



The Deviance of Deviant Research: An Analysis of The Extensibility of Social Construction and Research Surrounding Deviance

Kaylyn H. Anderson
Oregon State University
3-4-2015

Abstract

The preceding empirical research examines the traditional and evolutionary research surrounding youth deviance. Deviance is routinely discussed as an adverse impact in a plethora of theories and it is imperative to further develop the knowledge of deviance as society progresses. In this report, the utilized sample group approximately (n=13583) was obtained through a cross sectional survey conducted in 2013 and labeled as Youth Risky Behavior. It was then consolidated into an ideal representation of juvenile deviant behavior and the individual's social engagement to further examine deviant participation. It was also imperative in this study to take into consideration other circumstantial factors that contribute to the evolving social construction of deviance and previous studies that circulate around similar ideologies. The results conclude that they are subject to some level of complex spuriousness and eludes there is under representations in data if only one determinant is considered. By utilizing multiple indicators in the tabulations strengthened the proposed relationships and thus proved there is an imperative issue with the over simplification and reliance on empirical research on deviance.

Introduction

The following research consists a detailed process of identifying and elucidating the relationship youth risky behavior and social engagement while drawing heavily from engagement theories as a possible determinant of deviant behavior. This will assist in structuring a foundation to evaluate the data provided by the Youth Risky Behavior 2013 survey and as well allowing for insight on possible extensions on deviance research. The subsequent sections of this research will thus assist in proposing the general process and underlying controls or factors within the proposed relationship.

The research will also address other works of literature to strengthen the plausible relationship of the two concepts and as well social engagement as a preceding control variable. In many contemporary works and prior works circulate around the ideology that one's socioeconomic status is an ideal to examine as a determinant of deviance. This was an original consideration of this study, but after further analysis it failed to provide a definitive relationship between ones socioeconomic status and deviance.

Deviance and Social class have been widely discussed throughout the sociological realm as to impact society and are consistently evolving as society progresses in time, but other circumstances have come to light to have a stronger impact on the participation of deviant behavior. Therefore, it is ideal that we monitor and evaluate the relationship between them to gain an understanding of the hindrance of deviance on society and as well to understand the evolution of social construction surrounding deviant behavior.

Literature Review

The relationship between deviance and social class has long been a controversial issue and further investigation can assist in possible deterrence in the future in combination of other

contributing factors. As stated previously this research draws heavily from various academic journals from a wide range of authors and as well as data provided by the 2013 Youth Risk Behavior Survey. This study hopes to aggregate a more contemporary and diversified outline for prospective research on not only juvenile delinquency, but deviance inclusively. It is also important to note there is influence from sociological and criminology research to properly direct the structure of this research.

The argument of class struggles is echoed in many other previous works and as well as antecedent theorists such as Karl Marx. More recently this argument of socioeconomic struggles as being a predictor of deviance was seen in works by (Heimer, Karen 1997; Agnew, R., S. K. Matthews, J. Bucher, A. N. Welcher, and C. Keyes 2008; Leann M. Tigges, Irene Browne and Gary P. Green 1998) in the sense that there is a clear disadvantage between the “haves” and “have not’s”. Prior works surrounding this ideology commonly focus on this feature as a key insight to the likelihood of deviant participation and neglect other circumstances that would provide an understanding of what influences society. The conflict itself is inevitable and without it the progression would then become stagnate as Marx has pointed out in many of his works. Arguably, this has expanded with the advancement of society, but the unequal distribution of resources has remained a key explanation to deviant behavior. (Heimer, Karen 1997)

While in contrast, other researchers (Ryken Grattet 2010; Tapia, Mike. 2011.) have proposed that deviance is not solely a result of the predispositions between social classes and disadvantages between them, but rather a result of various contributing factors that would need to be considered to yield creditable results. This division in ideology or interpretation of deviance was elaborated by Davies (1999) in his recent piece and exemplifies the evolution of the school of thought behind juvenile delinquency, but other scopes of sociological research as a

result. This research will follow more recent studies and work surrounding juvenile delinquency to access not only the institutional attachment, but as well as gender differences as a possible predictor to deviant behavior. Numerous theoretical perspectives challenge the ideology of gender based differences in participation in said deviant behavior and more specifically argue that adolescent participation in illegal behavior is rooted in adult deviancy. (Booth, Jeb 2008)

It is seen routinely among theories in criminology that there are many other drivers that influence the likelihood of deviant behavior such as labeling and social control theories. In this study we will be structuring the research around the individual's social engagement or lack thereof based upon an index composed of sport participation, internet usage, and television viewing as a possible outline for this study. As well as a lack of interaction with support groups and or the involvement in institutions that could be an initial impact rather than the more commonly used variable of one's socioeconomic status as an indicator of deviant participation.

The contrasting structure surrounding criminology tends to follow four distinct differentials that encompass the complexity of deviant participation. These four components grants allowance for a vast amount of circumstances as this ideology is seen in most criminology research this present day and outlines four key differentials to consider while analyzing the social construction of deviance. The following passage from a piece by Nancy A. Heitzeg indicates the possible origin of diversity and commonalities within the ideology of deviance: "Race, class, gender and age -those cornerstones of stratification - shape access to social opportunity, demarcate social inequality, inform identity, and provide common ground for social movements and resistance. So too they shape our understanding of deviance. Race, class, gender and age create the contours of that battle story of deviant response and societal reaction."

Race is generally proposed as a determinant of a specific role or class affiliation in society and therefore could potentially determine the relationship between the given variables and collaborated with the other factors of stratification could yield potential indicators of illicit participation. As mentioned more specifically in work by Mack gender proves to be a strong predictor of adolescent deviance and males are generally more likely to participate in the deviant act. It is also imperative to consider age in this instance as a predictor of risky behavior.

This trend of multiple variables was also seen in various researchers findings (Mack, K. Y. 2005; Wright, B. R. E., and C. W. Younts. 2009; Olena Antonaccio, Charles R. Tittle, Ekaterina Botchkovar, and Maria Kranidiotis 2010). Given that it is also a controversial issue and is pointed out by some researchers (Cernkovich, S. A., P. C. Giordano, and J. L. Rudolph. 2000; Longshore, D. 2004) that there are other variables that could implicate social class and race is neglected to be taken into consideration of the findings. As stated previously, this study will take into consideration of race, age, and gender to compare with the previous studies conducted prior to this one that solely followed the more traditional approach of socioeconomic status as a precursor of deviance participation.

Another important focus on this study is the cultural diffusion of how society constructs what is viewed as deviant and what would be seen as accepted behavior. This debate over socially acceptable behavior is commonly referred to as Folkways, Norms, and Mores in criminal research and provided some insights to the predictability of deviant participation. The original theory created by William Graham Sumner in 1906 has long undergone alterations to accommodate the evolution in social construction, but interestingly similar gender differences in deviant participation were observed just as more recent works have also noted. (Sumner, 1940; Booth, 2008) While utilizing this ideology that deviance is ultimately transformable and

dependent on social construction, many of the variables that were once deemed as more deviant in one given point of time are more or so viewed less of a deviation from societal norms in other times. In more recent instances, marijuana is a key example of this shift in social construction of deviance with approval of measure 91 in 2014 and will be compared independently with Gender, Age, and Race. The comparison independently should allot for coherent characteristics of a deviant participant and the same process will be done for smoking and alcohol.

The second component to take in to account is an ideal representation of juvenile delinquency and in this case would be an index composed of use of methamphetamine, huffing, suicide, and use of prescription medication without doctor consent and or written script. This collaborated index held an alpha of $\alpha=.456$ which is noted to be low, but it was reported in some works some distortion to the response rate may occur due to the nature of the research.

Sample

The main source of statistical data that was used was from the Youth Risky Behavior 2013 survey. It should also be noted that the data provided by the respondents were in a survey format and was an adjusted combination of cross panels and cross sections. The survey participants were the ages between 12 and 18 at random throughout schools across the United States. The Youth Risky Behavior Survey contained 86 questions and were structured in an A-F answer format and thus needed to be recoded to provide empirical data. To assess the information effectively the questions were be numbered accordingly to the answers provided and then recoded essentially to either the respondents did not participate in the deviant act or they did participate in the deviant act to fit the empirical need with deviant participation being the highest number, whereas non deviant participation would be recoded to the lowest score.

The questions in the Youth Risky Behavior Survey that were used in the study ranged from very illicit drug usage to eating habits of the respondent and due to the nature of the age group the extremes were left out of the study. Some for example were “*During your life, how many times have you used any form of cocaine, including powder, crack, or freebase?*” or “*During the past 7 days, how many times did you eat potatoes? (Do not count French fries, fried potatoes, or potato chips.)*” These question although informing to particular characteristics of the respondent do not assist in the direction of the study.

Measures

The independent variables utilized in the following study are Gender, Age, and as well as control of Social Engagement of the participant as discussed in the previous passages in hopes to proportionality represent the population in the study. The variable of Gender was recoded to fit the empirical format outline above, thus male being the highest ranking score and female as the lowest ranking score. The variable of race was structure somewhat similarly, but was not utilized in an index due to the structure of the Youth Risky Behavior Survey questions surrounding Race. The survey provided two questions, one being “*Are you Hispanic or Latino?*” and the second being “*What is your race? (Select one or more responses.)*” Which proposed a challenge to simplify and or recode since multiple responses could be selected.

The variable of Age was broken into trichotomies to further analyze the differences in age of juvenile deviance and the survey assisted in a less broad age sample to strengthen the relationship between the variables. The survey directly asks “*How old are you?*” in the first portion of the survey and also asks the respondents grade in school, but in this case study it will be more informational to stick with just age. The variable was recoded in to three distinct age ranges and in this instance the lower the age the higher the score was, for example the category

that had a score of 3 was the age range from 12 or younger to the age 13. This trichotomy was determined by the age transition of middle school to high school is generally late 13-14 and regulations on driving permits. The age differences within this given sample should help further the analysis on juvenile deviance research and its complexity within just a few years of the respondents.

The dependent variable questions are worded as “*Have you ever or have you*” and as well with the answers will follow the same format with the answers with the option to not answer to avoid any bias or ethical issue with the respondent. Some examples of these survey questions are “*During the past 12 months, how many times did you actually attempt suicide?*” and “*How old were you when you smoked a whole cigarette for the first time?*” and have the same “A” through “G” format for answering and generally range from “Never” to “X amount of times” or “X age”.

The dependent variables as elaborated on in the prior passages, attempt to capture an ideal representation of contemporary teen deviance as well as gain an understanding on the progression of social construction of divergent behavior. The three dependent variables that were chosen to be analyzed individually were prime examples of cultural diffusion and the gradual acceptance that was deliberated by Sumner in his works on social construction of deviance. Interestingly enough, Oregon and Colorado within the last few years passed measures to allow recreational marijuana usage and thus makes a prime example of how deviance is relatively ever-evolving with society. Smoking and Alcohol are other examples of this transition in social construction on what would be permissible even though there is some level of displeasure in the act itself. It is acknowledged however that age is a considerable factor to this acceptance which will be further examined in the analysis.

The three isolated dependent variables were handled similarly to the independent variables with participation being the highest score of “2” and non-participation being the score of “1”. However, the variable Smoking was divided in to three scores essentially to accommodate respondents that were of legal age to smoke and or purchase tobacco when they participated in the act for the first time. This resulted in a clear separation between those who responded with never participated and those who were underage, thus participating in the deviance. Then to further examine other forms of deviance an index was constructed utilizing survey questions regarding Suicide, Huffing, Prescription use with Doctors script, and Methamphetamine use. The index labeled “Devianceindex2” which held a Cronbach’s reliability score of $\alpha=.456$ and was posed a composite measure of other deviant forms.

The answers were again calculated numerically based upon the respondent’s answers and will represent the high and low scores for the research. Missing data was combined with the findings and listed separately from the numerical remainder of the data to ensure the sample size. . This yielded a closer fit to the ideal respondent and was then collaborated into the indexes to utilize in the quantitative analysis. Then the respondents that answered partially were eliminated using a list wise process to retain an unbiased result and stay within the allocated funding and or time. The respondent’s provided a written consent before participation and the respondents were given the freedom to leave during the research process if they choose to do so to avoid any ethical issues and or bias during the research.

The last consideration of the research is preceding variable of social engagement will assist in further establishing and understanding the relationship as well as address spurious. This index was constructed of not only institutional engagement, but as well as contemporary measures of social engagements or lack thereof. It was imperative to consider the impact of

technological advancements on communal interactions with others and the survey provided questions that surrounded the usage of Televisions, Computers/Internet, Video games, and Physical activity. The index labeled “SocialEngageIndex” encompassed Physical Activity, Sports Team Participation, TV Viewing, Video and or Computer games (Including Facebook, YouTube, Tablets, Cellular/Smartphones, iPod, and other Social Networking tools) and held a Cronbach’s reliability score of $\alpha=.397$. The measures were then evaluated and Physical Activity and Sports team participation were recoded to fit the structure of the research where the low score is equal to high social engagement and the high score is equal to low social engagement in the instance of this particular index.

The index should provide some type of foundational understanding to the impact of social engagement on deviance from more of contemporary stance.

Results

To fully understand the proposed relationship, data was pulled from the Youth Risky Behavior 2013 and then analyzed through a series of univariate, bivariate, and multivariate tabulations using SPSS. To ensure all considerations of the general population, various variables were examined and collaborated into an ideal representation of the respondents involved the study. The study and analysis resulted in approximately $N=13583$ respondents that had participated in the survey and then compared to the proposed prior works of literature to see if there were any distinctive commonalities and or differences. (The multivariate tables regarding Social Engagement tabulations will be referenced as Table Number “x” in Appendix)

Table 1

		Gender		Total
		Female	Male	
Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	28.2%	26.8%	55%
	Participated In Deviant Act	20.6%	24.4%	45%
Total		6621	6950	13571

The analysis yielded impressive results in comparison to the other works that predominantly focused on

socioeconomic status as a key indicator of deviant behavior. There were many significant and as well as insightful results that potentially could assist in future research surrounding deviance and in particular juvenile.

The first tabulation, as seen in Table 1, was Gender and Marijuana which correlated with the other predictions of male adolescents taking the lead in deviant participation over females. Specifically, males were only 4.4% more likely to participate in Marijuana usage and whereas collectively nearly half of the sample 45% admitted to using the drug. The relationship between Marijuana and Gender did also produce significant relationship at Chi Squared = .000 ($p < 0.001$) and a positive correlation at $r=.055$.

Table 2

Table 2 produced a statistically significant relationship between Alcohol use and Gender. The tabulation

		Gender		Total
		Female	Male	
Alcohol	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	16%	18.1%	34%
	Participated In Deviant Act	32.8%	33.1%	66%
Total		6621	6950	13571

yielded Chi Squared=. 002 ($P<0.001$), but did not fit with the trend the literature proposed with males being the one who was more likely to participate in delinquent behavior. However, it should be noted the difference is quite minimal with females at 32.8% and males at 33.1%. There is a considerable increase in participation in the illegal behavior however in comparison to Table 1 at

66% of the sample population admitted to underage alcohol consumption. As well it was observed as a negative correlation ($r = -.027$) which indicated the opposite trend the literature proposes as indicated previously.

Table 3

		Gender		Total
		Female	Male	
Smoking	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	35.9%	34.8%	70.7%
	Of age or Older When Participated	1.3%	1.5%	2.8%
	Participated In Deviant Act	11.8%	14.6%	26.5%
Total		6322	6564	12886

The analysis of Smoking and

Gender resulted in an intriguingly low participation of 70.7% reporting that they have never smoked and only 26.5% of the sample actually

participated in the act. Regardless of the low participation the relationship still held statistically significant at Chi squared= .000 ($P < 0.001$) and with a positive correlation ($r = .054$). This tabulation also held to the trend of males typically being the main participant in the illegal act rather than females by 2.8%.

Table 4

			Gender		Total
			Female	Male	
Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	13.3%	13.9%	27.1%
		Count	1495	1567	3062
	Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	2.9%	2.9%	5.9%
		Count	329	331	660
	Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	11.1%	9.9%	21.0%
		Count	1251	1116	2367
	Mid-High of Deviant Participation	% of Total	22.2%	23.8%	46.0%
		Count	2503	2688	5191
Total		% of Total	49.5%	50.5%	100.0%
		Count	5578	5702	11280

To even further understand and fully analyze the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable (Devianceindex2) was broken into four categories, shown as Non-

Participation, Minimal Participation, Middle Range of Participation, and Mid-High Participation

level of Deviant Participation of our risk behavior index and were processed through a cross tabulation to compare with independent variable of Gender.

The composite index produced a less statically significant relationship than the variables that would be accessed individually against gender at Chi Squared = .002. However, the tabulation still signifies the relationship between the variables exists and there is still a minimal hint towards the trend stated by the prior works of males being more likely the participant in deviance as seen in Table 4. Remarkably, the sample concludes that collectively 73.2% of the participants reported no participation in the act. As well as the comparison between the index and gender reports a negative relationship at $r = -0.021$. It is worth noting, that after observing the results of the relationship there are clear under representations in some of the categories and would be beneficial to future research to reevaluate the index quintiles. The next portion of the research was the univariate analysis of age the proposed dependent variables to access if there is a visible relationship as the literature suggested.

Table 5

In Table 5 there was notable trends towards age being a predictor in deviant behavior. This could be due to an increase in accessibility through the High School

			Age			Total
			Age 12 or Younger to 13	Age 14 to 15	Age 16 to 18 or Older	
Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.1%	21.9%	33.1%	55.1%
	Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	.2%	33.1%	66.6%	44.9%
Total			44	4466	8996	13506

rather than middle school. (Booth, 2008) In contrast, the results were a negative correlation at $r = -.147$ which is inconclusive to what is actually observed and there would be a need to further disperse the categorization to the ages.

Interestingly, the population of respondents only made up .5% of the sample and there is a significant increase of respondents to the next age category. Again, this is a significant relationship at Chi Squared = .000 ($P < 0.001$) and reports that the age group of 16 to 18 and or older is more likely to participate in marijuana usage. Also that collectively 44.9% of the given sample reported in use of the drug, which nearly is almost half of the adolescent population. One could argue that the trend to moving to a definite acceptability of use of marijuana based upon the provided data.

Table 6

			Age			Total
			Age 12 or Younger to 13	Age 14 to 15	Age 16 to 18 or Older	
Alcohol	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.1%	14.8%	19.1%	34.0%
	Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	.2%	18.3%	47.6%	66.0%
Total			44	4466	8996	13506

Table 6 suggests a definitive relation between age and alcohol use in adolescents at Chi Squared= .000 ($P < 0.001$) and yet again the lowest age group make up a

minimal portion of the population. Surprisingly more than have of the respondents reported underage alcohol use at an astounding 66%. In a study conducted by Jeremy Staff and Christopher Uggen observes this similar increase in alcohol use over age with the numbers of hours the respondent had worked. They attributed the independence and adult-like work to be a considerable factor in minor drinking which correlated with what was stated previously with gain in independency with the transition to High School. In this instance, the results suggested that there is a 33.5% increase between ages 14 to 15 and ages 16 to 18 and older.

Table 7

			Age			Total
			Age 12 or Younger to 13	Age 14 to 15	Age 16 to 18 or Older	
Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total	.1%	26.3%	44.3%	70.8%
	Of age or Older	% of Total	.0%	.0%	2.8%	2.8%
	Deviant	% of Total	.1%	6.7%	19.7%	26.5%
Total		Count	30	4230	8564	12824

The results for the tabulation of smoking and age yielded surprisingly low

participation rates in comparison the other relationships. However, the tabulation did indicate a statistically significant relationship at Chi Squared = .000 ($P < 0.001$) and a correlation of $r = -.115$. The sample reported that 70.8% did not participate in smoking regardless of age and this also suggests a possible transition of non-acceptability based on the other literature's response rates of smoking.

Table 8

			Age			Total
			Age 12 or Younger to 13	Age 14 to 15	Age 16 to 18 or Older	
Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.1%	12.3%	14.7%	27.2%
		Count	7	1386	1656	3049
	Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.0%	1.7%	4.1%	5.8%
		Count	1	188	464	653
	Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.0%	6.2%	14.8%	21.0%
		Count	3	700	1657	2360
	Mid-High of Deviant Participation	% of Total	.2%	13.2%	32.7%	46.0%
		Count	17	1478	3672	5167
Total		% of Total	.2%	33.4%	66.3%	100.0%
		Count	28	3752	7449	11229

Again to gain understanding and fully analyze the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable (Devianceindex2) was broken into four categories, shown as

Non-Participation, Minimal Participation, Middle Range of Participation, and Mid-High

Participation Level of Deviant Participation of our risk behavior index and were processed through a cross tabulation to compare with independent variable of Age.

The “DevianceIndex2” again was statistically significant at Chi Squared= .000 and as well yielded a negative correlation ($r=-.027$) between the index and age. Yet again it also concluded that the majority of the sample (73.2%) reported they did not participant in the deviant acts as described in the index. It is important to note that the increase in age coincides with what the correlation suggests and there is a minimal decrease in deviant participation by .027.

The last tabulations were essentially the most insightful to the study and proposes that social engagement and or social interaction plays a fundamental role in deterring deviance in adolescents as the literature suggests. It should be noted that age plays a huge role in deviant participation according to the tabulations and this should be strongly considered in future research.

In Table 10 in the appendix, the tabulation between Marijuana, Gender, and the control Social Engagement index reported a decrease in statistical significance at about the third level labeled Minimal Social Engagement. The relationship between the given variables was positive, which interestingly signified that as social interaction increased for the collective gender of the respondents then in the participation increased in marijuana as well. Overall however there was very little impact of the social engagement index on the variable gender. The high level social engagement comparison with marijuana participation and gender only produced a 3.9% difference from the low level of social engagement.

The relationship between the variables also loses its statistical significance at about the Minimal-level of social engagement, but High level and Mid-High level of the social engagement remained significant at Chi Squared= .000 ($P<0.001$).

The results of gender and social engagement were conclusive that males are actually less likely to be deterred in marijuana use by social engagement and in fact the data suggests that as social engagement decreases the participation in use does as well. In contrast there was a minimal increase in non-participation for females if the more they were involved in social engagements.

The next comparison to evaluate was age, marijuana use, and the Social Engagement Index to determine if there were any considerable relationships between the variables. Table 11 in the appendix, the variable age was again trichotomized to further access differences and similarities in adolescents. The data suggests that even minimal years between the respondents there are strong differences that possibly enable them to participate in deviant acts and in this specific instance the age group of 14 to 15 presented the most dramatic change in participation.

The age group of 14 to 15 at the High level of social engagement had an increase of 2.2% in marijuana participation when compared to the Low-Non level of the Social Engagement Index. Also as anticipated by the literature the age group 16 to 18 or older made up the majority of the population, but presented a less dramatic increase in marijuana use with the decline in social engagement.

The relationship between the given variables was in fact statistically significant throughout all of the varying levels of the Social Engagement Index at Chi Squared= .000 ($P < 0.001$) and proved to hold a positive relationship.

The second proposed dependent variable of Alcohol was then ran through a cross tabulation against Gender and the Social Engagement Index and can be seen in Table 12 in the Appendix. There is a fairly similar trend in female and male alcohol participation to the trend seen in Table 10 when the variables Marijuana, Gender, and the Social Engagement Index. The

data suggests that there is a fairly dramatic increase in alcohol consumption for females as the respondent's social engagement declines which was also seen with marijuana use. The difference between the Low-Non level of the Social Engagement and the High level however is much more notable for female alcohol participation at an increase of 16.6% and a decline in male alcohol participation of 13.8%.

Interestingly, the relationship does not prove to be significant in any of the varying levels of the Social Engagement Index with the exception of the Low-Non level showing significant at Chi Squared= .000 ($P < 0.001$). As well as there is a transition from a positive correlation to a negative correlation just after the High level, which suggests there is a trend of social engagement influencing alcohol participation. Similarly there was also a 2.8% increase in alcohol participation collectively as the level of the respondents social interaction decreased.

It was also necessary to evaluate the influence of age on alcohol consumption and the proposed index for the respondent's level of social engagement. The trend that was seen Table 13 in the Appendix resembles the one seen in the previous tabulations involving age and that the age group of 14 to 15 expresses the most significant change in participation. The comparison of the High level and Low-Non level of the Social Engagement Index show that there is actually a 3% increase in the deviant participation for the age range of 14 to 15. Surprisingly, this difference in participation is higher than what was seen in the overall comparison for age consumption by .2%.

There is also the similar trend of the age group of 16 to 18 or older holding the majority of the population used in the survey, but not as skewed as it was seen in the marijuana and age tabulation. This follows the hypotheses suggested by the literature that the increase in the

respondents independence and influence of adult-like work that contributes the increase of participation over age. (Uggen, Staff, 2003)

This relationship also presented a positive relationship across all levels of the Social Engagement Index and as well expresses to be statistically significant at the Chi Squared= .000 ($P < 0.0001$).

The study also examined the impacts of social engagement and smoking participation for age as well as gender to see if there were similar trends seen in the data. The comparison of the Social Engagement Index and Gender for smoking can be seen on Table 14 in the Appendix and interestingly it correlates with the results from Table 3. The participation in Smoking regardless if the respondent is of age or not was low and only proved to be statistically significant on the High level of the Social Engagement Index at Chi Squared= .000 ($P > 0.0001$). However, the data moves from .000 to almost .1 and then goes back to being statistically significant at Chi Squared= .010.

The correlation between the variables remained positive through the varying levels of social engagement and followed a similar trend to the other examined dependent variables. This trend suggests that there is a clear difference in gender and deviant participation as the majority of past and present research proposed. In this instance male respondents tend to decrease in deviant participation of smoking as the social interaction decreases and female respondents were more likely to participate in deviant smoking as social engagement decreases. The changes between the levels of the Social Engagement Index however were not as dramatic as the other variables examined previously.

The data also presented there was little to no influence overall of social engagement and deviant smoking as well proved to have no impact really on those who were of age when first participated in smoking.

In the tabulation for Age, Smoking, and the Social Engagement Index found in Table 15 expressed the same no overall impact in deviant smoking across all ages. This tabulation as well presented a positive relationship between the variables as seen in the previous comparison with Smoking and Gender while controlled for social engagement. Although the tabulation in Table 15 proved to be significant throughout all levels at Chi Squared= .000 ($P > 0.0001$) and thus suggests that the respondents deviant participation is influenced by age and the level of social engagement.

The response in participation fell heavily in the age group 16 to 18 or older, but again the age group of 14 to 15 expressed to be more influenced by social interaction then the other remaining age groups.

The last two tabulations this study conducted was with the composite Deviance Index (DevianceIndex2), age, gender, and the Social Engagement Index. The analysis of Table 16 and Table 17 provided useful insights to how influential social engagements can be across various types of risky and of deviant behavior.

The comparison between the High level and the Low-Non level of the Social Engagement Index presented a 0.6% increase of deviant participation across both genders, but upon further investigation males and females were individually impacted by independent variables. The data prevailed that both males and females were specifically influenced and as the respondents social engagements increased the rate of deviant participation decreased. The relationship was positive for the highest and mid-high level of social engagement and then

transitioned to a negative correlation which is a similar trend to some of the studies previous cross tabulations. The data held to be statistically significant through the varying levels with the exception of the Mid-High level of the Social Engagement Index and then progressed back to Chi Squared= .000. The results propose that there is some transition in the levels of social integration where it could lead to be more enabling to deviant behavior rather than a deterrence.

The results in Table 17 in the Appendix also held to be statically significant at Chi Squared= .000 and a positive correlation through the different levels of social engagement. The data also mirrored the previous tabulations involving deviance and age where the age group of 14 to 15 expressed more dramatic changes in the rate of participation in the proposed deviance index. In fact, when compared to the high and low end of social engagement there is an overall 3.4% decrease in Non-Participation which implies the hypothesis of the literature held to be true. There is a notable transition from Non-Participation of the deviance index to the other three categories of deviant participation and the Mid-High level of the deviant participation expressing the largest increase of 1.5%. However, the results proposed that across all ages there is increase in deviant participation as the level of social engagement decreases.

Discussion

The elaborations of the various tabulations that were conducted in the study coincide with what many other researchers expressed in their own experiments. There is a definitive need to re-evaluate the process in which modern deviant research is conducted and to reestablish what is seen as really deviant.

The purpose of the study was to test the complexity of risky behavior and establish a better ideal representation of the population that is in question by utilizing many of the foundational variables in other works. The relationships used in the cross tabulations were

repeatedly statistically significant at the $P > 0.0001$ level and also present changes in social construction surrounding deviance, as seen with the decrease in participation of Smoking.

This extensive study proves that the ideology behind deviance is quite in fact very complex and society would benefit from continual research in a more open minded manner. The results from the data do follow closely to what the social engagement theory implies, however it does also imply that there are negative impacts to social interactions as well that fail to be taken into consideration. The varying levels of social engagement can enable the respondent to participate in the deviant act as seen with the participation in alcohol consumption and marijuana use in males. Some results did relate back to prior research such as males are more likely to participate in deviance over females as Merton theorized or with the transition of age to independency as suggested by Staff and Uggen.

The results were conclusive that there is still room for adjustments and that by evaluating the population by multiple indicators rather than one composite index would present a clearer understanding of the trends that are being presented. This would also involve other various outlets of research to be conducted to fully see what is taking place such more qualitative rather than simply empirical approaches as Robert Merton implies in the following passage: “Max Weber was right in subscribing to the view that one need not be Caesar in order to understand Caesar. But there is a temptation for us theoretical sociologists to act sometimes as though it is not necessary even to study Caesar in order to understand him. Yet we know that the interplay of theory and research makes both for understanding of the specific case and expansion of the general rule.” (Merton, 1968)

The social construction of deviance is influenced by a multitude of other societal factors and therefore influence the research that surrounds that constructed ideology as Nancy A. Heitzeg discusses in her work. While there are main indicators that assist in the understanding of how deviance occurs it lacks the ability to fully understand how to resolve it and by routinely evolving the ideology of what deviance is can assist in future deterrence effectively. The perplexity of deviance hinders the ability of society to progress and as well integrate rather than segregate by simplified or politicized definitions. It is imperative to structure the research surrounding deviance to encompass the true representation of diversity and in doing so more effective resolutions can be executed for deterrence.

Appendix

Table 10

Crosstab						
SocialEngageIndex				Gender		Total
				Female	Male	
High Social Engagement	Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	25.6%	32.0%	57.6%
			Count	1024	1283	2307
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	14.8%	27.6%	42.4%
		Count	593	1107	1700	
	Total		% of Total	40.4%	59.6%	100.0%
			Count	1617	2390	4007
Mid-High Social Engagement	Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	26.9%	27.6%	54.5%
			Count	827	851	1678
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	19.2%	26.3%	45.5%
		Count	590	810	1400	
	Total		% of Total	46.0%	54.0%	100.0%
			Count	1417	1661	3078
Minimal Social Engagement	Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	30.5%	24.8%	55.3%
			Count	873	712	1585
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	23.0%	21.7%	44.7%
		Count	659	622	1281	
	Total		% of Total	53.5%	46.5%	100.0%
			Count	1532	1334	2866
Low-Non Social Engagement	Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	32.2%	21.5%	53.7%
			Count	1005	670	1675
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	27.1%	19.2%	46.3%
		Count	846	600	1446	
	Total		% of Total	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
			Count	1851	1270	3121

Chi-Square Tests

SocialEngage Index		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	36.732 ²	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	4007		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	15.671 ³	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3078		
Minimal Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	3.762 ⁴	1	.052
	N of Valid Cases	2866		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	.718 ⁵	1	.397
	N of Valid Cases	3121		

1. Computed only for a 2x2 table

2. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 686.02.

3. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 644.51.

4. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 596.25.

5. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 588.41.

Symmetric Measures

SocialEngageIndex			Value	Asymp. Std. Error ¹	Approx. T ²	Approx. Sig. ³
High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.096	.016	6.087	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		4007			
Mid-High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.071	.018	3.967	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3078			
Minimal Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.036	.019	1.940	.052 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2866			
Low-Non Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.015	.018	.847	.397 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3121			

1. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

2. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

3. Based on normal approximation.

Table 11

Crosstab							
Social Engage Index				Age			Total
				Age 12 or Younger to 13	Age 14 to 15	Age 16 to 18 or Older	
High Social Engagement	Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.2%	22.9%	34.6%	57.6%
			Count	6	913	1378	2297
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	.2%	10.1%	32.1%	42.4%
		Count	6	401	1281	1688	
	Total		% of Total	.3%	33.0%	66.7%	100.0%
			Count	12	1314	2659	3985
Mid-High Social Engagement	Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.2%	21.4%	33.0%	54.6%
			Count	5	656	1011	1672
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	.2%	11.0%	34.3%	45.4%
		Count	6	336	1051	1393	
	Total		% of Total	.4%	32.4%	67.3%	100.0%
			Count	11	992	2062	3065
Minimal Social Engagement	Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.0%	22.8%	32.6%	55.4%
			Count	1	651	929	1581
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	.1%	11.3%	33.2%	44.6%
		Count	3	321	948	1272	
	Total		% of Total	.1%	34.1%	65.8%	100.0%
			Count	4	972	1877	2853
Low-Non Social Engagement	Marijuana	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total	.1%	20.5%	33.2%	53.7%
			Count	2	637	1031	1670
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total	.3%	12.3%	33.7%	46.3%
		Count	10	383	1047	1440	
	Total		% of Total	.4%	32.8%	66.8%	100.0%
			Count	12	1020	2078	3110

Chi-Square Tests

SocialEngage Index		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	112.600 ¹	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3985		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	79.353 ²	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3065		
Minimal Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	80.709 ³	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	2853		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	51.982 ⁴	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3110		

- 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.08.
- 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.00.
- 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.78.
- 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.56.

Symmetric Measures

SocialEngage Index		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ¹	Approx. T ²	Approx. Sig. ³
High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.163	.015	10.437 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3985		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.155	.018	8.664 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3065		
Minimal Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.162	.018	8.779 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2853		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.108	.018	6.053 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3110		

1. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

2. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

3. Based on normal approximation.

Table 12

Crosstab						
SocialEngageIndex				Gender		Total
				Female	Male	
High Social Engagement	Alcohol	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	14.9% 597	20.1% 804	35.0% 1401
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	25.5% 1020	39.6% 1586	65.0% 2606
	Total		% of Total Count	40.4% 1617	59.6% 2390	100.0% 4007
Mid-High Social Engagement	Alcohol	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	15.4% 473	19.6% 602	34.9% 1075
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	30.7% 944	34.4% 1059	65.1% 2003
	Total		% of Total Count	46.0% 1417	54.0% 1661	100.0% 3078
Minimal Social Engagement	Alcohol	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	17.2% 493	16.7% 478	33.9% 971
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	36.3% 1039	29.9% 856	66.1% 1895
	Total		% of Total Count	53.5% 1532	46.5% 1334	100.0% 2866
Low-Non Social Engagement	Alcohol	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	17.2% 538	14.9% 466	32.2% 1004
		Participated In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	42.1% 1313	25.8% 804	67.8% 2117
	Total		% of Total Count	59.3% 1851	40.7% 1270	100.0% 3121

Chi-Square Tests

SocialEngageIndex		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	4.563 ²	1	.033
	N of Valid Cases	4007		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	2.757 ³	1	.097
	N of Valid Cases	3078		
Minimal Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	4.245 ⁴	1	.039
	N of Valid Cases	2866		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	20.083 ⁵	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3121		

1. Computed only for a 2x2 table

2. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 565.36.

3. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 494.89.

4. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 451.96.

5. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 408.55.

Symmetric Measures

SocialEngageIndex		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ¹	Approx. T ²	Approx. Sig. ³
High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.034	.016	2.137 ₃
	N of Valid Cases	4007			
Mid-High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-.030	.018	-1.661 ₃
	N of Valid Cases	3078			
Minimal Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-.038	.019	-2.061 ₃
	N of Valid Cases	2866			
Low-Non Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-.080	.018	-4.494 ₃
	N of Valid Cases	3121			

1. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

2. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

3. Based on normal approximation.

Table 13

Crosstab							
SocialEngageIndex				Age			Total
				Age 12 or Younger to 13	Age 14 to 15	Age 16 to 18 or Older	
High Social Engagement	Alcohol	Non-Participation In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.1% 5	16.1% 640	18.7% 746	34.9% 1391
		Participation In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.2% 7	16.9% 674	48.0% 1913	65.1% 2594
	Total		% of Total Count	.3% 12	33.0% 1314	66.7% 2659	100.0% 3985
Mid-High Social Engagement	Alcohol	Non-Participation In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.2% 5	14.2% 435	20.6% 630	34.9% 1070
		Participation In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.2% 6	18.2% 557	46.7% 1432	65.1% 1995
	Total		% of Total Count	.4% 11	32.4% 992	67.3% 2062	100.0% 3065
Minimal Social Engagement	Alcohol	Non-Participation In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0% 1	15.7% 449	18.1% 516	33.9% 966
		Participation In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.1% 3	18.3% 523	47.7% 1361	66.1% 1887
	Total		% of Total Count	.1% 4	34.1% 972	65.8% 1877	100.0% 2853
Low-Non Social Engagement	Alcohol	Non-Participation In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.1% 3	12.9% 401	19.2% 597	32.2% 1001
		Participation In Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.3% 9	19.9% 619	47.6% 1481	67.8% 2109
	Total		% of Total Count	.4% 12	32.8% 1020	66.8% 2078	100.0% 3110

Chi-Square Tests

SocialEngageIndex		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	165.294 ¹	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3985		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	52.664 ²	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3065		
Minimal Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	100.164 ³	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	2853		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	35.400 ⁴	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3110		

- 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.19.
- 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.84.
- 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.35.
- 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.86.

Symmetric Measures

SocialEngageIndex		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ¹	Approx. T ²	Approx. Sig.
High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.201	.016	12.967 ³
	N of Valid Cases	3985			
Mid-High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.130	.018	7.273 ³
	N of Valid Cases	3065			
Minimal Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.185	.019	10.037 ³
	N of Valid Cases	2853			
Low-Non Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.102	.018	5.699 ³
	N of Valid Cases	3110			

1. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
2. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.
3. Based on normal approximation.

Table 14

Crosstab

Social EngageIndex				Gender		Total
				Female	Male	
High Social Engagement	Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total Count	30.7% 1170	40.7% 1550	71.4% 2720
		Of age or Older	% of Total Count	1.2% 44	1.8% 69	3.0% 113
		Deviant	% of Total Count	8.5% 325	17.1% 653	25.7% 978
	Total		% of Total Count	40.4% 1539	59.6% 2272	100.0% 3811
Mid-High Social Engagement	Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total Count	33.3% 967	36.9% 1073	70.2% 2040
		Of age or Older	% of Total Count	1.3% 37	1.8% 51	3.0% 88
		Deviant	% of Total Count	11.4% 331	15.3% 445	26.7% 776
	Total		% of Total Count	46.0% 1335	54.0% 1569	100.0% 2904
Minimal Social Engagement	Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total Count	38.4% 1046	31.7% 863	70.0% 1909
		Of age or Older	% of Total Count	1.3% 35	.8% 22	2.1% 57
		Deviant	% of Total Count	14.2% 387	13.7% 373	27.9% 760
	Total		% of Total Count	53.9% 1468	46.1% 1258	100.0% 2726
Low-Non Social Engagement	Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total Count	43.8% 1321	27.6% 833	71.3% 2154
		Of age or Older	% of Total Count	1.6% 48	1.4% 42	3.0% 90
		Deviant	% of Total Count	14.3% 431	11.4% 344	25.7% 775
	Total		% of Total Count	59.6% 1800	40.4% 1219	100.0% 3019

Chi-Square Tests

SocialEngage Index		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	28.701 ¹	2	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3811		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	5.664 ²	2	.059
	N of Valid Cases	2904		
Minimal Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	4.615 ³	2	.099
	N of Valid Cases	2726		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	9.256 ⁴	2	.010
	N of Valid Cases	3019		

1. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 45.63.

2. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.45.

3. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.30.

4. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.34.

Symmetric Measures

SocialEngage Index			Value	Asymp. Std. Error ¹	Approx. T ²	Approx. Sig. ³
High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.087	.016	5.373	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3811			
Mid-High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.043	.018	2.317	.021 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2904			
Minimal Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.033	.019	1.727	.084 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2726			
Low-Non Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.052	.018	2.885	.004 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3019			

1. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

2. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

3. Based on normal approximation.

Table 15

Crosstab

SocialEngage Index				Age			Total
				Age 12 or Younger to 13	Age 14 to 15	Age 16 to 18 or Older	
High Social Engagement	Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total Count	.2% 6	26.5% 1003	44.7% 1694	71.3% 2703
		Of age or Older	% of Total Count	.0% 0	.0% 0	3.0% 113	3.0% 113
		Deviant	% of Total Count	.1% 5	6.4% 244	19.1% 724	25.7% 973
		Total	% of Total Count	.3% 11	32.9% 1247	66.8% 2531	100.0% 3789
Mid-High Social Engagement	Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total Count	.2% 5	25.8% 746	44.4% 1285	70.4% 2036
		Of age or Older	% of Total Count	.0% 0	.0% 0	3.0% 87	3.0% 87
		Deviant	% of Total Count	.0% 0	6.5% 187	20.1% 581	26.6% 768
		Total	% of Total Count	.2% 5	32.3% 933	67.6% 1953	100.0% 2891
Minimal Social Engagement	Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total Count	.0% 0	27.1% 737	42.9% 1165	70.1% 1902
		Of age or Older	% of Total Count	.0% 0	.0% 0	2.1% 57	2.1% 57
		Deviant	% of Total Count	.0% 1	6.9% 186	21.0% 569	27.8% 756
		Total	% of Total Count	.0% 1	34.0% 923	66.0% 1791	100.0% 2715
Low-Non Social Engagement	Smoking	Non-Deviant	% of Total Count	.1% 4	25.6% 769	45.7% 1374	71.4% 2147
		Of age or Older	% of Total Count	.0% 0	.0% 0	3.0% 89	3.0% 89
		Deviant	% of Total Count	.2% 6	7.1% 213	18.4% 553	25.7% 772
		Total	% of Total Count	.3% 10	32.6% 982	67.0% 2016	100.0% 3008

Chi-Square Tests

SocialEngage Index		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	106.209 ¹	4	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3789		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	84.107 ²	4	.000
	N of Valid Cases	2891		
Minimal Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	80.552 ³	4	.000
	N of Valid Cases	2715		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	67.804 ⁴	4	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3008		

1. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33.

2. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

3. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

4. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .30.

Symmetric Measures

SocialEngage Index			Value	Asymp. Std. Error ¹	Approx. T ²	Approx. Sig.
High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.115	.016	7.116	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3789			
Mid-High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.129	.017	6.993	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2891			
Minimal Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.137	.018	7.229	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2715			
Low-Non Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.075	.018	4.115	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3008			

1. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

2. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

3. Based on normal approximation.

Table 16

Crosstab						
SocialEngageIndex				Gender		Total
				Female	Male	
High Social Engagement	Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	12.8% 443	16.1% 557	28.9% 1000
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	2.4% 83	2.8% 96	5.2% 179
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	8.2% 282	12.0% 415	20.1% 697
		Mid-High of Deviant Participation	% of Total Count	17.2% 595	28.6% 989	45.8% 1584
		Total	% of Total Count	40.5% 1403	59.5% 2057	100.0% 3460
Mid-High Social Engagement	Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	13.1% 329	14.0% 353	27.1% 682
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	2.2% 56	3.3% 82	5.5% 138
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	10.3% 259	10.8% 271	21.1% 530
		Mid-High of Deviant Participation	% of Total Count	21.3% 536	25.0% 629	46.3% 1165
		Total	% of Total Count	46.9% 1180	53.1% 1335	100.0% 2515
Minimal Social Engagement	Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	13.8% 323	13.8% 321	27.6% 644
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	3.7% 86	2.7% 62	6.3% 148
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	12.7% 296	8.6% 200	21.3% 496
		Mid-High of Deviant Participation	% of Total Count	23.8% 555	21.0% 491	44.8% 1046
		Total	% of Total Count	54.0% 1260	46.0% 1074	100.0% 2334
Low-Non Social Engagement	Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	13.9% 367	11.1% 293	25.0% 660
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	3.7% 99	3.1% 81	6.8% 180
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	14.3% 377	7.6% 200	21.8% 577
		Mid-High of Deviant Participation	% of Total Count	28.2% 746	18.2% 482	46.4% 1228
		Total	% of Total Count	60.1% 1589	39.9% 1056	100.0% 2645

Chi-Square Tests				
SocialEngageIndex		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	14.212 ¹	3	.003
	Likelihood Ratio	14.179	3	.003
	Linear-by-Linear Association	12.907	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3460		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	3.901 ²	3	.272
	Likelihood Ratio	3.918	3	.270
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.398	1	.528
	N of Valid Cases	2515		
Minimal Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	11.640 ³	3	.009
	Likelihood Ratio	11.694	3	.009
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.222	1	.269
	N of Valid Cases	2334		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	14.325 ⁴	3	.002
	Likelihood Ratio	14.355	3	.002
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6.052	1	.014
	N of Valid Cases	2645		

1. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 72.58.
2. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 64.75.
3. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 68.10.
4. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 71.86.

Symmetric Measures						
SocialEngageIndex			Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ²	Approx. Sig.
High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.061	.017	3.599	.000 ³
	Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.061	.017	3.609	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3460			
Mid-High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.013	.020	.631	.528 ³
	Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.015	.020	.753	.452 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2515			
Minimal Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-.023	.021	-1.105	.269 ³
	Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	-.011	.021	-.544	.586 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2334			
Low-Non Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-.048	.020	-2.462	.014 ³
	Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	-.037	.020	-1.919	.055 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2645			

1. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
2. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.
3. Based on normal approximation.

Table 17

Crosstab						
SocialEngageIndex				AgeRecode		
				Age 12 or Younger to 13	Age 14 to 15	Age 16 to 18 or Older
High Social Engagement	Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.1%	13.5%	15.4%
				4	463	529
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	1.5%	3.6%
				0	53	123
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	5.8%	14.3%
Mid-High Social Engagement	Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.1%	12.1%	15.0%
				2	304	375
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	1.4%	4.1%
				0	34	103
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	6.4%	14.7%
Minimal Social Engagement	Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.1%	12.9%	33.2%
				2	323	832
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	2.0%	4.3%
				0	47	100
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	6.5%	14.8%
Low-Non Social Engagement	Deviance Index2	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	10.1%	14.8%
				1	266	391
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	1.8%	5.0%
				1	47	132
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	6.6%	15.2%
Total	Total	Non-Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.3%	32.7%	67.0%
				11	1153	2278
		Minimal Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	1.4%	4.1%
				0	34	103
		Middle Participation in Deviant Act	% of Total Count	.0%	6.4%	14.7%

Chi-Square Tests

SocialEngageIndex		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	108.906 ¹	6	.000
	Likelihood Ratio	106.999	6	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	90.917	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	3442		
Mid-High Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	62.210 ²	6	.000
	Likelihood Ratio	60.991	6	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	48.881	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	2505		
Minimal Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	85.459 ³	6	.000
	Likelihood Ratio	83.792	6	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	74.353	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	2324		
Low-Non Social Engagement	Pearson Chi-Square	27.386 ⁴	6	.000
	Likelihood Ratio	27.092	6	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	12.705	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	2637		

1. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .56.
2. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.
3. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.
4. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .61.

Symmetric Measures

SocialEngageIndex			Value	Asymp. Std. Error ¹	Approx. T ²	Approx. Sig.
High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.163	.017	9.662	.000 ³
	Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.153	.017	9.094	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		3442			
Mid-High Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.140	.020	7.059	.000 ³
	Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.131	.020	6.633	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2505			
Minimal Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.179	.021	8.762	.000 ³
	Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.169	.021	8.283	.000 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2324			
Low-Non Social Engagement	Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.089	.020	3.572	.000 ³
	Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.063	.020	3.238	.001 ³
	N of Valid Cases		2637			

1. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
2. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.
3. Based on normal approximation.

Bibliography

- Agnew, R., S. K. Matthews, J. Bucher, A. N. Welcher, and C. Keyes. 2008 "Socioeconomic Status, Economic Problems, And Delinquency." *Youth & Society* 40.2 : 159-181. Retrieved October 21, 2013 from <http://yas.sagepub.com.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/content/40/2/159.full.pdf+html>
- Babbie, Earl R. 2007. "The Practice of Social Research". Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, Print.
- Booth, J. A., A. Farrell, and S. P. Varano. 2008. "Social Control, Serious Delinquency, and Risky Behavior: A Gendered Analysis." *Crime & Delinquency* 54.3: 423-56. Retrieved January, 25, 2015 from <http://cad.sagepub.com/content/54/3/423.full.pdf+html>
- Cernkovich, S. A., P. C. Giordano, and J. L. Rudolph. 2000 "Race, Crime, and the American Dream." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 37.2 : 131-70 Retrieved November, 11, 2013 from <http://jrc.sagepub.com.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/content/37/2/131#cited-by>
- Grattet, Ryken. 2012 "Societal Reactions to Deviance." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37.1 : 110301102512058. Retrieved November, 10, 2013 from <http://www.annualreviews.org.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150012>
- Heitzeg, Nancy A. 2011. "Differentials in Deviance: Race, Class, Gender and Age." *The International Handbook Of Deviant Behavior*: n. pag. Retrieved March 1, 2015. <[http://minerva.stkate.edu/people/nsf/files/mina-82vm3a/\\$file/differnetialsindeviancel.pdf](http://minerva.stkate.edu/people/nsf/files/mina-82vm3a/$file/differnetialsindeviancel.pdf)>.
- Heimer, Karen 1997. "Socioeconomic Status, Subcultural Definitions, and Violent Delinquency" *Social Forces* , Vol. 75, No. 3 (Mar., 1997), pp. 799-833 Retrieved October 21, 2013 from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/stable/2580520>
- Kim, Heejung; Markus, Hazel Rose. 1999 "Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 77(4), 785-800. Retrieved November, 10, 2013 from <http://psycnet.apa.org.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/journals/psp/77/4/785.pdf>
- Longshore, D. 2004 "Self-Control and Social Bonds: A Combined Control Perspective on Deviance." *Crime & Delinquency* 50.4 : 542-64. Retrieved November, 10, 2013 from <http://cad.sagepub.com.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/content/50/4/542.full.pdf+html>
- Mack, K. Y. 2005 "Race, Gender, Single-Mother Households, and Delinquency: A Further Test of Power-Control Theory." *Youth & Society* 37.2 :115-44. Retrieved November, 11, 2013 from <http://yas.sagepub.com.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/content/37/2/115.full.pdf+html>
- Marx, Karl. 1999. "Karl Marx ' s A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy." (1859) Retrieved October 21 2013 from http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Contribution_to_the_Critique_of_Political_Economy.pdf
- Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. 2010. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." (May 1871). Retrieved October 21 2013 from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf>
- Merton, Robert King. 1968. "Social Theory and Social Structure". New York: Free, Print

Messner, Steven F., and Scott J. South. 2000 "CRIME AND DEMOGRAPHY: Multiple Linkages, Reciprocal Relations." *Annual Review of Sociology*: 83. *Criminal Justice Collection*. Retrieved November, 10, 2013 from http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/ps/retrieve.do?sgHitCountType=None&sort=RELEVANCE&inPS=true&prodId=PPCJ&userGroupName=s8405248&tabID=T002&searchId=R1&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&contentSegment=&searchType=BasicSearchForm¤tPosition=4&contentSet=GALE%7CA67051602&&docId=GALE|A67051602&docType=GALE&role=

Olena Antonaccio, Charles R. Tittle, Ekaterina Botchkovar, and Maria Kranidiotis 2010 "The Correlates of Crime and Deviance: Additional Evidence" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 47(3) 297-328 Retrieved October 21, 2013 from <http://jrc.sagepub.com.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/content/47/3/297.full.pdf+html>

Phelan, Julie E.; Rudman, Laurie A. 2010 Reactions to ethnic deviance: The role of backlash in racial stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 99(2), 265-281. Retrieved November, 10, 2013 from <http://psycnet.apa.org.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/journals/psp/99/2/265.pdf>

Publishers, Progress, and Mark Harris. 2010. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." (March 1852). Retrieved October 21 2013 from <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1346/1346-h/1346-h.htm>

Tigges, Leann, Browne, Irene and Green, Gary 1998 "Social Isolation of the Urban Poor: Race, Class, and Neighborhood Effects on Social Resources" *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 53-77 Retrieved November, 11, 2013 from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/stable/4121011?seq=2>

Sumner, William Graham, and Albert Galloway Keller. 1940. "Folkways; a Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals." Boston: Ginn, 1940. Print.

Tapia, Mike. 2011. "U.S. Juvenile Arrests: Gang Membership, Social Class, and Labeling Effects" *Youth Society* 2011 43: 1407 Retrieved October 21 2013 from <http://yas.sagepub.com.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/content/43/4/1407.full.pdf+html>

Tigges, Leann, Browne, Irene and Green, Gary 1998 "Social Isolation of the Urban Poor: Race, Class, and Neighborhood Effects on Social Resources" *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 53-77 Retrieved November, 11, 2013 from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/stable/4121011?seq=2>

Wright, B. R. E., and C. W. Younts. 2009 "Reconsidering the Relationship between Race and Crime: Positive and Negative Predictors of Crime among African American Youth." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 46.3 : 327-52. Retrieved November, 11, 2013 from <http://jrc.sagepub.com.ezproxy.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/content/46/3/327.full.pdf+html>