussed and highlighted in the model that was presented in chapter one.

Hypothesis 1: Respondents' degree of family rituals with positive meaning, regardless of level of routine, would report less deviant behavior.

Hypothesis 2: Respondents' degree of family rituals with positive meaning, regardless of level of routine, would report higher levels of self-esteem.

Hypothesis 3: Respondents' degree of family rituals with positive meaning, regardless of
level of routine, would report more interaction in conforming activities both within and outside the family.

Hypothesis 4: Respondents' self-esteem had a positive relationship with their participation in conforming activities, both within and outside the family.

Hypothesis 5: Respondents' multiple risk factors were positively related to deviant behavior even if they report family rituals with a high degree of positive meaning.

The following chapter describes the research methods for this study, including a description of the sample, the instruments, and the methods of data collection.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH METHODS

Research has confirmed that family relationships play an important role in children's behavior (McCord, 1991; Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992). This study explored how family rituals influenced family members' behavior. Specifically, young adults were asked to reflect on their family rituals when they were growing up. The goal was to determine if these experiences had an impact on self-esteem, participation in conforming activities with family members both inside and outside the home, participation in extracurricular activities, and, ultimately, deviant behavior. The process of conducting the research began with the development of the model based on the theoretical framework and the literature review. A target sample was identified and the method of data collection was selected. A pretest was conducted to ascertain whether there were any problems with the surveys or the administration process.

Pretest

The sample for the pretest was composed of young adults from Hill Community College and from the Hill County Probation Department. The college students were members of the author’s marriage and family class and approximately 20 students participated. Seven Hill County probationers participated in the pretest. The probationers’ survey instruments were read orally to them to alleviate any problems that might have occurred as a result of reading problems.
Prior to the pretest, Dr. Barbara H. Fiese, the author of the Family Rituals Questionnaire, was contacted to obtain permission to use the Family Rituals Questionnaire and to modify some of the titles for the settings and some of the descriptions of the settings (Fiese & Kline, 1993). This was done to broaden the response categories and to make them more relevant for the respondents. For example, the dimension of dinnertime was broadened to mealtime to include those respondents who might have spent breakfast or lunchtime with their families. Additional holidays such as Cinco de Mayo and Juneteenth were added because they were more relevant for the populations in Texas.

After the pretest was conducted, both the probationers and the college students were asked to provide comments on the format and the content of the survey instruments. As a result of their feedback, minor changes were made to the survey instruments. For example, in the original Family Rituals Questionnaire, the response choices were letters, with the legend identified in the directions section. As many of the respondents worked through the Family Rituals Questionnaire, they forgot what the letters stood for. As a result, the response choices were changed to the actual choices, which were “really true” for the response choices of A and C, and “sort of true” for the response choices of B and D. Also, at the end of the Family Rituals Questionnaire a statement was added to encourage respondents to comment on any rituals or ritual behaviors that had not been addressed by the survey. This option was added so that respondents could clarify their family rituals or identify additional family rituals, including unpleasant or abusive family rituals. The author of the Family Rituals Questionnaire, Dr. Barbara H. Fiese, was
contacted to obtain approval for all of the above changes. She gave her approval since the actual content of the instrument was not changed.

Comments on the pretest also led to several changes on the Family Information Inventory. These changes were made to clarify the response categories and to allow the respondents to answer the questions more quickly. The first change was made to Question 1, which asked for the respondent’s age. Instead of an open-ended question, the actual ages were listed and the respondents checked their age. A multi-racial category was added to Question 3, which asked the respondents about their race/ethnicity. In the pretest, Question 4 asked the respondents to identify the last grade they completed in school. The response option was changed from an open-ended answer into grade categories ranging from 1 (8th grade or less) to 5 (more than one year of college). Question 5, which asked the respondents about the grades they received in school, was changed from the choices of As, Bs, Cs, Ds, and Fs, to 1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3 = average, 4 = poor, and 5 = failing. Additional categories were added to question number 8, which asked the respondents who they lived with while growing up if they didn't live with both natural parents. The pretest had an open-ended option for this question but the new question listed eight options with an opportunity to explain an “other” category. The new categories that were added were based on the pretest responses. An additional category, which stated that “my family lived in several different places”, was added to question 13, which asked about the type(s) of community the respondents lived in while growing up. This was added because several of the pretest respondents mentioned that they had moved several times. For questions numbers 19 through 26, which were
statements related to participation in conforming activities, all of the response options were listed under each statement related to participation in conforming activities rather than having one response category for the whole group. For the question that asked the respondents how many hours they worked, which was question number 29, response categories were added rather than leaving this as an open-ended question.

The final page of the Family Information Inventory consisted of the delinquent self-report survey (Short & Nye, 1958; Siegel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988). Changes were made in the directions to clarify the response categories. Also, in the original survey, the pretest respondents were directed to write the number of times they had committed a delinquent act. If they had not committed the behavior, they were to write in 0. If they committed the act, they were directed to write the number of times they had committed the act and to circle any of the listed actions that may have been taken against them if they were caught. After the pretest, these actions were written out rather than having the respondent circle a number that corresponded with a particular action.

Design of the Research

Preliminary Sample

The respondents in this study were older adolescents and young adults. The unit of analysis was the individual. Two subsamples were taken: one from a prison population and a second from a college population. The two subsamples in this research differed significantly in their legal status. Incarcerated respondents were included because they represented the officially labeled deviant members in our society. College students were
included because they were more likely to represent conforming members of American society. Realistically, the research has indicated that neither categorization is completely true (Conklin, 1998). There have been incarcerated individuals who have not been involved in committing many deviant acts or been involved in pervasive deviant lifestyles, while there have been college students who have committed many deviant acts and maintained fairly deviant lifestyles (Reid, 1996). It may be that some of the college students who committed deviant acts had the resources to avoid becoming part of the criminal justice system or they were simply not caught. In regards to the incarcerated respondents, a disproportionate number of them may have come from low-income neighborhoods where they were more likely to be arrested and more likely to be sentenced. (Conklin, 1998). In addition, a number of the incarcerated respondents may have already been a part of the juvenile justice system as minors, although, the majority of young people who commit delinquent acts or status offenses do not become adult criminals (Reid, 1996).

The original goal of this study was to obtain four hundred total useable responses from the respondents. Data were collected during February, March, and April, of 1998. A total of 573 people were surveyed. The data from female incarcerated respondents were obtained from three state correctional facilities in Gatesville, Texas, including the Hilltop Unit, the Gatesville Unit, and the Woodman State Jail. Data were collected from male incarcerated respondents at two correctional facilities. The first facility was the Hughes Unit in Gatesville, Texas, and the second facility was the Hutchins State Prison in Dallas, Texas. Data were obtained from college students at Hill, El Centro, and Cedar
Valley Community Colleges, and the University of North Texas. The following table displays the location and number of respondents from each institution.

Table 1
Location of the Respondents by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>Males (N=117)</th>
<th>Females (N=139)</th>
<th>Total (N=256)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatesville Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodman State Jail Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes Unit</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchins State Jail Unit</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of College Respondents</th>
<th>Males (N=136)</th>
<th>Females (N=181)</th>
<th>Total (N=317)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hill Community College</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro Community College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Community College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of North Texas</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original research design called for obtaining data from three hundred randomly selected individuals from the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. One hundred and fifty males and one hundred and fifty females were to be selected. A list of random names was generated by the administrative office in Huntsville, Texas and sent to some of the units in Gatesville. However, once the list was sent to the units it became impossible to locate all of the inmates who were on the list. This was due to the inmates' changing legal status, discipline problems, work detail, and school responsibilities. In order to replace the inmates who were not available, the wardens and members of their staff asked for volunteers who fit the age range from 18 to 23. As a result, the sample became a nonprobability convenience sample. There were a total of 276 incarcerated respondents who completed the survey instruments. Within this sample, there were 256
respondents who fit the age range from 18 to 23 years of age. The final sample consisted of 117 males and 139 females.

The majority of the offenders who responded to the surveys were in minimum and medium lock-up facilities, with a few being in administrative segregation, or solitary confinement. The inmates’ facility status was based on their behavior after they were incarcerated and did not necessarily reflect the type of crime(s) they committed prior to being incarcerated. The exception to this was that all known members of gangs were automatically confined to administrative segregation.

The college sample, like that of the incarcerated sample identified on the previous page, was also a non-probability convenience sample. The total number of college respondents was 317, which included 136 males and 181 females. Attempts were made to match the incarcerated and college samples as closely as possible in regards to age, gender, and race/ethnicity. The original intent was to use only community college students, however, students from the University of North Texas were included to broaden the diversity of the college sample. The incarcerated respondents and the college students were matched most closely by age and gender. The groups differed most by race/ethnicity. The incarcerated subsample had a higher percentage of African-American and Hispanic respondents than the college student subsample. Overall, the strength of the sample was its size and its diversity.

**Measuring the Research Variables**

Based on the study’s hypotheses, the independent variable in the first three hypotheses was family rituals with a higher degree of positive meaning. Positive self-
esteem was treated as an independent variable in the fourth hypothesis. Multiple risk factors were treated as the independent variables in the fifth hypothesis. The dependent variable in the first and fifth hypotheses was self-reported measures of deviant behavior. The dependent variable in the second hypothesis was reported levels of self-esteem. The dependent variable in hypotheses three and four was participation in conforming activities with the family both inside and outside the home and independent of family members (extracurricular activities). In addition, some of these variables were combined to test their pooled effects on deviant behavior. To measure these variables, three instruments were used. Two were previously developed and tested instruments with one being modified for this study. The third instrument was developed specifically for this study, except for the deviant self-report section.

**Instruments**

The variables identified in the hypotheses were operationalized through the survey instruments. The three instruments that were used were the Family Rituals Questionnaire ([FRQ]; Fiese & Kline, 1993; see Appendix A), the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2 ([CFSEI-2] Battle, 1992; see Appendix B), and the Family Information Inventory ([FII] Short & Nye, 1958; Siegel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988; Sweet, Bumpass, & Call, 1988; see Appendix C). Family rituals were operationalized through responses to the Family Rituals Questionnaire. Levels of self-esteem were operationalized through responses to the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2. Conforming behaviors, risk factors and self-reported deviant behavior were
evaluated through responses to the Family Information Inventory.

At the beginning of the administration of the survey instruments, all of the respondents were informed about the purpose of the research. They were allowed to ask questions and were given an opportunity to leave if they did not want to participate. A total of 57 inmates and 20 college students declined to participate. All of the respondents were told that they could receive the results of the research if they were interested in doing so. Interested participants were asked to leave their mailing addresses and they were also given information on how to contact the researcher.

All respondents were asked to respond to these instruments using the period of time before the age of 18. The survey instruments were self-administered questionnaires, however, they were read to the incarcerated respondents in groups of 15 or less. This was done in order to assist any incarcerated respondents who might have had poor reading skills. Group sizes ranged from fifteen to one, depending on the institution and the institutional status of the individual inmates. The instruments were not read orally to the college students, based on the assumption that they had the ability to read the survey instruments. Group sizes for the college students ranged from 7 students to 50 students.

The following describes the instruments that were used in this study.

**Family Rituals Questionnaire (FRQ)**

This instrument was a 56-item forced choice questionnaire. There were seven settings and eight dimensions of family rituals examined in this survey. The seven settings of the FRQ included mealtimes, weekends, trips, annual celebrations, special celebrations, religious celebrations, and cultural celebrations. Eight dimensions of family
rituals were evaluated for each setting. These dimensions were occurrence, roles, routine, attendance, affect, symbolic significance, continuation, and deliberateness (See Table 2).

Table 2
Settings and Dimensions of the Family Rituals Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settings</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meal time</td>
<td>Shared Family Meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Leisure and/or planned activities on nonworking days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Events or activities surrounding any sort of family trip or vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual celebrations</td>
<td>Yearly celebrations: birthday’s anniversaries, first day of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special celebrations</td>
<td>Celebrations that occur regardless of religion or culture: weddings, graduations, family reunions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious holidays</td>
<td>Religious celebrations: Christmas, Chanukah, Easter, and Ramadan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural celebrations</td>
<td>Celebrations tied to culture and ethnic groups: naming ceremonies, wakes, funerals, baking particular ethnic food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>How often an activity occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>Assignment of roles, duties during activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Regularity in how activity is conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Expectations for whether attendance is mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>Emotional investment in an activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic significance</td>
<td>Attachment of meaning to an activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>Perseverance of activity across generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberateness</td>
<td>Advance preparation and planning associated with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dimensions of the FRQ represented the properties of rituals that were discussed in Chapter 3. The ritual properties that were described include structure, stabilization, similarity, transformation, and communication. The dimensions of the FRQ, as related to these five properties were, structure by the role and routine dimension, stabilization by the occurrence and attendance dimensions, similarity by the continuation dimension, transformation by the deliberateness dimension, and communication by the affect and symbolic significance dimensions. For each dimension, the respondents in this study chose the answer that was most like their family when they were growing up and then decided whether the statement was sort of true or really true. Each statement was scored on a 4-point scale, and in order to prevent response bias, an equal number of items were reversed. Items were scored across dimensions and settings, with higher scores indicating more ritualization and more positive meaning within the family. A summary score was calculated for the entire scale. The range of scores was from 56 to 224; if scores for all dimensions across all settings were calculated. The routine factor represented the sum of the roles, routine, and continuation scores. The sum of the scores ranged from 21 to 84. The meaning dimension was composed of the sum of the scores on attendance, occurrence, affect, symbolic significance, and deliberateness. These scores ranged from 35 to 140 (Fiese, 1992b; Fiese & Kline, 1993).

An open-ended question was included at the end of the FRQ to allow respondents
to describe any family rituals that were not included on the FRQ. A few respondents
described some of their family rituals, with most clarifying their previous responses. No
respondents mentioned any abusive rituals.

The psychometric properties of the FRQ have been evaluated through four studies
(Fiese & Kline, 1993). Internal consistency, criterion validity, test-retest reliability, and
parent-child agreement have been established. In Study 1, internal consistency was
determined through the calculations of Cronbach's *alphas*, with the scales ranging from
.52 to .90. Subsequent studies confirmed the internal consistency of the FRQ. In Study 2,
criterion validity was established by comparing correlations between the FRQ and the
Family Environment Scale (FES). A positive correlation was found to exist between the
FRQ and the FES subscales measuring cohesion and organization. Study 3 assessed the
test-retest reliability of the FRQ. After four weeks, the test-retest reliability was .88.
Study 4 explored the agreement among parents and one child in their perception of family
rituals.

Fiese & Kline (1993) cited some limitations of the previous studies. First, the
subjects in all of the studies were primarily from white middle-class families. Second,
there have been no studies in which more than one child has shared their perception of
family rituals. Finally, the FRQ has not been given to families who have experienced
great disorganization. As a result of these limitations, the authors declined to make
predictions in regards to the generalizability of the study.

**Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2nd Edition (CFSEI-2)**

The inner containment variable of self-esteem was evaluated through responses to
the Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2 (Battle, 1992; see Appendix C). The Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2 ([CFSEI-2] Battle, 1992) was a 40 item self-report instrument that yielded sub-scales in four areas of self-esteem: general (16 items), social (8 items), personal (8 items), and lie [(defensiveness) 8 items]. This inventory required simple yes or no answers. The second edition was standardized on nearly 5,000 subjects throughout the U.S. and Canada. It had been approved for use with individuals ages five through adulthood. The adult form, Form AD, was used in this study.

Scores for this instrument were calculated by totaling the number of items checked that indicated high self-esteem, excluding the Lie scale items. Thus, the highest possible score for Form AD was 32, with higher scores indicating higher self-esteem. Based on previous studies, the classification of scores were as follows: 30+ = very high, 27-29 = high, 20-26 = intermediate, 14-19 = low, and less than 13 = very low. The CFSEI-2 was divided into four sub-tests: general self-esteem, social self-esteem, personal self-esteem, and the lie sub-test. The following were the classifications for the sub-tests scores; (a) general, 15 = very high, 13-14 = high, 7-12 = intermediate, 5-6 = low, and less than 4 = very low, (b) social, 8 = very high, 6-7 = high, 4-5 = intermediate, 2-3 = low, and 1 = very low, and (c) personal, 8 = very high, 6-7 = high, 4-5 = intermediate, 2-3 = low, and 1 = very low. The highest possible score on the lie sub-test was 8, with lower scores representing more defensiveness (Battle, 1992).

Family Information Inventory

This inventory was developed especially for this study except for some of the questions on conforming behaviors and those related to deviant behavior (Short & Nye, 1996).
1958; Siegel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988; Sweet, Bumpass & Call, 1988; see Appendix C). The survey contained questions regarding demographic and risk factors, participation in conforming activities with family members both within and outside the household, participation in extracurricular activities, and a self-report questionnaire on deviant behavior. Questions were developed to gather information on variables related to the research problem. They were suggested by the theoretical perspective and previous research. The revisions that were made were based upon review by colleagues and the pretest respondents. Questions 1 through 8 covered topics related to age, sex, race/ethnicity, highest grade completed in school, attitude toward school, grades, and family structure. Questions 9 and 10 measured attachment to parents by asking if the respondents would go ahead and do something even if they knew their parents would disapprove. Question 11 asked the respondents to identify their social class and question 12 asked if the respondent’s family had ever been on welfare. The question on welfare was added because it was felt that this was a more objective measure of social class rather than the more subjective measure of self-identification of social class. Questions 13 and 14 were related to the type of neighborhood in which the respondents grew up and the crime rate in that neighborhood.

Parents’ deviance was the focus of questions 15 and 16. Questions 17 and 18 asked about deviant friends. These two questions were included because Reckless (1973b) found that delinquent friends were often present at the onset of self-reported delinquency and for officially reported acts of delinquent behavior as well. He considered delinquent friends to be part of the pull of the environment (Reckless, 1973b). In
addition, their inclusion was based on previous research, which indicated that peer influence was significantly associated with deviant behavior (Paternoster and Triplett, 1988). For example, the prevalence and incidence of smoking marijuana has been found to be significantly associated with being around friends who smoke marijuana (Paternoster and Triplett, 1988). Participation in conforming activities, primarily with parents, was measured by questions 19 through 26. These questions were taken from the National Survey of Families and Households (Sweet, Bumpass & Call, 1988). Participation in conforming activities performed independently outside the household was determined by questions 27 through 29.

Index variables. The index variables were included in the Family Information Inventory. This part of the instrument was created to survey the respondent’s participation in conforming activities with the family in the home, with the family outside the home, and independent participation in extracurricular activities outside the home. Adding together the scores from questions 20, 21, and 22 created the variable of participation in family activities within the household. Scores ranged from 3 to 18. The reliability of this index variable was measured by Cronbach’s alpha, with a score of .80. Combining questions 19, 23, 24, 25, and 26 created the second variable, participation in family activities outside the household. Scores ranged from 5 to 30. The reliability coefficient or Cronbach’s alpha score was .76. Combining the responses to questions 27 and 28 created the third variable, independent participation in outside activities. Question number 27 was re-coded into three categories with, 0 indicating no participation in independent activities outside the home, 1 representing participation in one activity
outside the home, and 2 representing participation in two or more activities outside the home. This was combined with question number 28 which indicated the frequency with which the respondents participated in these activities. Scores ranged from 1 to 8. The Cronbach’s alpha score for this index variable was .53.

**Deviant Behavior.** Self-reported levels of deviant behavior were identified through the final questions on the Family Information Inventory (Short & Nye, 1958; Siegel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988). Respondents were asked to report the prevalence and incidence of their own deviant behavior. They were also asked to report if they were caught and if any action was taken. The following describes how the responses to the questions on deviance were categorized and measured.

The responses to the questions on deviant behavior were categorized to create 7 different variables (See Table 5). The first variable measured the prevalence or total number of different deviant acts committed. A dummy variable was created; with 0 representing 0 acts committed and 1 indicating that the act was committed at least once. There were 18 different deviant acts identified on the deviance survey so the range of possible scores was from 0 to 18. The second deviance variable measured the prevalence or total number of different status offenses committed. There were three questions on the deviance survey related to status offenses. They were questions 1, 14, & 16. Once again, a dummy variable was created with 0 representing 0 status offenses committed and 1 representing a status offense had been committed. The scores for this variable ranged from 0 to 3. The third deviance variable evaluated the prevalence or total number of...
different index crimes committed. Questions 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 18 were the questions on the survey related to index crimes. A dummy variable was created with 0 representing 0 index crimes committed and 1 representing that an index crime had been committed at least once. The scores on this deviance variable ranged from 0 to 7. The fourth variable related to deviant behavior measured the incidence or number of times each index crime was committed. There was a very broad range of responses given so categories were created for the variable. They were: (a) 0, which represented that a particular index crime had not been committed; (b) 1, which represented that the index crime had been committed between 1-4 times; (c) 2, which represented that the crime had been committed 5-35 times, and; (d) 3, which indicated that the crime had been committed more than 35 times. The categories were established by percentiles, with the first group representing the percentage of the respondents who didn’t commit any deviant acts, and the subsequent groups representing an even distribution of the populations. The fifth deviance variable assessed the prevalence or total number of non-index crimes committed. Questions 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, and 17 measured the non-index crimes. A dummy variable was created with 0 representing 0 non-index crimes being committed and 1 indicating that a non-index crime had been committed at least once. The scores ranged from 0 to 8. The sixth deviance variable measured the incidence or number of times each non-index crime was committed. Once again, there was a broad range of responses to the questions so the answers were presented in categories. The categories were: (a) 0, which represented that 0 acts had been committed; (b) 1, which represented that the non-index crimes had been committed 1-10 times; (c) 2, which represented the
crimes had been committed 11-62 times; (d) 3, which represented that the crimes had
been committed 63-820 times, and (e) 4, which represented that the crime had been
committed more than 820 times (See Table 6). The final deviance variable evaluated the
prevalence or total number of deviant acts committed, if the respondent was caught, and
if any official act was taken. This was called a labeled act. This variable was calculated
by recoding each of the deviant acts, with 0 representing no action being taken if the
respondent was caught committing a deviant act and 1 if the respondent was caught
committing a deviant act, regardless of the particular action taken. The response was also
coded 0 if the respondent did not commit a particular act. These responses were then
summed and the total indicated the number of times a deviant act had been committed
and the respondent had been caught. Scores ranged from 0 to 18. This was called a
labeled act.

For the regression analysis, a deviance index variable was computed. Summing
the totals of all 7 deviance variables created this variable. The Cronbach’s alpha for the 7
variables was .87. This new variable is referred to as the deviance index variable in
subsequent analysis.

Factor Analysis of the Family Rituals Questionnaire

Previous research using the FRQ has determined that the FRQ has both a meaning
and a routine component (Fiese, 1992a, 1993). In order to determine if this was true for
this sample, a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted
on the dimension scores of occurrence, roles, routines, attendance, affect, symbolic
significance, continuation, and deliberateness. The dimension scores were summed across
the seven settings. Using an eigen value of 1 as the criterion, a two-factor solution was found for all respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. Results were presented in Table 3. The first factor accounted for 44% to 57% of the variance for the three groups, loading more heavily on the dimensions of occurrence, attendance, affect, symbolic significance, and deliberateness. According to Fiese (1992a), this factor was more representative of the personal meaning related to family rituals. The second factor that emerged accounted for 17% to 27% percent of the variance for the three groups. This factor loaded more heavily on the dimensions of roles, routines, and continuation. Fiese (1992a) suggested that this factor was representative of the structural aspect of family rituals.

The results of the factor analysis supported the reliability and validity of the FRQ. The results also supported the original assertion that there would be three variables derived from the FRQ. Therefore, in this study, the meaning factor, the routine factor, and the total family rituals score were evaluated in terms of their relationships with the other variables. The following table displays the results of the factor analysis.

Table 3

Scores From the Factor Analysis of the FRQ by Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>College Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affect    .89     .22    .90 .00           .88    .29
Symbolic  .91     .14    .91 .00           .91    .18
Continuity     .00     .84    .00       .91           .16    .70
Deliberateness  .82     .27    .86 .00           .79    .36

%Total Variance       50.2    23.2  57.1    17.5                44.9    27.0

Alphas             .92     .70      .93     .68       .92     .70

Characteristics of the Sample

Out of the total sample of 573 respondents, the final sample of 424 respondents
was selected for analysis based on their complete responses to the Family Rituals
Questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were generated in order to profile the demographic
and risk characteristics of the respondents and are reported in the following table (See
Table 4). Not all of these variables were used in the subsequent analyses but they were
included here to provide additional information about the respondents. The average age
of the incarcerated respondents was 20.68 and the average age of the college students was
19.88. There were 90 (43.5%) male and 117 (56.5%) female incarcerated respondents and
102 (47%) male and 115 female (53%) college respondents. In terms of race/ethnicity,
there were 2 (1%) Asian Americans, 101 (48.8%) African Americans, 44 (21.3%)
Whites, 4 (1.9%) Native Americans, 38 (18.4%) Hispanics, and 18 (8.7%) Multi-racial
incarcerated respondents. There were 11 (5.1%) Asian Americans, 72 (33.2%) African
Americans, 104 (47.9%) Whites, 0 Native Americans, 21 (9.7%) Hispanics, and 9 (4.1%)
Multi-racial college students. The mode of race/ethnicity status of the incarcerated
respondents was African-American, while it was White for the college students. There
were twice as many Hispanics in the incarcerated group as there were in the college
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group. This difference in the sample in terms of race/ethnicity was expected, as the research has established that minorities are over represented in the prison population (Sacco & Kennedy, 1996).

In regards to education, the difference between the two groups was in the predicted direction, with the college students reporting higher levels of education. From the data it appeared that more than 50% of the incarcerated respondents had dropped out of high school, and yet, they also were slightly more likely to report that they made good grades and that they enjoyed going to school. In terms of family structure, 24% of the incarcerated respondents reported that they grew up in intact nuclear families, whereas, 63% of the college students reported that they grew up in intact nuclear families. This was a significant difference between the groups, but one that has been described by previous research (Conklin, 1998; Bartollas & Miller, 2001).

There were differences between the incarcerated respondents and the college students in regards to doing something even when their fathers or mothers disapproved, with 21.7% of the incarcerated respondents reporting that they frequently would do something if their father disapproved versus 16.1% of the college students. The incarcerated respondents and the college students differed more when it came to their mother’s disapproval, with 33.8% of the incarcerated respondents and 17.5% of the college students reporting that they would frequently do something if their mothers disapproved. These results could provide evidence for Hirschi’s (1969) social bond theory, in which he stated that children who were more sensitive to their parents’ expectations were less likely to be deviant.
There did not appear to be significant differences in terms of social class as reported by the respondents. However, more than 50% of the incarcerated respondents reported that their family had been on welfare while only 14% of the college students reported that their family had received welfare benefits. This is an indicator that many of the incarcerated respondents spent part of their youth living in poverty. The types of communities in which the respondents were reared did not appear to significantly differ. However, the incarcerated respondents reported higher rates of crime in the neighborhoods in which they grew up. In addition, incarcerated respondents were exposed to more crime at home, with 50% reporting that their fathers were involved with the criminal justice system versus 22% of the college students. This was true for their mothers as well, with the incarcerated respondents reporting that almost a third of their mothers were involved with the criminal justice system versus 7% of the college students. In terms of deviant friends, 51.2% of the incarcerated respondents reported that most of their friends were deviant while only 12% of the college students reported that most of their friends were deviant. Finally, 31.4% of the incarcerated respondents reported that they were members of gangs while only 4.1% of the college students reported that they were members of gangs. Clearly, these last few variables were indicators that the incarcerated respondents were much more likely than the college students to be exposed to and reared in deviant environments. These results indicated that a larger number of the incarcerated respondents might have experienced multiple risk factors, which put them at greater peril for committing deviant behavior (Benn & Garbarino, 1992). Table 4 presents the detailed results of the descriptives for the major variables.
Table 4

Demographic Characteristics and Risk Factors for Total Respondents, Incarcerated Respondents, and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents (n=424)</th>
<th>% of Incarcerated Respondents (n=207)</th>
<th>% of College Students (n=217)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8th grade</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11th grade</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year of college</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; a year of college</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived With Both Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Disapprove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never/Rarely</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Disapprove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never/Rarely</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Crime Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the two subsamples were very similar in age and gender but more dissimilar on race/ethnicity. The differences in the risk factors appeared to be in the predicted direction as suggested by the literature. For example, the incarcerated respondents had a higher drop-out rate, were less likely to have grown up in intact nuclear families, were poorer, were more likely to live in high crime neighborhoods, and were more likely to have parents and friends who were deviant (Sacco & Kennedy, 1996; Conklin, 1998). The incarcerated respondents were more likely to do something even if their mothers and fathers disapproved, they were more likely to be members of gangs, 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imprisoned</th>
<th>Arr &amp; Probation</th>
<th>Arr &amp; Imprisoned</th>
<th>Arr, Prob, &amp;</th>
<th>Imprisoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>13.0</th>
<th>1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arr and Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arr and Imprisoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arr, Prob, &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisoned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of Gang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviant Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>13.0</th>
<th>1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and they reported that a significant number of their friends were deviant.

A detailed analysis of the deviance variables follows in Table 5. The descriptive statistics indicate that the incarcerated respondents reported committing more different deviant behaviors than the college students. They committed a much higher number of status offenses, with almost 50% reporting that they had committed three or more of these offenses. The same was true of index crimes, with 60% of the college students reporting that they had never committed an index crime versus 10% or the incarcerated respondents. They also reported committing index crimes more often. The same was true for the nonindex crimes. Finally, the incarcerated respondents were much more likely to report that they an action was taken when they committed a deviant act. Table 5 displays the descriptive statistics for the deviance variables.

Table 5
Deviance Variables for Total Respondent, Incarcerated Respondents, and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviance Variables</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents</th>
<th>% of Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>% of College Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Different Deviant Acts Committed</td>
<td>(n=364)</td>
<td>(n=169)</td>
<td>(n=195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 deviant acts</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 deviant act</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 deviant acts</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 deviant acts</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 deviant acts</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 deviant acts</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 deviant acts</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 deviant acts</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant Acts</td>
<td>(n=389)</td>
<td>(n=191)</td>
<td>(n=198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Different Status Offenses Committed</th>
<th>(n=389)</th>
<th>(n=191)</th>
<th>(n=198)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 status offenses</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 status offense</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 status offenses</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 status offenses</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Different Index Crimes Committed</th>
<th>(n=390)</th>
<th>(n=185)</th>
<th>(n=205)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 index crimes</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 index crime</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 index crime</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 index crimes</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 index crimes</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 index crimes</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 index crimes</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 index crimes</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Times Each Index Crime Was Committed</th>
<th>(n=390)</th>
<th>(n=185)</th>
<th>(n=205)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 times</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1 – 4) times</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (5 – 35) times</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (&gt; 35) times</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Total Number of Different Non-Index Crimes Committed</th>
<th>(n=381)</th>
<th>(n=179)</th>
<th>(n=202)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 non-index crimes</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 non-index crime</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 non-index crimes</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 non-index crimes   11.8   9.5   13.9  
4 non-index crimes   12.9   15.1   10.9  
5 non-index crimes   15.5   18.4    12.9  
6 non-index crimes   11.8   16.2    7.9  
7 non-index crimes   10.2   17.3    4.0  
8 non-index crimes   1.0    1.7    .5

Conclusion

This chapter has described the pretest of the variable measures, how the sample was gathered, the instruments used, and detailed characteristics of the sample. The next chapter examines the data to determine if these and other differences between the incarcerated respondents and the college students were significantly different, and if these factors along with others were associated with deviant behavior.
CHAPTER V
DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and interpret the results of the data analyses. It was determined in the previous chapter that some important differences existed between the incarcerated respondents and the college students. As a result, t-tests were conducted to determine if the differences between the two groups were significant. This was followed by regression analyses to explore whether differences in family rituals could account for variations in deviant behavior. Regression analyses were also performed to explore the influence of family rituals on inner and outer containment variables, the influence of inner and outer containment variables on deviant behavior, and the influence of risk factors on deviant behavior. Finally, power analyses were applied to the data to explain the value of the regression statistics.

T-tests

Independent sample t-tests were conducted comparing the incarcerated respondents to the college students for all of the major variables and the risk factors. The Levene Test for Equality of Variances was calculated to determine if the spread of the groups differed. This test has been used by researchers to determine if they would accept or reject the null hypothesis that the two population variances were equal (SPSS Base 10.0: Applications Guide, 1999). The F statistic and the significance level were evaluated
to determine if the hypothesis of equal variance was accepted or rejected. If the hypothesis of equal variance was accepted, the pooled-variance t-test was used. If the hypothesis of equal variance was rejected, the separate-variance t-test was used. The results were mixed for the variables, therefore, the pooled-variance t-test and the separate-variance t-tests were used on a case-by-case basis. The following Table 6 displays the t-test results for both the incarcerated respondents and the college students on the major variables.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and T-test Comparisons on the Major Variables for Incarcerated Respondents and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n=164)</th>
<th>College Students (n=185)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ</td>
<td>250.12</td>
<td>55.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ Meaning Dimension</td>
<td>80.87</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ Routine Dimension</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Total</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Lie Dimension</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Family Activities Within the Home</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Family Activities Outside the Home</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participation in Extra-curricular Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Labeled Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer Containment Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of Total Deviant Acts Committed</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of Status Offenses Committed</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of Index Crimes</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of Index Crimes</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of Non-Index Crimes</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of Non-Index Crimes</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .01. **p < .001.

The results of the t-tests indicated that the two groups differed significantly on all of the variables except for participation in family activities within the home. The t-test results included comparisons on responses to the Family Rituals Questionnaire (Fiese & Kline, 1993), the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2 (Battle, 1992), and selected questions from the Family Information Inventory (Short & Nye, 1958; Seigel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988; Sweet, Bumpass, & Call, 1988). related to participation in conforming activities and deviant behavior.

Many of these differences were noted in the discussion in Chapter 4, and the t-test results confirmed that these differences were significant and in the expected direction. For
instance, the mean difference between the incarcerated respondents and the college students on the total FRQ score was almost 30 points, with the college students reporting higher scores. This trend was true for the meaning component of family rituals, with college students scoring 12 points higher than the incarcerated respondents. There was only a 3-point difference between the two subgroups on the routine dimension of family rituals. In terms of self-esteem, the college students scored 2 points higher, while the incarcerated respondents scored slightly higher on the lie dimension. In regards to the outer containment variables, the college students had higher mean scores on participation in family activities outside the home and in extracurricular activities. The groups did not significantly differ on participation in family activities in the home, although the college students had a higher mean score.

The incarcerated respondents reported higher scores of deviance than the college students on all the deviance variables. The incarcerated respondents reported committing 9.86 mean deviant acts versus 4.83 for the college students. They committed more status offenses, with a mean score of 2.23 versus 1.39 for the college students. The incarcerated respondents scored significantly higher on the index crimes, with their mean score being 3.13 versus the college students’ scores .63. They also reported committing the acts more often as well. In terms of non-index crimes, the mean score for the incarcerated respondents was 4.44 with the score being 2.81 for the college students. They also reported committing the acts more often. The incarcerated respondents were more likely to report that they were caught when committing deviant acts, with their mean score on this variable being 3.23 versus the college student’s score of .64. Overall, the incarcerated
respondents reported committing a higher prevalence and incidence of deviant acts than
the college students and they were more likely to be caught when committing a deviant act.

After analyzing the data it was concluded that: a) college students reported
significantly higher scores on total family rituals, the meaning dimension of family
rituals, and the ritual component of family rituals; b) college students reported
significantly higher levels of self-esteem and were less likely to lie on their responses; c)
college students reported higher levels of participation in conforming activities, primarily
outside the home; d) incarcerated respondents reported higher levels of deviant behavior
in all categories but one; and e) the incarcerated respondents reported that they were
slightly more likely to be caught after committing deviant acts. Overall, the incarcerated
respondents and college students differed significantly on every variable in the predicted
direction except participation in conforming activities with family members inside the
home.

The second set of t-tests that were conducted compared the incarcerated
respondents and the college students on the risk factors. The results are presented in
Table 7. The variables that were considered risk factors in this study included age, sex,
race/ethnicity, education, family structure, socioeconomic status, neighborhood crime,
and parents’ deviance. In order to conduct the t-test for these risk factors and a later
regression analysis, the nominal variables were turned into dummy variables. Sex was re-
coded into two categories, 0 = male and 1 = being female. Race/ethnicity was re-coded
into 2 categories, 0 = nonwhites and 1 = being white. Family structure was re-coded into
2 categories, 0 = growing up with both natural parents in the household and 1 = growing up in a different family structure which became nonintact family of origin. Being on welfare was recoded from 1 = yes and 2 = no to 0 = yes and 1 = never being on welfare. The variable on welfare was used as the variable to represent socioeconomic status rather than the student’s self-evaluation of social class. This was done because it was felt that this was a more objective measure of socioeconomic status. In subsequent discussions, the welfare variable was referred to as the socioeconomic (SES) variable.

An index variable was created for education. On the Family Information Inventory, there were three questions related to education (See Table 4). The first question asked the respondent the last grade completed in school. The response categories ranged from 1 – 5, with 1 representing less than a 9th grade education and 5 representing more than one year of college. The second question asked the respondents if they liked school. The response categories were 1 = yes and 2 = no. The categories were recoded to 0 = no and 1 = yes. The final question asked the respondents what kind of grades they made in school. Their response categories ranged from 1, which represented As to 5, which represented Fs. The response categories were recoded with 5 representing As and 1 representing Fs. The purpose for recoding these variables was to obtain a consistent order in the same direction, with lower numbers representing lower levels of education, liking school less, and doing less well in school. The higher numbers represented the opposite experiences. The responses to all three questions were converted to z scores and then added together to create an index variable for education. A Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to test the reliability of the three measures that
comprised the education index variable. The statistic was .61.

Other variables were recoded to provide consistency in the numerical order of the response categories. For example, mother and father’s deviance were recoded from 1 = arrested, 2 = placed on probation, 3 = imprisoned, 4 = none of the above, to 0 = none, 1 = arrested, 2 = placed on probation, 3 = imprisoned. The remaining variable, neighborhood crime, was left in its original format. The response categories were 1 = little or no crime, 2 = some crime, and 3 = a great deal of crime. The following table displays the results of the t-test analysis.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and T-test Comparisons on the Risk Factors for Incarcerated Respondents and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n=207)</th>
<th>College Students (n=217)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Years</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Female</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being White</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Index</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonintact Family of Origin</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never on Welfare</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Crime</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates statistical significance.
Father’s Deviance 1.40 1.93 .53 1.40 5.23*
Mother’s Deviance .77 1.58 .20 .91 .50*

Note. * p < .001.

The results of the t-test analysis on the risk factors indicated that there were significant differences between the incarcerated respondents and the college students on all of the risk factors except for being female. The subsample of incarcerated respondents were slightly older, were less likely to be white, scored lower on the education index variable, and were more likely to come from nonintact families of origin. Their families were much more likely to have been on welfare; they reported growing up in neighborhoods with higher crime rates, and they were more likely to have parents who were deviant. Conversely, the college sample was slightly younger, had more whites, scored higher on the education index variable, and was more likely to come from intact families of origin. In addition, they were less likely to come from families who had been on welfare and less likely to live in high crime neighborhoods. They were also less likely to have parents who were deviant. In conclusion, it appears from the t-test results on both the major variables and the risk factors that the incarcerated respondents and the college students were significantly different. These identified differences led to the subsamples being evaluated separately in subsequent analysis.

It should be noted that researchers have found that when multiple t-tests are calculated, the number of significant differences between groups increases (SPSS Base 10.0: Applications Guide, 1999). Thus, these results should be viewed with some caution
and it has been recommended that additional analysis be conducted. As a result, regression analyses were conducted for the two subsamples and the sample as a whole.

Regression Analysis

The major premise of this research was that the independent variables would have separate influences on reducing deviant behavior. The results of the t-tests indicate that the respondents differed significantly on the major variables. The next step was to determine if these major variables accounted for any of the variability in deviant behavior for all of the respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. During the analyses, incomplete cases were eliminated on a listwise basis.

Based on the hypotheses, variables were selected to represent the major variables identified in the model (Chapter 1, p. 13) and to create parsimony for the analysis. The regression analyses compared the responses for all of the respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. For family rituals, the meaning dimension of the FRQ was used. For inner containment, the total self-esteem score minus the lie component, or self-esteem net score was used. The outer containment variable was expressed by examining three family processes. They were previously identified as: a) participation in conforming activities with family members inside the home, b) participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home, and c) participation in extracurricular activities independent of family members. The index variable’s reliability as measured by Cronbach’s alpha was .60. The deviant score was an index variable that was created by taking the sums of all 7 deviant variables and creating a new index variable called the deviance index variable. Regression analyses were also
performed for the individual measures of deviance and the results were almost identical. As was previously mentioned Cronbach’s alpha for the 7 deviance variables was .87.

The first hypothesis proposed that there would be a difference in the family rituals of the incarcerated respondents and the college students. T-tests confirmed that there was a significant difference between the two groups on the meaning dimension of family rituals and deviant behaviors (See Table 6). A simple regression analysis was run to determine if meaningful family rituals accounted for any of the variance in deviant behavior for all of the respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. The results suggested that meaningful family rituals accounted for a very small but significant amount of variance in deviance for all of the respondents and for the incarcerated respondents. This was not found to be the case for the college students. The results could be interpreted to mean that for the total group and for the incarcerated respondents reporting more meaningful family rituals was associated with committing fewer deviant acts. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was confirmed for these two groups, but rejected for the college students. The following table displayed the results of this analysis.

Table 8
Meaningful Family Rituals Regressed on Deviance Index Variable for Total Respondents, Incarcerated Respondents, and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>College Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second hypothesis proposed that there would be a positive relationship between meaningful family rituals and the inner containment variable of higher levels of self-esteem. The results of the t-test analysis suggested that the incarcerated respondents, and the college students differed significantly on both variables (See Table 6). A simple regression analysis was run to determine if meaningful family rituals accounted for any of the variability in levels of self-esteem. The results suggested that meaningful family rituals played a weak but significant role in self-esteem for all of the respondents and the college students. The results were not significant for the incarcerated respondents. This could be interpreted to mean that for all of the respondents and the college students, reporting more meaningful family rituals was correlated with higher levels of self-esteem. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was confirmed for the total respondents and the college students. It was rejected for the incarcerated respondents. Table 9 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(n=359)</th>
<th>(n=167)</th>
<th>(n=192)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Beta</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .01, **p < .001.
The third hypothesis suggested that there would be a positive relationship between meaningful family rituals and participation in conforming activities or the outer containment variables. T-tests were generated comparing meaningful family rituals and participation in conforming activities with family members in the home, participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home, and participation in extracurricular activities independent of family members (See Table 6). The results indicated that the incarcerated respondents and the college students differed significantly on participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home and participation in extracurricular activities. There was no significant difference between the two groups on participation in conforming activities in the home.

The regression results suggested that meaningful family rituals accounted for a moderate but significant variation in participation in conforming activities with family members at home for all of the respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. This was also true for participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home. Meaningful family rituals accounted for a smaller but still

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Respondents (n=413)</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n=201)</th>
<th>College Students (n=212)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Beta Coefficients</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.11.</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .001.
highly significant amount of the variation in participation in extracurricular activities.

These results indicated that the reporting of meaningful family rituals was associated with being more likely to participate with family members in activities both inside and outside the home and participation in extracurricular activities for all of the respondents, including the subgroups. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was supported by the data analysis. The following table provides the results of this analysis.

Table 10

Meaningful Family Rituals Regressed on Outer Containment Variables for Total Respondents, the Incarcerated Respondents, and the College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outer Containment Variables</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>College Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Conforming Activities with Family</td>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.48 (n=422)</td>
<td>.55 (n=207)</td>
<td>.43 (n=215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized Beta Coefficients</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Conforming Activities with Family .20 Members Outside the Home</td>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.55 (n=419)</td>
<td>.57 (n=205)</td>
<td>.49 (n=214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized Beta Coefficients</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Extracurricular Activities</td>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.27 (n=424)</td>
<td>.23 (n=207)</td>
<td>.20 (n=217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fourth hypothesis suggests a positive relationship between self-esteem (the inner containment variable) and participation in conforming activities (the outer containment variables). This was based on Reckless’ (1973b) premise that there was a reciprocal relationship between the inner and outer containment variables, with inner containment variables having more influence over the outer containment variables. The t-test results indicated that there were significant differences between the incarcerated respondents and the college students on self-esteem and participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home and participation in extracurricular activities (See Table 6). There was no significant difference between the two groups on participation in conforming activities with family members in the home. Regression analyses were generated to determine if self-esteem could account for any of the variance in the three types of conforming activities.

A simple regression analysis was run to determine if there was a linear relationship between self-esteem and participation in conforming activities. The results indicate that self-esteem does not contribute to any of the variability in participation in conforming activities with family members in the home. Self-esteem accounts for a very small but significant association with participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home for all of the respondents and the incarcerated respondents. This is also true for participation in extracurricular activities. From the results, it could be inferred that reporting higher levels of self-esteem is associated with reporting more
participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home and participation in extracurricular activities for the total respondents and the incarcerated respondents. Thus, hypothesis 4 was partially supported. The following table displays the results of this analysis.

Table 11

Self-Esteem Net Score Regressed on Outer Containment Variables for Total Respondents, the Incarcerated Respondents, and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outer Containment Variables</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>College Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=411)</td>
<td>(n=201)</td>
<td>(n=210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Conforming Activities with Family Members Inside the Home</td>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized Beta Coefficients</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=408)</td>
<td>(n=199)</td>
<td>(n=209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Conforming Activities with Family Members Outside the Home</td>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized Beta Coefficients</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Extracurricular Activities</td>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized Beta Coefficients</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .01 **p < .001.
Before the regression analysis was conducted for hypothesis 5, the relationship between the inner and outer containment variables and deviant behavior was explored. Several simple regression analyses were generated between self-esteem, participation in family activities in the home, participation in family activities outside the home, participation in extracurricular activities, and deviance. The results indicate that for the total respondents, the inner containment variable of self-esteem accounts for a weak but significant amount of variance in deviant behavior. This was not true for the incarcerated respondents and the college students. The outer containment variable of participating in family activities within the home accounted for a weak but significant amount of the variance in deviant behavior for the total respondents and the incarcerated respondents. This was also true for the second outer containment variable, participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home. The third outer containment variable, participation in extracurricular activities, accounted for a weak but significant variation in deviant behavior for all of the respondents. There was no significant relationship between participation in extracurricular activities and deviant behavior for the subgroups. The results are displayed in the following table.

Table 12

Inner Containment (Self-Esteem Net Score) and Outer Containment Variables Regressed on Deviance Index Variable for Total Respondents, Incarcerated Respondents, and College Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>College Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=352)</td>
<td>(n=164)</td>
<td>(n=188)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inner Containment Variable Analysis**

- **Self-Esteem Net Score**
  - Multiple R: .11
  - Adjusted R²: -
  - Standardized Beta Coefficients: -.11*

- **Outer Containment Variables**
  - **Participation in Conforming Activities with Family**
    - Multiple R: .16
    - Adjusted R²: .02
    - Standardized Beta Coefficients: -.16**
  - **Members Inside the Home**
    - Multiple R: .27
    - Adjusted R²: .07
    - Standardized Beta Coefficients: -.27**
  - **Participation in Extra-curricular Activities**
    - Multiple R: .18
    - Adjusted R²: .03
    - Standardized Beta Coefficients: -.18**

**Note.**  
* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001.

The results of the previous regression analysis point out that the inner and outer containment variables, when evaluated separately, had very small or no explanatory power for deviant behavior. Therefore, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if there would be a different result if the variables were regressed together. The findings indicated that, together, the inner and outer containment variables accounted for
7% of the deviance for the total respondents, 5% for the incarcerated respondents, and 3% for the college students. The variable that was most significant for the total respondents was participation in conforming activities with parents outside the home. The variable that was significant for the college students was participation in conforming activities with family members inside the home. No variables were significant for the incarcerated respondents. The combined effect of the inner and outer containment variables was no more likely to explain deviant behavior than when the variables were evaluated for their separate effects. Table 13 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 13

Inner (Self-Esteem Net Score) and Outer Containment Variables Regressed on Deviance Index Variable for Total Respondents, Incarcerated Respondents, and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total Respondents (n=348)</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n=163)</th>
<th>College Students (n=184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Net Score</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Conforming Activities with Family Members Inside the Home</td>
<td>-.01-</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Conforming Activities with Family Members Outside the Home</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Extracurricular Activities</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To further expand the model that was identified in Chapter 1, a multiple regression analysis was generated to explore the role that meaningful family rituals and the inner and outer containment variables played in explaining deviant behavior. The results of the analysis indicated that these variables account for 10% of the variance of deviant behavior for the total respondents, 5% for the incarcerated respondents, and 3% for the college students. The variables that were significant for the total respondents were meaningful family rituals and participation in activities with family members outside the home. None of the variables were significant for the incarcerated respondents. The significant variable for the college students was participation in conforming activities with family members inside the home. This regression analysis showed that adding meaningful family rituals to the inner and outer containment variables did not enhance much at all the explanatory value of the inner and outer containment variables when attempting to explain deviant behavior. Table 14 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Incarcerated</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p ≤ .05. **p < .01.
The fifth and final hypothesis of this study proposed that the risk factors would be positively associated with deviance, regardless of reported levels of meaningful family rituals. The risk factors in this study were age, sex, race/ethnicity, family structure, education, socioeconomic status (SES), neighborhood crime, father’s deviance and mother’s deviance. As were indicated by the t-test analyses results in Table 7, the incarcerated respondents and the college students differed significantly on all of the risk factors except for sex. To further explore the relationship between the risk factors and deviant behavior, Pearson correlation coefficients with one-tailed significance were computed among the risk factors and deviant behavior. This was done to determine if there were linear relationships between the variables and if co-linearity was a problem. The correlation matrix in Table 14 indicated that there was a significant relationship between deviant behavior and all of the risk factors. There was a positive correlation **p < .01.**
between being more likely to be deviant, being older, not living in an intact family of origin, being reared in high crime neighborhoods, and mother’s and father’s deviance. There was a negative correlation between deviance and the risk factors of being female, being white, the education index variable, and never being on welfare. This meant that older, nonwhite males, with lower educational index levels, coming from nonintact families, living in high crime neighborhoods, having been on welfare, and having parents who were deviant were more likely to be deviant. In addition, several of the risk factors were correlated with each other; however, they were not correlated strongly enough with each other to indicate that co-linearity was a problem (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 1996). The following described the most significant correlations among the risk factors and between the risk factors and deviant behavior.

The highest correlation among the risk factors was between neighborhood crime and socioeconomic status (SES). Respondents who reported being on welfare were more likely to live in high crime neighborhoods. The second highest correlation among the risk factors was between mother and father’s deviance, with a positive relationship occurring between the two. The third highest correlations among the risk factors were between neighborhood crime and race/ethnicity and neighborhood crime and the education index variable. These statistics indicate that living in high crime neighborhoods was associated with being nonwhite and having a lower educational level. The fourth highest correlation among the risk factors was between being on welfare and coming from nonintact families of origin. The fifth highest correlation was between SES and the education index variable, which indicated that being on welfare was associated with a lower score on the
education index variable. Finally, the sixth highest correlation was between SES and race/ethnicity, with being white not being associated with being on welfare.

There were also some significant correlations between some of the risk factors and the deviance index variable. For example, scoring lower on the education index variable was associated with higher levels of deviant behavior while living in high crime neighborhoods was positively associated with higher rates of deviance. Never being on welfare was associated with lower levels of deviant behavior. The results also indicate that having parents who were deviant was associated with higher rates of deviant behavior. All of these findings were in the predicted direction. Table 15 displays the correlation matrix.

Table 15
Pearson Correlations Among Risk Factors and Deviance Index Variable for Total Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Years</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being White</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Index</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intact Family</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never on Welfare</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>9. Father’s Deviance</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Mother’s Deviance</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

After exploring the correlations among the risk factors, a multiple regression was generated. The purpose of the regression analysis was to determine if the risk factors accounted for any of the variation for deviant behavior. Examination of the results for all of the respondents indicated that 6 of the risk factors accounted for 36% of the variance for deviant behavior. They were education, neighborhood crime, growing up in non-intact families, age, sex, and father’s deviance. Level of education was the variable that accounted for the most variance, followed by neighborhood crime, family structure, age, sex, and father’s deviance. All of these variables, being an older male, performing poorly in school, growing up in non-intact households, living in high crime neighborhoods, and having a parent who is deviant have all been established as risk factors for deviant behavior (Sacco & Kennedy, 1996; Bartollas & Miller, 2001).

For the incarcerated respondents, the risk factors accounted for 14% of the variance for deviant behavior. Sex, race, and neighborhood crime were the variables that were significant. In other words, older nonwhite males who lived in high crime neighborhoods were more likely to be deviant among the incarcerated respondents. The results for the college students were somewhat different, with the risk factors accounting for 16% of the variance for deviance with sex, mother’s deviance, and education being the most significant variables. In this subgroup, being male, having a mother who was...
deviant, and scoring lower on the education variable put the respondents in this group more at risk for committing deviant behaviors. Overall, the results were in the predicted direction, thus, hypothesis 5 was confirmed. The following table displays the results of the regression analysis.

Table 16

Risk Factors Regressed on Deviance Index Variable for Total Respondents, Incarcerated Respondents, and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total Respondents (n=339)</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n=154)</th>
<th>College Students (n=184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age by Years</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Female</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being White</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Index</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intact Family of Origin</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never on Welfare</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Crime</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Deviance</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Deviance</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The risk factors accounted for more deviance than meaningful family rituals and the inner and outer containment variables. While meaningful family rituals and the inner and outer containment variables accounted for 10% of the variance in deviant behavior for the total respondents, 5% for the incarcerated respondents and 3% for the college students; the risk factors accounted for 36%, 14% and 16% of the variance, respectively. The differences in the results could be attributed to environmental factors being more influential than internal family processes in contributing to deviant behavior, although the family process variables were significant. These results differed from Reckless’ (1973b) proposal that inner containment variables were better predictors of deviant behavior than outer containment variables. In this case, the outer containment variables were better able to explain deviant behavior.

The final regression analysis combined the variables of meaningful family rituals, the inner and outer containment variables, and the risk factors to determine their total effect on deviant behavior. The results indicated that, together, the variables accounted for 36% of the deviance as reported by the total respondents. The most significant variables were the education index variable, neighborhood crime, reporting more meaningful family rituals, sex, age, and family structure. For the incarcerated respondents, the variables accounted for 15% of the variance in deviant behavior. The significant variables were sex, neighborhood crime, and race/ethnicity. In regards to the college students, the variables accounted for 16% of the variation in deviance, with the

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
most significant variables being sex, mother’s deviance, neighborhood crime and education. Regression results indicated that the effect of all of the variables on deviant behavior were almost identical to that of the regression analysis when the risk factors were evaluated separately. The results were displayed in the following table.

Table 17
Meaningful Family Rituals, Inner Containment Variable (Self-Esteem Net Score), Outer Containment Variables and Risk Factors Regressed on Deviance Index Variable for Total Respondents, Incarcerated Respondents, and College Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total Respondents (n=329)</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n=156)</th>
<th>College Students (n=186)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Family Rituals</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Net Score</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Conforming Activities With Family Members In the Home</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Conforming Activities With Family Members Outside the Home</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Extracurricular Activities</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Years</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Female</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being White</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous regression analysis completed the study of the model identified in Chapter 1. After examining the data, it appears that the independent variables of meaningful family rituals and participation in activities with family members inside the home, accounts for a small but significant amount of the variation in deviant behavior. Self-esteem played no role in explaining deviant behavior, except in an indirect way through its influence on participation in conforming activities. The risk factors accounted for the largest portion of the variation in deviant behavior. Some of the most significant risk factors were sex, neighborhood crime, education, family structure, and mother’s deviance. It appears that environmental forces external to the family played the most significant role in explaining deviant behavior, with the family process variables having less significance.

Overall, the results of the regression analysis indicate that there were often weak
but significant amounts of variation in the dependent variables caused by the independent variables. A test of statistical significance was used to show whether the research results were due to chance or sampling variability (SPSS Base 10.0: Applications Guide, 1999). Some researchers have questioned the value of statistical significance and whether it tells researchers what they really want to know (Cohen, 1992). Researchers have developed alternative ways of viewing the statistical relationships between variables (Kirk, 1996). One such method is power analysis (Cohen, 1983; Cohen, 1992). In the following section, power analysis is described and applied to the data in this study.

**Power Analysis**

Cohen (1992) suggested that significance levels alone cannot provide the information that was needed to allow researchers to fully explain the relationship between variables. He, along with other researchers, argued that classical null hypothesis testing is troublesome because the use of statistical significance tells researchers that the null hypotheses might not be true, but it does little to explain the value of the statistic (Kirk, 1996). As a result of his concerns, Cohen (1983; 1992) developed a formula for evaluating the value of a statistic if it was determined to be significant. He called his formula power analysis. With power analysis, four components of statistical inference were used: sample size (n), significance criterion (α), population effect size (ES), and statistical power. For multiple regression, the formula was \( R^2 = \frac{R^2}{1-R^2} \). If the score ranged from .02 to .15, Cohen (1992) suggested that this was an indication that one variable had a small effect on the other variable. If the results were .15 to .35, the variable was said to have a medium effect on the other variable, and if the results were .35 or
larger, the variable was said to have a large effect. A power analysis was conducted on the variables that were addressed by the hypotheses.

For hypothesis 1, which examined the relationship between meaningful family rituals and deviant behavior, the power analysis statistic was .09 for all the respondents, .04 for the incarcerated respondents, and 0 for the college students. This means that meaningful family rituals had a small effect on deviant behavior for all of the respondents and for the incarcerated respondents but not for the college students. These results are consistent with the regression analysis, which indicated that meaningful family rituals had a small but significant impact on deviance for the total respondents and the incarcerated respondents. In hypothesis 2, the power statistic for all of the respondents was .03, 0 for the incarcerated respondents and .02 for the college students. This was interpreted to mean that meaningful family rituals had almost no effect on self-esteem. These results are also consistent with the previous regression analysis. Hypothesis 3, which states that meaningful family rituals would have a significant effect on participation in conforming activities was highly significant. The power statistic for participation in conforming activities with family members in the home was .29 for all of the respondents, .42 for the incarcerated respondents, and .22 for the college students. This meant that meaningful family rituals have a large effect on participation in conforming activities with family members inside the home for the incarcerated respondents and a medium effect for the total group and the college students. The power statistic for participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home was .42 for all of the respondents, .47 for the incarcerated respondents, and .25 for the
college students. This could be interpreted to mean that meaningful family rituals had a large effect on participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home for all of the respondents and the incarcerated respondents, and a medium effect for the college students. The power statistics for the third conforming activity, participation in extracurricular activities, was .08 for all of the respondents, .05 for the incarcerated respondents, and .03 for the college students. This shows that meaningful family rituals have a small effect on participation in extracurricular activities. These findings were consistent with the previous regression analysis. The fourth hypothesis proposed that higher levels of self-esteem would contribute to participation in conforming activities. The power analysis statistics showed a very small effect of self-esteem on participation in conforming activities with family members both inside and outside the home and for participation in extracurricular activities. The next power analysis evaluated the influence of both the inner and outer containment variables on deviant behavior. The power statistics, .08 for the total respondents, .05 for the incarcerated respondents, and .03 for the college students indicates a small effect of these variables on deviant behavior. In addition, power statistics were calculated for the independent variables of meaningful family rituals, self-esteem, participation in conforming activities with family members both inside and outside the home, and participation in extracurricular activities and their relationship with deviant behavior. The statistics were .11 for the total respondents and .05 for the incarcerated respondents, and .03 for the college students. This was interpreted to mean that the independent variables had a small effect on deviant behavior. The earlier regression statistics also supported this finding. The fifth hypothesis, which examined the
role of risk factors and deviant behavior, indicated that the risk factors accounted for a large effect on deviant behavior for all of the respondents and a medium effect for the incarcerated respondents and the college students. The power statistics were .56, .16, and .16, respectively. Finally, meaningful family rituals, the inner and outer containment variables, and the risk factors were evaluated for their influence on deviant behavior. The power statistics were .56, .18, and .16, indicating that the variables had a large effect for all the respondents and a medium effect for the incarcerated respondents and the college students. The earlier regression analysis supported the findings. The following table presents the results of the power analysis.

Table 18

Power Analysis for the Major Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>College Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Family Rituals and Deviance Index</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Family Rituals and Self-Esteem Net Score</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Family Rituals and Participation in Conforming Activities in the Home</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Family Rituals and Participation in Conforming Activities Outside the Home</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Family Rituals and Extracurricular Activities</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Net Score and Participation in</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conforming Activities in the Home

Self-Esteem Net Score and Participation in Conforming Activities Outside the Home

| .04 | .03 | .01 |

Self-Esteem Net Score and Participation in Extracurricular Activities

| .04 | .03 | .01 |

Inner (Self-Esteem Net Score) and Outer Containment Variables and Deviance Index

| .08 | .05 | .03 |

Meaningful Family Rituals, Inner (Self-Esteem Net Score) and Outer Containment Variables, and Deviance Index Variable

| .11 | .05 | .03 |

Risk Factors and Deviance Index Variable

| .56 | .16 | .16 |

All Variables and Deviance Index Variable

| .56 | .18 | .16 |

Conclusion

Overall, it appears that the incarcerated respondents and the college students differed significantly on the major variables. The results of the regression analyses indicate that many of the independent variables did not account for a large amount of the variation in deviant behavior, although many of the statistics were significant. Self-esteem was obvious in its lack of influence over deviant behavior, although, it had a small effect on participation in conforming activities. Some of the results of the power analysis were impressive, with participation in conforming activities and the risk factors displaying a large effect on deviant behavior. In addition, the power statistics suggest that meaningful family rituals play a large role in the respondents’ participation in conforming activities with family members both inside and outside the home. Therefore, even though the direct effect of meaningful family rituals was not high, their indirect effect could be
significant. The next chapter will discuss the results of the data analysis, provide further interpretation, and identify implications for future research.
CHAPTER VI
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

School authorities, criminal justice officials, mental-health professionals, and members of the general public have attempted to identify the antecedents of some troubling trends in adolescent behavior (Cherlin, 1988; Dryfoos, 1990; Resnick, et al., 1997). Parents, in particular, have been aware of the many social forces that have the potential to influence their children, in both positive and negative ways (Kozol, 1995). All are concerned about rearing children in a social context that will promote their transition into responsible, productive members of society (Pipher, 1996). Families have often been credited with providing their children with the necessary resources to resist the negative influences in society (Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992).

Family researchers have recognized that some young people are more vulnerable to negative influences than others (Pipher, 1996; Resnick, et al., 1997). This vulnerability has sometimes been attributed to psychological and social factors or both (Reckless, 1973a; Sacco and Kennedy, 1995). Researchers are concerned about this vulnerability because it may contribute to adolescents' deviant behavior (Dryfoos, 1990; Resnick, et al., 1997). Some researchers have suggested that one family process variable that might provide both a psychological and social buffer against some of these negative influences is family rituals (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Fiese, 1993). It has been suggested that family
rituals may have the potential to contribute to conforming behavior and reduce both motivation and opportunities for deviant behavior (Pipher, 1996). The purpose of this study was to examine rituals that take place within families and to determine how these experiences might influence the future behavior of children in these families. Specifically, this study proposed that when individual family members had favorable perceptions of family rituals, they would report higher levels of self-esteem and they would report higher levels of participation in conforming activities, both with and independent of family members. In turn, these experiences would reduce participation in deviant activities.

Survey Instruments

Three survey instruments were used in this study including the Family Rituals Questionnaire (Fiese & Kline, 1992; see Appendix A), the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2 (Battle, 1992; see Appendix B), and the Family Information Inventory (Short & Nye, 1958; Siegel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988; Sweet, Bumpass, & Call, 1988; See Appendix C). The first two instruments had been developed and used in previous studies. The first part of the Family Information Inventory was developed for this study, with the questions on participation in activities with family members inside the home, participation in activities with family members outside the home, and deviance coming from other sources.

The Family Rituals Questionnaire was essential in providing information about the respondents’ family rituals. As in previous studies using the FRQ, a factor analysis was conducted to see if the dimensions of the FRQ separated into a routine and meaning
dimension (Fiese, 1992a, 1993). Even with this more diverse sample, these same dimensions emerged, and the meaning dimension became the primary independent variable in the data analysis for this study. It should also be noted that no significant differences were found in the outcome when the total FRQ score was used versus the subscore for meaningful family rituals.

Theoretical Perspectives Related to the Findings

Several major theories were used in this study to provide the framework for the research, including structural functional theory, family systems theory, symbolic interaction theory, and social control theory. Structural functional theory was included because of its emphasis on social order, social organization and culture. Structural functional theory provided the framework for understanding how family rituals might contribute to conforming behavior, and ultimately, social control. It was suggested that family rituals play a role in the development of family culture, thereby, acting as an agent of social control. The results of the data analysis in this study provide support for this idea, with meaningful family rituals being associated with less deviant behavior for the total respondents and the incarcerated respondents. One might conclude that meaningful family rituals contribute to family culture, which in turn, promotes participation in conforming activities. It is significant that meaningful family rituals play a small role in explaining deviant behavior for the incarcerated respondents. Findings suggest, however, that family rituals may not compensate for the multiple risk factors the incarcerated respondents encountered when growing up. For example, one of the risk factors in this study that was highly correlated with deviant behavior was neighborhood crime.
Neighborhood crime has been associated with social disorganization and is also one of Reckless’ (1973a) outer containment variables (Sacco & Kennedy, 1995). The incarcerated respondents who reported fewer meaningful family rituals and more neighborhood crime also reported more deviant behavior. In fact, the risk factors in this study were found to be more influential in predicting deviant behavior than family rituals. This could be interpreted to mean that social process variables were important, but they might not be able to compensate for higher levels of social disorganization in the person’s social context.

Like structural functional theory, family systems theory emphasizes the system as a whole and the need for the system to maintain equilibrium or order. The processes that contribute to a functioning family system were the focus of this study, in particular, family rituals and participation in conforming activities. Family systems theory suggests that families are systems, with the primary focus being on the interaction among family members (Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993). As family members interact over time, patterns of relationships develop (Cheal, 1991). Researchers have called these patterns of relationships family rituals (Reiss, 1981; Imber-Black & Roberts, 1992). Family rituals have the potential to bond family members together and to connect them to the outside world (Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Bradshaw, 1988). The results of the data analysis in this study support family systems theory. Meaningful family rituals play a significant role in contributing to participation in conforming activities. In turn, those respondents who participate in conforming activities are less likely to commit deviant acts.

The third theory, symbolic interaction theory, was the theory that provides the
explanation for how meaningful family rituals might contribute to higher levels of self-esteem. Measures of self-esteem were used in this study as part of Walter Reckless’ (1973b) social control theory. According to some sociologists, the process through which self-esteem develops is through social interaction (Meltzer, 1994). In this study, it was proposed that meaningful family rituals contribute to higher levels of self-esteem, which in turn reduces deviant behavior. Also, higher levels of self-esteem will contribute to higher levels of participation in conforming activities. The results of this study indicate that higher levels of self-esteem play no significant role in reducing deviant behavior. However, higher levels of self-esteem were correlated with higher levels of participation in conforming activities for the total respondents and the incarcerated respondents. Thus, self-esteem may have had an indirect effect on reducing deviant behavior.

The final theory was developed by Walter Reckless (1973b). This was a theory of deviance in which the focus is on social control. The major premise of this theory is that there are inner and outer containment variables that contribute to social control. Examples of inner containment variables are attitudes toward self, self-control, and self-esteem. Some outer containment variables are environmental factors such as the family, peers, community, and participation in conforming activities. Reckless suggests that there is a reciprocal relationship between these variables, with inner containment variables having more influence on social control or in the reduction of deviant behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). In terms of this study, it was proposed that meaningful family rituals contribute to both inner and outer containment, thereby, reducing deviant behavior.

The results of the data analysis indicate that meaningful family rituals have a
positive effect on self-esteem for the total respondents and the college students. However, higher levels of self-esteem had no significant relationship with reducing deviant behavior. Therefore, there was little support for Reckless’ emphasis on the role of inner containment as an element of social control. On the other hand, Reckless suggested that there was a reciprocal relationship between the inner and outer containment variables (Shoemaker, 1996). The data in this study support this notion, with higher levels of self-esteem contributing to higher levels of participation in conforming activities for the total respondents and the incarcerated respondents. In turn, the outer containment variables of participation in conforming activities with family members inside the home, participation in activities with family members outside the home, and participation in extracurricular activities were significant in reducing deviant behavior for the respondents. In addition, Reckless (1973b) included other variables, such as living in poverty and neighborhood crimes as outer containment variables that could potentially impact social control. In this study, it was found that the variable of neighborhood crime did contribute to deviant behavior.

Summary of the Findings

Model

A model using the major variables was developed and presented in Chapter 1 (p. 13). The model represents the hypotheses of this study, which were that meaningful family rituals would contribute to inner and outer containment, which in turn, would reduce deviant behavior. The model also identifies the risk factors that were evaluated for their contribution to deviant behavior. In terms of the model and its predictions, the
relationships between most of the variables were in the predicted direction. The one exception to this was that self-esteem has no relationship with deviant behavior. This finding questions the role of self-esteem in predicting deviant behavior (Jang & Thornberry, 1998). The results of the data analysis provided weak but significant support for the model. The most significant relationship was between the risk factors and deviant behavior. The following describes the hypotheses with a description of the findings.

Hypotheses

The first hypothesis in this study proposed that there would be a significant difference between the incarcerated respondents and the college students in terms of their family rituals. The results of the t-tests confirmed that there was a significant difference between the two groups for both family rituals and deviant behavior, with college students having higher levels of family rituals with positive meaning and incarcerated respondents reporting higher levels of deviant behavior. The regression analysis indicated that family rituals accounted for a small amount of deviance for the total respondents and the incarcerated respondents. This was not true for the college students. The power analysis indicated that meaningful family rituals had a small effect on deviant behavior for the incarcerated respondents but not for the college students. It should be noted that the college students had a higher mean score on meaningful family rituals and less deviant behavior than the incarcerated respondents, so even though these variables were not found to be statistically related, the relationship between the two should receive further exploration. However, from the current data analysis, hypothesis 1 was partially supported.
The second hypothesis proposed that respondents who reported higher levels of family rituals with positive meaning would also report a higher level of self-esteem. The results of the t-tests indicated that the incarcerated respondents and the college students differed significantly on self-esteem, with college students reporting significantly higher levels. Both the regression analysis and the power analysis indicated that levels of self-esteem accounted for a very small amount of variation in deviant behavior for the total respondents and the college students. Thus, in this study, the data did not strongly support this hypothesis, or Walter Reckless’ (1973b) contention that self-esteem would be a significant variable when explaining inner containment.

The third hypothesis in this study proposed that there would be a positive correlation between family rituals high in positive meaning and participation in conforming activities. The results of the t-tests indicated that there was not a significant difference between the incarcerated respondents and the college students on participation in conforming activities with family members in the home. There were, however, significant differences between the two groups in regard to participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home and participation in extracurricular activities. The regression analysis indicated that meaningful family rituals accounted for a moderate but significant variation in participation in conforming activities with family members inside and outside the home for all of the respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. Meaningful family rituals accounted for a small but significant variation in participation in extracurricular activities for the total respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. The power analysis indicated that
meaningful family rituals had a moderate to large effect on participation in conforming activities with family members both inside and outside the home and a small effect on participation in extracurricular activities. One would anticipate that there would be a significant correlation between higher levels of ritual behavior and participation in conforming activities because both involve deliberate behaviors. There was actually little difference between the two variables when calculating their separate effects on deviant behavior, and they had only a slight ability to predict deviant behavior.

The fourth hypothesis suggested that there would be a positive correlation between higher levels of self-esteem and participation in conforming activities. Regression analysis indicated that higher levels of self-esteem accounted for none of the variance in participation in conforming activities with family members inside the home for any of the respondents. Higher levels of self-esteem accounted for a very small but significant amount of the variation in participation in conforming activities with family members outside the home and in extracurricular activities for the total respondents and the incarcerated respondents. From the results of the data analysis, it could be stated that self-esteem was not a strong predictor of participation in conforming activities. Thus, Reckless’ (1973a) assertion about the importance of the role of inner containment was not supported from this data.

To further expand the model identified in Chapter 1, the inner and outer containment variables were regressed on deviance to see if they could explain any deviant behavior. They were evaluated separately and then together to test their effects. Independently, self-esteem had a small effect on deviant behavior for the total
respondents. This was not true for the incarcerated respondents and the college students. The three variables related to participation in conforming activities had very small effects on deviant behavior, with the most significant one being participation with family members outside the home. The results were similar when the variables were regressed collectively on deviant behavior.

In order to broaden the explanatory power of the independent variables, the variable of meaningful family rituals was added to the inner and outer containment variables for an additional multiple regression analysis. The results indicated that meaningful family rituals did not add any explanatory power to the inner and outer containment variables when trying to explain deviant behavior. Therefore, it appears that these family process variables need to be re-evaluated for their relevance in future studies related to deviant behavior.

The final hypothesis proposed that certain risk factors would account for a significant amount of the variability in deviant behavior, regardless of reported levels of family rituals. The data supported this hypothesis. Specifically, it was found that being an older male, scoring lower on the education index variable, being less likely to live with both natural parents when growing up, living in high crime neighborhoods, and having parents who committed deviant acts were more likely to be deviant. Race, or being nonwhite was a significant variable for the incarcerated respondents. There was no empirical support for SES as a risk factor for deviant behavior. Overall, the risk factors were the best predictors of deviant behavior. The following provides a detailed analysis of the risk factors that were most relevant in this study.
Risk Factors

In this study, there was a negative correlation between education and deviant behavior for the total respondents and the college students. Previous research has found that negative educational experiences have been associated with deviant behavior (Hirschi, 1969). In particular, young people who reported lower levels of academic performance and a lower level of attachment to school have been linked to delinquency (Conklin, 1998). This was found to be true for the college students in this study but not for the incarcerated respondents.

Neighborhood crime was a risk factor that seemed to be important in explaining deviant behavior for all of the respondents, including both subgroups. Previous research has linked high-crime neighborhoods to social disorganization (Sacco & Kennedy, 1996). Bursik and Grasmick (1993) contend that in neighborhoods with high social disorganization some of the agents of social control may be less effective. This means that the family, local schools, churches, other community organizations, and the larger community may have less influence on individuals. High crime neighborhoods were considered to be part of Reckless’ (1973b) outer containment variables, and the results of this study indicate that this was a significant variable in predicting deviant behavior.

Age was a risk factor for the total respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. The age range of the respondents in this study was from 18 to 23. The older respondents in this sample reported more deviant behavior. The research has suggested that younger people are more likely to be deviant (Shoemaker, 1996). It would be difficult to say that the results of this study are contrary to this prediction since the age
range of the sample is still relatively young.

Another significant risk factor that was related to deviant behavior was family structure. In this study, coming from non-intact homes was a significant variable for the total respondents and the incarcerated group. Coming from nonintact homes has been associated with delinquency (Shoemaker, 1996; Conklin, 1998). Some major issues associated with nonintact families have been lack of supervision and economic problems (Simons & Associates, 1996; Olson & DeFrain, 2000). The relevance of these two issues should be explored in future research.

Being male was a significant risk factor for predicting behavior for the total respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. Men continue to be much more likely than women to commit crimes (Bartollas & Miller, 2001), and the data from this study supported this trend.

The results of the analysis indicated that parent’s deviance was associated with deviant behavior for the total respondents and the college students. Father’s deviance was a significant risk factor for the total respondents and mother’s deviance was a significant risk factor for the college students. Even though the regression analysis did not find that father and mother’s deviance was a significant variable for the incarcerated respondents, they reported a higher mean score for both mother and father’s deviance, and there was a significant difference between them and the college students. Since research has established that parental deviance and juvenile delinquency are linked, these results confirm that this was a problem for both the incarcerated respondents and the college students (Geismar & Wood, 1986; Stark, 1996).
Finally, race/ethnicity was a significant risk factor for the incarcerated respondents. Being nonwhite was associated with deviant behavior. This was in the predicted direction as previous research has indicated that minority youth are more likely to be involved in the criminal justice system (Bartollas & Miller, 2001).

Profile of the Subgroups

The results of the data analysis indicate that the incarcerated respondents and the college students differed significantly on all of the major variables. This was expected in regards to their deviant behavior, however, the differences in family rituals and participation in conforming activities were not as evident prior to the study. After reviewing the separate hypotheses and their relationship to the model, a profile of the total respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students was generated. The purpose of the profile was to summarize the similarities and differences between the groups and to speculate why these phenomena occurred. The following highlights the characteristics of the groups.

The total respondents were comprised of the incarcerated respondents and the college students, and their profile represented the data in a general way. First, those respondents who reported higher levels of meaningful family rituals also reported less deviant behavior, higher levels of self-esteem, and greater participation in activities with family members both inside and outside the home, and in extracurricular activities. Second, those respondents who reported higher levels of self-esteem also reported greater participation in activities with family members outside the home and in extracurricular activities. Third, reporting higher levels of self-esteem had a small effect on deviant
behavior. Fourth, participation in activities with family members inside and outside the home, and participation in extracurricular activities was associated with less deviant behavior. Finally, the risk factors of age, sex, education, family structure, neighborhood crime, and father’s deviance accounted for more deviant behavior than the collective effect of meaningful family rituals, higher levels of self-esteem, and participation in conforming activities.

The next group to be profiled was the incarcerated respondents. First, the incarcerated respondents who reported higher levels of meaningful family rituals also reported less deviant behavior, greater participation in activities with family members both inside and outside the home, and in extracurricular activities. Second, meaningful family rituals had no effect on self-esteem. Third, reporting higher levels of self-esteem was related to participation in conforming family activities outside the home and in extracurricular activities but had no relationship with deviant behavior. Fourth, participation in activities with family members inside and outside the home was associated with less deviant behavior. Finally, the risk factors of sex, race/ethnicity, and neighborhood crime, explained 14% of the variance in deviant behavior.

The final group to be profiled was the college students. First, interestingly for this group, meaningful family rituals were not related to deviant behavior. However, meaningful family rituals were related to higher levels of self-esteem, participation in activities with family members both inside and outside the home, and in extracurricular activities. Self-esteem had no relationship with deviant behavior and no association with the outer containment variables. Of the outer containment variables, participation in
activities with family members inside the home was associated with lower levels of deviant behavior. The risk factors accounted for 16% of the variance in deviant behavior, with gender, mother’s deviance, and education being the most significant variables.

There were several common threads among the three groups, and these were the most significant findings of the study. They were:

1. Meaningful family rituals played a very small role in reducing deviant behavior.
2. Self-esteem had no relationship with deviant behavior.
3. Meaningful family rituals were significantly related to participation in activities with family members both inside and outside the home.
4. The risk factors were better predictors of deviant behavior than the other independent variables.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the results. First, reporting less meaningful family rituals has been associated with alcoholism and anxiety (Wolin & Bennett; 1984; Fiese, 1992a). The results of this study suggest that there is also some association with reporting less meaningful family rituals and deviant behavior. Although the relationship was small, this might be an area of future exploration. Second, the inner containment variable of self-esteem had no explanatory power for deviant behavior, which was contrary to what Reckless (1973a) had predicted. The outer containment variables played a small role in explaining deviant behavior. Thus, there was only partial support for Reckless’ theory in this study. The risk factors were most significant when attempting to explain deviant behavior, and they should continue to receive attention in future research.
There were some limitations of this study that reduce the generalizability of these results. The following identifies and discusses these limitations.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations of this study. First, the research design was cross-sectional. With cross-sectional research, the data are gathered at one point in time, and as a result, the information gathered may not reflect the full scope and experiences of the respondents. Second, the respondents in this study were asked to provide retrospective histories of their childhood. For most people, the ability to recall past events and feelings fades over time. Respondents also have a tendency to select memories and to rescript memories. For example, when the respondents answered the questions on the self-esteem inventory, they were directed to respond as they would have been before the age of 18. It was probably more likely that they reported their current feelings. An indicator of this was that during the administration of the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2 (Battle, 1992) to the incarcerated respondents, several of them verbally expressed that they felt good about themselves and that they were not ashamed of who they were and what they had done. This attitude may have played a role in their responses to the self-esteem survey. Also, some of the incarcerated respondents mentioned that some of the acts they committed prior to being incarcerated actually raised their self-esteem because they had received the approval of their peers. As a result, it might be hard to predict the influence of self-esteem on deviant behavior when measured from a retroactive perspective. A third limitation was related to the issue of time or causal order. The self-esteem measurement was taken after the incarcerated respondents had been officially labeled deviant. It was
difficult to factor out the separate effects of family rituals versus this label and its effects upon their level of self-esteem. A fourth limitation of this study was that only one respondent from each family was assessing their family rituals. Previous research has indicated that family member's perception of family life might be different (Fiese, 1992a). The full range of family dynamics might be better understood if several family members were responding to the questionnaires. Fifth, this was a quantitative study using survey instruments. Data obtained in this manner generally lacks depth and details. Sixth, the race/ethnicity status of the college students and the incarcerated respondents was not as similar as it could have been. Seventh, multiple variables were assessed during the t-test analysis and the large number of variables may have contributed to the significance of the variables. Finally, the nonrandom samples used in this study violated one of the major assumptions of regression analysis. This restricted the generalizability of the findings from this study.

Implications for Future Research

The results of this study indicated that the incarcerated respondents and the college students differed significantly on several of the variables. This tells researchers that there may have been some significant differences in the family lives of incarcerated respondents and college students. Even though meaningful family rituals accounted for very little of the variance in deviant behavior, they may have provided a qualitative difference in the family life experiences of the respondents. The meaning dimension of the FRQ appeared to be more significant in influencing prosocial behavior than the routine dimension of family rituals. The meaning dimension represented the
properties of rituals that were discussed in Chapter 3, which represented the ritual properties of stabilization, communication, and transformation. One might project that these aspects of rituals should receive more consideration when studying family rituals in the future. In addition, the lack of significant association between meaningful family rituals and deviant behavior indicated that there might be other factors that play a role in deviant behavior. The role of the risk factors and their influence on deviant behavior provided support for the idea that the causes of deviant behavior are complex and varied, and are often external to the individual. Previous research has indicated that multiple risk factors may put children at risk for deviant behavior (Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992). Certainly, the incarcerated respondents experienced more risk factors and higher levels of them. If family researcher, family educators, school personnel, and criminal justice officials, and researchers want to reduce deviant behavior, the risk factors should be acknowledge and addressed. Additional research should continue to explore the role that family rituals play in the lives of family members as well as all the factors that potentially contribute to deviant behavior.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
The Purpose of This Research
The purpose of this research is to determine if family rituals help individuals develop social control. As a family researcher, I would like to identify the activities that occur within families that may help individuals resist acting in a deviant manner.

Confidentiality
ALL of your responses will be completely confidential and anonymous. I will not ask you for your name, and the answers to these questions will never be associated with you in any way. PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THESE FORMS.

You can help most by carefully answering every question on the questionnaires. You may omit any questions or discontinue at any time.

Your Comments
You can write on the questionnaire...feel free to write any comments that you may have.

More Information About the Study
My name is Joanne Roberts and you can contact me through the sociology department at the University of North Texas at (940)565-2296 or Hill College, (254)582-2555. I will gladly send you the results of this research when I am finished. I will leave you my business card so that you can contact me with your address.

PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRES!
FAMILY RITUALS QUESTIONNAIRE

On the following pages are descriptions of family rituals and traditions. Every family is somewhat different in the types of rituals and traditions that they follow. In some families rituals and traditions are very important but in other families there is a more casual attitude towards rituals and traditions.

On the top of each page you will find a heading for a family setting. Think of how your family typically acted or participated during these events. Read the two statements and then choose the statement that is most like the family that you grew up in. After choosing the statement that is most like your family decide if the statement is really true or sort of true for your family. Circle the statement which best describes the family that you grew up in. Circle only one statement in each row.

When thinking of your family think of yourself, your parents, and your brothers and sisters. Some of the family settings may also include other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins. However, try and answer the questions as they best relate to your immediate family when you were growing up.

INSTRUCTIONS
1. Read both statements then choose the statement most like your family.
2. Decide if the statement is really true or sort of true of your family and circle the most appropriate statement.
3. There should be only one circled statement per line.

EXAMPLE:
MEALTIME

Think about a typical mealtime in your family when you were growing up. Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really true  sort of true
1. My family regularly ate meals together. OR My family rarely ate meals together. really true  sort of true
2. In my family everyone had a specific role and job to do at mealtime. OR In my family people did different jobs at different times depending on needs at mealtime. really true  sort of true
3. In my family mealtime was flexible. People ate whenever they could. OR In my family everything about meals was scheduled; meals were at the same time every day. really true  sort of true

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO EACH STATEMENT SO PLEASE TRY AND CHOOSE THE STATEMENT THAT MOST CLOSELY DESCRIBES YOUR FAMILY.
MEALTIME

Think about a typical mealtime in your family when you were growing up.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

1. My family regularly OR My family rarely ate meals together. really true sort of true

2. In my family everyone OR In my family at mealtime people did had a specific role and different jobs at different job to do at mealtime. times depending on needs at mealtime. really true sort of true

3. In my family mealtime was flexible. OR In my family everything about meals was Members ate whenever scheduled; meals were at they could. the same time every day. really true sort of true

4. In my family, every one was expected to be home for meals. OR In my family you never knew who would be home for meals. really true sort of true

5. In my family family felt strongly about eating meals together. OR In my family it was not that important if people ate together. really true sort of true

6. In my family mealtime OR In my family mealtime was just for getting food. was more than just a meal; it had special meaning. really true sort of true

7. In my family mealtime was pretty much the same over the years. OR In my family mealtime changed over the years. really true sort of true

8. In my family there was little planning around mealtime. OR In my family mealtime was planned in advance. really true sort of true
WEEKENDS

Think of a typical weekend with your family when you were growing up.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really true OR sort of 1. My family rarely spent weekends together.

really true OR sort of 2. In my family everyone had a specific job to do on weekends.

really true OR sort of 3. In my family there were set routines and regular events on weekends.

really true OR sort of 4. In my family everyone was expected to come to weekend events.

really true OR sort of 5. In my family weekends were pretty casual, there were no special feelings about them.

really true OR sort of 6. In my family spending time together at weekend events was special.

really true OR sort of 7. In my family weekend activities have shifted over the years.

really true OR sort of 8. In my family there was much discussion and planning around weekends.
FAMILY TRIPS/VACATIONS

Think of typical family trips or vacations you spent with your family when you were growing up.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really  sort of  1. My family regularly OR My family rarely spent time together on family true true trips/vacations.
really  sort of  2. In my family everyone OR In my family people sort of really had a job or task to do on really done and took turns true true family trips/vacations.
really  sort of  3. In my family there OR In my family there sort of really were times for something true true new and there were no routines on family trips/vacations.
really  sort of  4. In my family it was OK OR In my family it was sort of really if some members decided true true not to go on family trips/ really expected that everyone would go true vacation. on family/trips vacations.
really  sort of  5. In my family people OR In my family there sort of really felt strongly that family true true trips/vacations were important family events.
really  sort of  6. In my family trips/ OR In my family, the sort of really vacations were just a time to true true relax or catch up on work.
really  sort of  7. In my family there OR In my family, trip/ sort of really is a history and tradition true true associated with "The Family more spontaneous and change Trip/Vacation". from year to year.
really  sort of  8. In my family there was OR In my family there was sort of really little planning around family true true trips/vacation; we just went.
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ANNUAL FAMILY CELEBRATIONS
AND GATHERINGS

Think of celebrations that your family had every year when you were growing up. Some examples would be birthdays, anniversaries, Mother's Day, Father's Day, Fourth of July, Grandparent's Day, Thanksgiving, New Years, and perhaps the first or last day of school.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really sort of 1. My family had regular and several annual celebrations. OR In my family there were few annual celebrations or they were rarely observed.

true true

really sort of 2. In my family people didn't have assigned jobs for each celebration. OR In my family everyone had a certain job to do during family celebrations.

true true

really sort of 3. In my family these celebrations had no set routines; it was hard to know what would happen. OR In my family these celebrations were pretty standard; everyone knew what to expect.

true true

really sort of 4. In my family every one was expected to be there for the celebration. OR In my family annual celebrations were not a time for all members.

true true

really sort of 5. In my family there were strong feelings at annual family celebrations. OR In my family annual celebrations were more casual; people weren't emotionally involved.

true true

really sort of 6. In my family annual family celebrations were important milestones to be celebrated in special ways. OR In my family not a lot of fuss was made over annual family celebrations; members may have celebrated but it was nothing particularly special.

true true

really sort of 7. In my family the way annual family celebrations are observed has changed from year to year. OR In my family the traditional ways of celebrating annual family celebrations has rarely changed.

true true

really sort of 8. In my family there was a lot of planning and discussion around these family celebrations. OR In my family there was little planning and discussion around these family celebrations.

true true
SPECIAL EVENTS

Think of some special events that happened in your family when you were growing up; special events that may occur in many families regardless of religion or culture. Some examples would be confirmations, weddings, graduations, special achievements, retirement parties, and family reunions.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True</th>
<th>Sort of True</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Really True</th>
<th>Sort of True</th>
<th>Really True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In my family there were rarely special events.</td>
<td>In my family there were several special events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In my family people didn't have certain jobs or roles to do at special events.</td>
<td>In my family people had certain jobs to do at special events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In my family there was a set routine at these events; everyone knew what would happen.</td>
<td>In my family there was not a routine; every event was different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In my family it was hard to know who would be there for special events; whoever could would show up.</td>
<td>In my family everyone was expected to attend special events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my family special events were times of high emotions and feelings.</td>
<td>In my family special events were pretty low-key; there weren't a lot of strong emotions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my family special events had deep meaning for the family.</td>
<td>In my family special events were the same as other occasions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In my family special events have shifted over the years.</td>
<td>In my family special events are traditional and are carried across generations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In my family there was a lot of planning and discussion around these special events.</td>
<td>In my family there was little planning and discussion around these special events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

Think of how your family celebrated religious holidays such as Christmas, Lent, Holy Week, Chanukah, Easter, Passover, Rosh Hashanah, and Ramadan when you were growing up.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really true sort of 1. My family rarely celebrated religious holidays. OR My family regularly celebrated religious holidays.
really true sort of 2. In my family there were no set jobs; people did what they could during religious holidays. OR In my family everyone had a certain job to do during religious holidays.
really true sort of 3. In my family there was a set routine during religious holidays; everyone knew what to expect. OR In my family there were few routines during religious holidays; activities changed from year to year.
really true sort of 4. In my family, everyone was expected to be there during religious holidays. OR In my family it was not expected to know who would be around during religious holidays; whoever could show up.
really true sort of 5. In my family religious holidays were more casual, there weren't a lot of strong feelings. OR In my family religious holidays were times of strong feelings and emotions.
really true sort of 6. In my family religious holidays had special meaning for the family. OR In my family religious holidays were more just like a day off.
really true sort of 7. In my family religious holidays were traditional with activities passed down thru generations. OR In my family religious holiday activities shifted across the years.
really true sort of 8. In my family there was little planning or discussion around religious holidays. OR In my family there was a lot of planning and discussion around religious holidays.
CULTURAL AND ETHNIC TRADITIONS

Think of some cultural and ethnic traditions related to your heritage or background culture that your family observed when you were growing up. Some examples may be baptisms, naming ceremonies, barmitzvahs, baking a particular ethnic food, festivals, wakes, and funerals. Also, the celebration of special holidays such as Cinco de Mayo, Juneteenth, el Dia de los Muertos (the day of the Dead), Kwanza, and St. Patrick’s Day.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really  sort of  1. My family rarely observed cultural traditions. OR My family regularly observed cultural traditions.
true  true

really  sort of  2. In my family there were set jobs for people to do during these events. OR In my family there were no set jobs for people to do during these events.
true  true

really  sort of  3. In my family there was flexibility in the ways these events were observed. OR In my family there were set routines and everyone knew what to expect during these events.
true  true

really  sort of  4. In my family every one was expected to attend these events. OR In my family only a few members were in attendance to represent the family.
true  true

really  sort of  5. In my family these events were very emotional and family members experienced strong emotions. OR In my family these events were more casual events with family members less emotionally involved.
true  true

really  sort of  6. In my family these events didn't have much meaning for the family. OR In my family these events took on a special meaning and significance.
true  true

really  sort of  7. In my family these events have stayed pretty much the same across generations. OR In my family these events were flexible and changed over the years.
true  true

really  sort of  8. In my family there was little planning on the part of the family; details were left to people outside the family. OR In my family there was a lot of planning and discussion among family members.
true  true

Finally, if you have either good or bad family practices, rituals, or traditions that were not addressed in this questionnaire, please describe them on the back of this page.
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APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
CULTURE-FREE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

Please fill in the square completely for each question. If the question describes how you usually feel, fill in the square in the "yes" column. If the question does not describe how you usually feel, fill in the square in the "no" column.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Do you have only a few friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Are you happy most of the time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Can you do most things as well as others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Do you like everyone you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Do you spend most of your free time alone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Do you like being a male? / Do you like being a female?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Do most people you know like you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Are you usually successful when you attempt important tasks or assignments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Have you ever taken anything that did not belong to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Are you as intelligent as most people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Do you feel you are as important as most people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Are you easily depressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Would you change many things about yourself if you could?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Do you always tell the truth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Are you as nice looking as most people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Do many people dislike you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Are you usually tense or anxious?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Are you lacking in self-confidence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Do you gossip at times?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Do you often feel that you are no good at all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Are you as strong and healthy as most people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Are your feelings easily hurt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Is it difficult for you to express your views or opinions on things?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Do you ever get angry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Do you often feel ashamed of yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Are other people generally more successful than you are?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Do you feel uneasy much of the time without knowing why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Would you like to be as happy as others appear to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Are you ever shy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Are you a failure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Do people like your ideas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Is it hard for you to meet new people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Do you ever lie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Are you often upset about nothing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Do most people respect your views?  
36. Are you more sensitive than most people?  
37. Are you as happy as most people?  
38. Are you ever sad?  
39. Are you definitely lacking in initiative?  
40. Do you worry a lot?

Note. From the Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventories (2nd Ed), by Battle, 1992, Austin, Texas: Pro-Ed. Copyright 1992 by J. Battle. Adapted with permission.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE
FAMILY INFORMATION INVENTORY

Please answer the following questions about yourself and the family you grew up in. Circle the answer that best fits you and your family.

1. How old are you? 1 = 18  2 = 19  3 = 20  4 = 21  5 = 22  6 = 23  7 = 24 or older

2. What is your sex? 1 = Male  2 = Female

3. What is your race or ethnic identity?
   1 = Asian-American
   2 = African-American (Black)
   3 = White
   4 = Native American (American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian)
   5 = Hispanic (Latino)
   6 = Multiracial
   7 = Other, please identify ____________________

4. What is the last grade you completed in school?
   1 = 8th grade or less
   2 = 9th through 11th grade
   3 = 12th grade
   4 = one year of college or less
   5 = more than one year of college

5. In general, did you like school? 1 = yes  2 = no

6. What kind of grades did you typically get in school? (Choose one)
   1 = excellent (all As)
   2 = good (As and Bs)
   3 = average (Bs and Cs)
   4 = poor (Ds and Fs)
   5 = failing (Fs)

7. Did you grow up with both of your natural parents living at home? 1 = yes  2 = no
   If you answered yes to this question, skip to question number 9.

8. If you did not live with your natural parents, who did you live with?
   1 = mother only
   2 = father only
   3 = mother and stepfather
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4 = father and stepmother
5 = grandmother
6 = grandparents
7 = aunt
8 = aunt and uncle
9 = other (please explain)

9. If you thought your father would disapprove of something you wanted to do, how often would you go ahead and do it anyway?
   1 = never/rarely   2 = occasionally   3 = frequently   4 = doesn't apply

10. If you thought your mother would disapprove of something you wanted to do, how often would you go ahead and do it anyway?
    1 = never/rarely   2 = occasionally   3 = frequently   4 = doesn't apply

11. How would you describe your family's social class?
    1 = poor/lower class
    2 = working class
    3 = lower middle class
    4 = middle class
    5 = upper middle class
    6 = upper class

12. Was your family ever on welfare when you were growing up?
    1 = yes   2 = no

13. In what type of community did you live while growing up?
    1 = the country
    2 = a small town
    3 = a city
    4 = the suburbs
    5 = a large metropolitan area
    6 = my family lived in several different places

14. How would you describe the crime in the neighborhood in which you grew up?
    1 = little or no crime   2 = some crime   3 = a great deal of crime

15. Check any of the following that has happened to your father.
    1 = arrested
    2 = placed on probation
    3 = imprisoned
    4 = none of the above
16. Check any of the following that has happened to your mother.
   1 = arrested
   2 = placed on probation
   3 = imprisoned
   4 = none of the above

17. Were you a member of a gang?
   1 = yes   2 = no

18. Of the friends you hung around with, how many ever committed a crime?
   1 = none   2 = a few   3 = some   4 = most

19. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you in leisure activities away from home (picnics, movies, sports, shopping, etc.)
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

20. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you at home working on a project or playing together
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

21. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you having private talks
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

22. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you helping with reading or homework?
   1 = Never or rarely
2 = Once a month or less
3 = Several times a month
4 = About once a week
5 = Several times a week
6 = Almost everyday

23. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you attending parent-teacher organization meetings or other school activities?
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

24. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you attending church activities?
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

25. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you working with community youth groups (for example, scouts, boys and girls clubs)
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

26. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you with team sports or youth athletic clubs
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

27. Check all of the following activities you participated in when you were between the ages of 12 and 18?
1 = none
2 = sports
3 = school activities like FFA, Band, Cheerleading, Drama, Choir
4 = civic organizations/volunteer activities (Scouts, 4H, Rainbow Girls, Demolays)
5 = church groups (youth groups, Young Life)
6 = dance/ballet/twirling/gymnastics
7 = other, please explain ____________________

28. How often did you participate in these activities?
   1 = never/rarely
   2 = once a month or less
   3 = several times a month
   4 = about once a week
   5 = several times a week
   6 = almost everyday

29. Were you ever employed or did you work for pay between the ages of 12 and 18?
   1 = yes   2 = no
   If your answer is yes, how many hours per week did you usually work?

   1 = less than 6 hour per week   5 = 31-40 hours per week
   2 = 6-10 hours per week        6 = more than 40 hours per week
   3 = 11-20 hours per week       7 = part-time summer only
   4 = 21-30 hours per week       8 = full-time summer only
BEHAVIORS

Write in the number of times you committed the following behaviors before your 18th birthday. If you did not commit the behavior, put a 0 in the blank and go to the next question. If you committed a behavior, write in the number of times you committed it. If you were not caught, go to the next question. If you were caught, circle all of the actions that were taken.

How many times?

_____ 1. Run away from home.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)

_____ 2. Taken a car for a ride without the owner's permission.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)

_____ 3. Used marijuana.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)

_____ 4. Broken into and entered a home, building, or store.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)

_____ 5. Used drugs or other chemicals to get high for kicks.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)

_____ 6. Engaged in a fistfight with another person.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)

_____ 7. Bought or drunk beer, wine or other alcohol without your parent's permission.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)

_____ 8. Used a weapon in a fight with another person.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)

_____ 9. Taken something valued at more than $20 but less than $750.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0 =none 1 =sent home 2 =arrested 3 =jailed 4 =probation 5 =imprisoned 6 =other (please explain)
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

10. Taken something of larger value (more than $750).
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

11. Driven a car while strongly under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

12. Used force or a weapon to take money or something of value from another person.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

13. Destroyed or damaged someone else's property on purpose.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

14. Missed school without permission of parents.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

15. Gone hunting or fishing without a license (or violated other game laws).
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

16. Had sex relations with someone of the opposite sex.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

17. Had sex relations with someone of the same sex.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

18. Forced someone to have sex relations against their will.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught: 0=none  1=sent home
2=arrested  3=jailed  4=probation  5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)

(Short and Nye, 1958; Siegel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster and Triplett, 1988).
Please circle the reason(s) why you are currently incarcerated:

1 = aggravated assault
2 = aggravated assault on a peace officer
3 = aggravated kidnapping with a deadly weapon
4 = aggravated assault with a deadly weapon
5 = aggravated perjury
6 = aggravated robbery
7 = aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon
8 = aggravated robbery/elderly person
9 = aggravated theft
10 = aggravated sexual abuse
11 = aggravated sexual assault
12 = aggravated sexual assault of a child with a deadly weapon
13 = arson
14 = attempted murder
15 = bodily injury to a child
16 = burglary of a building
17 = burglary of habitation
18 = burglary of habitation with the intent to commit sexual assault
19 = burglary of habitation with the intent to commit kidnapping
20 = burglary of building with intent to commit theft
21 = burglary of motor vehicle
22 = burglary with the intent to commit theft
23 = capital murder with a deadly weapon
24 = credit card abuse
25 = debit card abuse
26 = delivery of a controlled substance
27 = delivery of a controlled substance/amphetamine
28 = delivery of a controlled substance/cocaine
29 = delivery of heroin
30 = DWI
31 = endangerment of a child
32 = escape
33 = felony theft
34 = forgery
35 = forgery financial institution
36 = forgery by passing
37 = forgery by possession
38 = forgery by writing
39 = homicide/murder with a deadly weapon
40 = indecency with a child
41 = injury to a child
42 = injury to a child/criminal negligence
43 = kidnapping
44 = manufacturing and delivery of a controlled substance
45 = manslaughter
46 = murder
47 = murder with a deadly weapon
48 = possession of heroin
49 = possession of marijuana
50 = possession of a controlled substance/amphetamine
51 = possession of a controlled substance/cocaine
52 = possession of a controlled substance/metamphetamine
53 = possession phencyclidine
54 = possession of a firearm on school premises
55 = possession of a controlled substance the intent to deliver
56 = retaliation
57 = robbery
58 = robbery/bodily injury
59 = tampering with government records
60 = theft by check
61 = theft from person
62 = theft less than $750
63 = theft more than $750 and less than $20,000
64 = theft over $20,000
65 = unauthorized use of a motor vehicle
66 = violation of a controlled substance tax act
67 = voluntary manslaughter
68 = voluntary manslaughter with a deadly weapon
69 = other (please explain)
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